香港研究中心

The Effects of Peer Orientation, Parent Orientation, and Schooling Subculture on Leisure Behaviour and Life Satisfaction of Youths in Hong Kong

Pedro Pak-tao Ng and Peter Jic-leung Man
Department of Sociology
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

THE EFFECTS OF PEER ORIENTATION, PARENT ORIENTATION, AND SCHOOLING SUBCULTURE ON LEISURE BEHAVIOUR AND LIFE SATISFACTION OF YOUTHS IN HONG KONG

by

Dr. Pedro Pak-tao Ng   Dr. Peter Jic-leung Man
Department of Sociology
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Acknowledgement

About the Authors

Pedro Pak-tao Ng is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Peter Jic-leung Man is Lecturer in Sociology at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a study of two aspects of life of secondary school youths in Hong Kong, namely, patterns of leisure behaviour and life satisfaction. Leisure is a concept not without difficulties of definition, for it embodies the elements of time, activity, and experience or meaning (Kelly, 1982). Generally speaking, leisure consists of time outside the constraint of gainful employment or various obligations, and activity which is relatively self-determined or chosen to be engaged in during such time (Parker, 1971; Kaplan, 1975; Roberts, 1978). For schooling youths, leisure would mean essentially activities undertaken outside the obligations associated with classroom learning, homework and examinations. Life satisfaction refers largely to people's subjective perception and assessment of the kind of life they live under given circumstances, and may thus be understood as a component of "life quality" (Andrews and Withey, 1976). In this study, leisure and life satisfaction of adolescents attending secondary schools are seen as shaped in certain ways by their relationship with their peers, their parents, and their orientations to their study and their school.

Adolescence and Leisure

Adolescence, or roughly the period of the life cycle from 12 or 13 years to 18 or 19 years of age, is typically a period of dynamic growth and change-- physically, psychologically, and socially. For most youths, it is also a period of schooling. During this time, the individual not only acquires formal learning of knowledge and skills, but also undergoes various forms of socialization whereby he establishes acquaintances, cultivates and develops interests, and accumulates a miscellany of experience, all of which will have some impact on his life.

As pointed out by Rapoport and Rapoport (1975), a characteristic of adolescence is that the individual responds to his environment by continuously exploring, trying, creating, and searching. Apparently, the question that is of greatest concern to the growing and developing youth is: "Who am I?" He is constantly searching for a meaningful answer to this question. As Erikson (1968) would say, he is faced with an "identity crisis." Although the problem of identity arises also in other life stages, it is likely to be more conspicuous and serious during adolescence. In the search for a meaningful self, the adolescent may sequentially or simultaneously take up a variety of interests. He is preoccupied with independence, stimulation, and novelty. He could be highly variable and even unpredictable. Most noteworthy is the fact that the adolescent is placed in an environment during schooling in which he comes into regular contact with great numbers of others who resemble him in age and the multivarious preoccupations of youth. These are his peers with whom he is likely to develop a close relationship through frequent interaction.

In the literature on adolescence, considerable attention has been given to the significance of peer groups in the socialization process, such as the development of attitudes and interests (Newcomb, 1966), strengthening of the egalitarian components of a person's motivational structure (Parsons, 1959), the provision of non-academic values and activities with their own social rewards and approvals for fellow teenagers (Coleman, 1961), and the representation of different forms of youth culture through which identity-seeking takes place (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1975).

In this study, our basic assumption is that both leisure experiences and life satisfaction (one component of which being leisure) have important implications for the adolescent's identity-seeking. This is primarily because the self grows out of social interaction and participation in life domains that are relevant to the person, including, in the case of the adolescent, the school, the family, and friendship network. The satisfactions obtained in such a context, or the lack of them, should contribute to such feelings as efficacy, acceptance by others, and fulfilment of specific needs.

The salience of the group in school life is unmistakable. Both classroom learning and extracurricular activities are structured around the class as a group or various of students within the class or acrosss different classes. Performance, academic and otherwise, is meaningful only when assessed in the context of the group. It is only natural that, in the process of interaction with one's peers over a substantial period of time, sets of values and behavioral norms emerge to guide the individual's development in both study and play.

Generally speaking, peers tend to serve as companions and sources of influence in the leisure behaviour of adolescents. They play and chat together a great deal at school. Outside the school, they may share fun at parks, playgrounds, camp sites; and some may visit cinemas, fast food shops, and discos. While there are variations in youth subcultures, a large part--perhaps the core--of these subcultures is actually built upon a certain mix of leisure activities. It is through such activities that youths develop their sociability and establish their identity.

It has often been noted that in the process of identity-seeking, adolescents tend to be highly self-conscious. They are sensitive to how they

are seen and evaluated by others, especially their peers who, in all likelihood more than the family, serve as their reference groups (Roberts, 1983). Peer support and approval are much sought after. Indeed, peer evaluation can cause great anxiety. In their study of adolescents, Bowerman and Kinch (1959) and Wright and Keple (1981) found that adolescents spend more time together with their peers than with their parents and that their behavioral norms are much determined by the peer group. Wilson (1970) believed that inter-generational conflict in society is probably more significant than racial or inter-class conflict. Further, J. C. Coleman (1979) pointed out that the three greatest problems of adolescence are troubles of heterosexual relationships, fear of non-acceptance by peers, and conflict with parents.

Despite the important role played by peers, it does not necessarily follow that adolescents are disrespectful or resentful towards their family or parents. For all practical purposes, they continue to live within the social framework of the family. To varying degrees, they participate in family activities. For instance, the family still maintains a functional role in the recreation of its members and is not entirely replaced by recreational enterprises in society (Young and Willmott, 1973). Indeed, Hendry (1983) argues that family life style, living habits, and relationships among family members all have their influence on the leisure pursuits of young people. While the studies by Bowerman and Kinch (1959) and by Wright and Keple (1981), as mentioned above, found that teenagers spend more time with their peers, they also found that the youths maintain rather strong identification with their parents throughout high school. Hence we shall, in this study, examine the possible effects of both peers and parents on the leisure behaviour and life satisfaction of young people.

Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction, like life style, is not easy to define or measure. There is no overall consensus as to what the concept actually means, how it should be defined, and in what manner the indicators should be constructed (McCall, 1975; Carley, 1981). Life satisfaction is often used interchangeably with the concepts of social well-being and subjective life quality. This is in contrast to the concept of social indicators which purports to measure qualiy of life objectively. The social indicators approach to life quality studies the objective conditions appropriate to a selected population or place, which may include the economic component (GNP, income, employment), the political component

(percent voting), environmental component (pollution levels, recreational facilities), health and education component (mortality, years of schooling), and the social component (mobility, race/sex equality) (Liu,1976).

Yet such an approach has received more and more criticisms. As Liu (1974) points out, discontent with the quality of life has seemed to accelerate proportionally with technological progress and increases in material wealth. People have come to realize that quality of life is not necessarily directly related to material wealth. Hence, there is an increasing tendency to study quality of life subjectively. The social well-being or life satisfaction approach studies the subjective attitudes held by persons in that population or place. This method attempts to unveil the privately known and privately evaluated aspects of life by asking the respondents appropriate questions. It is believed that we cannot understand the psychological quality of a person's life simply from a knowledge of the circumstances in which that person lives. The same circumstances may be satisfying and enjoyable to some people but not others. Therefore it is important to include perceptual and subjective elements in the study of quality of life (Campbell, 1981; Campbell and Converse, 1972; Andrews and Withey, 1976).

Emphasis of this study is placed on the perceived life satisfaction of the schooling youths in Hong Kong. Studies have shown strong socioeconomic strata differences in the correlations between SES indicators and life satisfaction (Strumpel, 1974; Knox, 1976; Andrews and Withey, 1976; Rodgers and Converse, 1975; Campbell, 1981). On balance, it was found that young people were more satisfied with their lives than older people. To what extent is this true in Hong Kong, especially at a time when its future stability is being questioned? The well-being of a particular segment of the population may change because some important event in that period has particular meaning to them. As such, life satisfaction could be a time-relative concept. Also, one may be interested to know if life satisfaction is also culture-relative or society-relative. Are the general happiness or satisfaction requirements different in different cultures or societies? We do not have ready answers to all these important questions and this study alone is unlikely to answer all of them. But the study of life satisfaction of schooling youths in Hong Kong should provide a modest beginning, if not a benchmark, of this important yet unexplored subject in Hong Kong.

In Hong Kong, questions about youths have frequently attracted the attention of policy makers and the general public. Some surveys have also been

taken on the leisure activities life styles of schooling adolescents by certain social service agencies or student organizations (e.g., Hong Kong Boys and Girls Clubs Association, 1980; Social Science Society, University of Hong Kong, 1982; Sociology Society, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1983). However, these surveys are essentially descriptive and have not given any systematic attention to the influence of peers and parents on the youths. Research by academics has seldom dealt with both peer and parental influence on youths, especially on the latter's leisure behaviour. One relevant piece of research is that by Mitchell (1969) in which he found peer influence is stronger than parental influence when social involvement with peers is high and when parent-child relationship is poor. Since other academic research addressed to this problem area in Hong Kong is rare, our study is an attempt to fill the gap.

II. SAMPLING AND COLLECTION OF DATA

For the purposes of this study, both male and female students studying in Form/Middle 1 and Form/Middle 4 during the 1983-84 school year in Hong Kong constitute our target category of schooling youths. These two classes or grades were selected because they represent youths aged approximately 13 and 16 which are sufficiently different to make age comparisons relatively meaningful. Although a highly representative sample in terms of areal composition and detailed school type distribution was not intended, we derived our sample from a fairly comprehensive frame.

The following criteria were adopted for inclusion of schools in a master list that was later used for drawing the sample:

1. Anglo-Chinese and Chinese grammar day schools, whether one-sex or co-educational.

2. Geographical areas: Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and New Kowloon, and the New Territories (Shatin, Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, and Yuen Long only).

3. All Government, aided, and private schools that fit the above descriptions.

4. A branch school was counted separately, except when two branches were so close to each other that they practically had the same address (where, for instance, one branch operated F/M 1-3 and the other F/M 4-6). In such a case the two branches would be counted as one school.

With information supplied by the Education Department of the Government, a list of all schools meeting the above criteria for 1983-84, totalling 354, was drawn up.

Initially, we intended to include 33 schools in the sample, which represented roughly 9 per cent of all the schools in our list. Their distribution according to school type was to be 8 (Government), 16 (aided), and 8 (private). While the proportion of aided and private schools in this arrangement reflected roughly that in the population of schools, Government schools were oversampled because only one or two would have been selected had we sampled them according to their actual share in the population. Their number in the sample was arbitrarily set at eight, to match the number of private schools sampled.

The number of schools of each school type by area (Hong Kong Island, Kowloon, New Territories) was further allocated in such a way as to reflect approximately the actual areal distribution of schools. In the case of the New Territories, the four districts of Shatin, Tuen Mun, Tsuen Wan, and Yuen Long were represented as far as possible since these are among the major new towns of Hong Kong.

Having set the allocation, the required number of schools for each of the nine categories (3 school types X 3 areas) was selected at random from the master list to make up the total of 33. For each of the nine categories, a number of schools were also randomly drawn for replacement if necessary. A letter was sent to all the principals of the 33 schools informing them of the study and inviting them to participate. After the initial contact, 22 of the 33 schools consented and 11 declined. The latter were accordingly replaced until there were eventually 33 schools willing to take part in the study.

To administer the questionnaire in the schools, a total of twelve students (7 undergraduate and 5 post-graduate) of The Chinese University of Hong Kong were recruited. The fieldwork was carried out in June and July of 1984. Questionnaires requiring about 40 minutes to fill out were administered during class time by prior arrangement. Fieldwork at three schools had to be cancelled owing to typhoons. As the schools affected found it impossible to reschedule fieldwork sessions, they had to be given up. Replacement was too late to be feasible at that time. The effective sample thus consisted of 30 schools instead of 33. Details are given in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1   School Sample by Type of School and Location

Location	Type of School			ALL
	Government	Aided	Private	
Hong Kong Island	3	3 (4)[a]	1 (2)	7 (9)
Kowloon	2	7	3 (4)	12 (13)
New Territories	3	6	2	11
TOTAL	8	16 (17)	6 (8)	30 (33)

[a]Number of schools originally intended.

A total of 2209 students filled out questionnaires. However, 311 were later determined to be unuseable because they included too many obviously problematic or irresponsible responses or because they were filled out under disorderly classroom conditions at some schools.

As the sample of students were basically disproportionately taken from the three types of schools, it was necessary to apply weights to ensure that school type composition would be more accurately represented during data analysis.

To arrive at these weights, we needed to know student enrolment figures in F/M 1 and F/M 4 for all three school types in our population of schools. Such information for the school year 1983-84 was obtained from the Education Department of the Government. Weights were then calculated, as shown in Table 2.2. After weighting, the adjusted final sample size was 1906.

Table 2.2   Make-up of Adjusted Sample after Weighting

School Type	F/M 1 & F/M 4 students in population	Students in survey after elimination of bad cases	Weight[a]	Adjusted sample after weighting
Government	7,630	539	0.21	113
Aided	86,556	1,011	1.22	1,233
Private	39,455	348	1.61	560
Total	133,641	1,898		1,906

[a]The weights are in the same ratio as those obtained by inversing the probability of selection of the group of students in a given school type.

III. THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

The dependent variables in this study are those of leisure behaviour and life satisfaction. We shall report on the selection and, where appropriate, the construction, of these variables.

Leisure Activity and Orientation

In the survey questionnaire, a variety of questions are included concerning leisure behaviour. One main question is: "Did you take part in the following activities during your spare time in the past month?" A list of 25 items, some of which referring to generally similar activities (e.g., listening to the radio, cassette recorder, or hi-fi all counted as one item; and various ball games as another), is given for the respondent to check whichever is applicable. While multiple items may obviously be checked, two other questions referring to these items are more relevant to our analyses: "In which kind of activity did you spend the most time during the past month?" "If you had the choice, which kind of activity would you most prefer to take part in if you have three or four hours' spare time?" The first of these two other questions intends to capture the general pattern of what might be called "actual leisure activity" and the second "preferred leisure activity."

To make our analyses more manageable, the 25 items of leisure activity are classified into three major categories:

(1) **Home-based activity** (e.g., reading newspapers and other printed material, watching television, listening to the radio or hi-fi, playing musical instruments, hobbies, household work), which, presumably, is engaged in alone or mostly so.

(2) **Social activity** (e.g., playing card games or chess, going out to the movies, electronic game centres, and other public places, group games, chatting and telephoning), which is characterized by typically involving some companion(s).

(3) **Physical activity** (e.g., ball games and other sports, camping and various outdoor activities), which usually involves active motion and companions as well.

These categories are inevitably crude and some items may be classified on arbitrary grounds. Thus, for example, telephoning may well take place at

home, but, because of its interactive nature, is treated more as a social activity than as a home-based one. Further, listening to music on the radio or hi-fi may well take place in the company of friends, but is classified as a home-based rather than a social activity. An underlying assumption is that, for adolescents, activities taking place outside the home are more likely than those in the home to involve peers. The likelihood to involve peers is important for our analytic purposes because of our interest in studying the possible effects of peers vis-a-vis parents on adolescents' leisure behaviour. Indeed, for our purposes, an important aspect of adolescents' leisure behaviour is whether or not it takes place at home.

Using this classification, the joint distribution of the respondents' actual leisure activity and preferred leisure activity is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Joint Distribution of Actual and Preferred Leisure Actiivity

Preferred Leisure Activity	Actual Leisure Activity			ALL
	Home-based	Social	Physical	
Home-based	35.5[a]	6.2	4.7	46.4
Social	12.2	7.5	3.1	22.8
Physical	14.6	5.0	11.2	30.8
ALL	62.3	18.7	19.0	100.0 (N=1742)

[a]Percentage based on total responses.

It is interesting to note that while 62.3 per cent of the respondents mentioned some form of home-based activity as the most frequently occurring during their leisure, only 46.4 per cent of them chose a home-based activity as most preferred. Also, the likelihood of choosing a social or physical leisure activity as most preferred is rather higher than the likelihood of actually engaging in some such activity most frequently. Thus, whereas only 19 per cent of the respondents said they took part in physical activities most frequently,

nearly 31 per cent of them said they would prefer to engage in such activities if they had the choice.

Since we are more concerned with whether or not the leisure activity takes place in or outside the home and since we need to make the analysis of variations in leisure behaviour more manageable, we have further reduced the classification scheme by combining the "social" and "physical" categories to just one "social/physical" category. This results in a relatively simple fourfold classification scheme:

(1) home-based activity as most frequent and most preferred;

(2) home-based activity as most frequent but social/physical activity as most preferred;

(3) social/physical activity as most frequent but home-based activity as most preferred; and

(4) social/physical activity as most frequent and most preferred.

According to this scheme, the figures of Table 3.1 can be converted to those of Table 3.2.

Table 3.2   Distribution of Simplified Leisure Activity Types

Most Preferred Leisure Activity	Most Frequent Leisure Activity		ALL
	Home-based	Social/Physical	
Home-based	35.5[a]	10.9	46.4
Social/Physical	26.8	26.8	53.6
ALL	62.3	37.7	100.0 (N=1742)

[a]Percentage based on total responses.

From Table 3.2, we see that approximately 62 per cent (35.5 per cent plus 26.8 per cent) of the respondents may be said to be basically consistent in their leisure behaviour. That is, what they most frequently do during their leisure is by and large the same as what they most prefer or like, either in the general category of home-based activity or in that of social/physical activity. The remaining 38 per cent are those for whom what is most frequently done during leisure is probably not what is most desired.

For our analyses to be reported later, we shall examine both the actual (most frequent) pattern of leisure activity (social/physical activity versus home-based activity) and the patterns generated by the fourfold classification as in Table 3.2. The treatment of the latter, which we shall call leisure orientation, will vary according to the requirement of our analysis. It can be treated as one dependent variable with four categorical values. This is appropriate when the independent variable is nominal, such as "student subculture" which will be described later. Alternatively, when the independent variable is ordinal, such as "peer orientation" which is of special concern to us in this study, each of the four categories in the fourfold classification can be treated as a dependent variable in its own right. That is, each "leisure orientation" can be treated as a dummy variable. All those in the cell representing a given orientation are scored "1" while all those in the other three cells of the fourfold classification are scored "0". In this way, each leisure orientation approximates an ordinal variable, and hence the strength of association between peer orientation, for example, and a certain leisure orientation can be more easily examined.

Leisure Companionship

The respondents were asked with whom they would be happiest during their leisure: parents, siblings, good friends, schoolmates (but not necessarily good friends), and alone. The distribution is shown in Table 3.3

Table 3.3   "With whom are you happiest
during your spare time?"

	Per cent
Parents	5.9
Siblings	12.6
Good friends[a]	54.1
Schoolmates	15.2
Alone	12.2
Total	100.0 (N=1886)

[a]"Good friends" refers to good friends
in the same class as the respondent.

Table 3.4   Proportion of Leisure Time Spent
with Peers ("Good Friends")

	Per cent
Less than 1/4	41.4
About 1/4	30.8
About 1/2	19.8
About 3/4	3.7
More than 3/4	4.3
All	100.0 (N=1728)[a]

[a]Excluding non-responses and those who
said that they did not have good friends
in their class.

For the purposes of our analysis, "good friends" will be singled out (scored "1", all others scored "0") so that the dependent variable in this case becomes one referring to being happiest with good friends during leisure.

Time Spent with Peers during Leisure

To measure roughly the degree to which the youths associate with their peers during their leisure, they were asked to indicate approximately the proportion of their leisure time that is spent with their good friends. The distribution of the response categories used is given in Table 3.4.

Since nearly 28 per cent of our respondents admitted spending roughly half or more of their leisure time together with their peers, the presence of peers as leisure companions of the youths is something not to be easily overlooked. If we include those who spend about a quarter of their leisure time in this way, then peer companionship applies to almost 60 per cent of our respondents.

In some of our analyses, we shall code "time spent with peers during leisure" in such a way as to highlight spending half or more of leisure time as against spending less than half. This will show more vividly variations in time spent with peers during leisure according to different levels of peer orientation. However, the five categories of time spent with peers during leisure will be retained in calculating the degree of association between it and peer orientation.

Life Satisfaction

In this study, a large number of life concerns or "domains" are asked of the respondents. Such concerns or domains can be considered as the major divisions in a person's life. It is important to tackle different domains of life separately because one may be more satisfied and pleased with some aspects of life than others. For instance, a middle-class youth may be more satisfied with his material possessions than with his relationship with parents. Following similar previous studies, such domains fall within various levels of specificity or generality, i.e., the proportion of an individual's life space to which a particular indicator is relevant (Rodgers and Converse, 1975; Andrews and Withey, 1974, 1976; Campbell, 1981). At the most general level, an indicator may be concerned with the evaluation of one's overall life satisfaction. Other indicators may be concerned with a more specific level, such as one's satisfaction with his neighbourhood. Still other indicators may deal with quite specific life experiences, such as interaction with peers. While it is difficult to develop an exhaustive list of domains in life, we try to include aspects of life with a fairly broad coverage for our respondents.

Respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with each of 26 different domains of life on the same seven-point scale ranging from 1 for "very satisfied" to 7 for "very dissatisfied". The middle point on this scale is labelled "just as satisfied as dissatisfied". Finally, the respondents are asked to describe their satisfaction with their life as a whole.

The set of domains used is listed in Table 3.5 below, along with the overall distribution of responses on each scale, and the average score values.

We note that responses across these 26 items tend to cluster rather heavily around the more satisfied end of the scale. With the exception of the first four items concerning Government and the two items relating to noise and law and order in one's district, all the rest show a majority in the first three, or satisfied, positions. Amazingly, more than 85 per cent of our respondents reported that they were satisfied with their peer relationships. However, this does not mean that they love their peers and hate their family. In fact, the respondents reported very high satisfaction levels (75 per cent or more) on the several items concerning their family life. Only three items (Government, noise, law and order) show more than 30 per cent of the sample lying on the dissatisfied side of the scale.

Table 3.5 Responses to 27 Items of Satisfaction

Item	Most Satisfied 1	2	3	4	5	6	Least Satisfied 7	Total*	Mean	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Government	2.0	9.8	27.0	24.7	17.9	12.9	5.6	100.0	4.08	1879
Execo and Legco	1.8	10.7	27.4	31.0	15.2	10.0	3.9	100.0	3.93	1874
Urban Council	2.1	13.6	31.3	28.4	12.4	8.7	3.4	100.0	3.75	1877
District Boards	1.9	13.8	31.4	27.8	12.8	8.3	4.1	100.0	3.77	1866
Television	6.7	27.2	37.6	18.7	5.9	3.3	.7	100.0	3.02	1878
Radio	7.1	29.6	37.2	18.1	4.5	2.3	1.2	100.0	2.95	1880
Newspaper	6.4	29.8	38.7	17.5	4.7	2.3	.7	100.0	2.94	1887
Magazines	5.4	26.0	37.7	20.1	6.7	3.6	.6	100.0	3.10	1880
School Life	4.4	23.9	34.2	17.3	7.9	8.3	4.1	100.0	3.42	1876
School Activities	4.6	20.9	29.2	20.2	10.8	9.4	4.9	100.0	3.60	1879
Family Life	12.5	37.8	27.3	12.0	4.3	4.1	2.1	100.0	2.78	1874
Relationship with Father	14.7	34.7	25.5	12.6	5.5	4.1	2.8	100.0	2.83	1790
Relationship with Mother	20.4	36.5	24.9	10.4	3.6	2.6	1.6	100.0	2.55	1816
Relationship with Siblings	11.3	33.3	35.2	12.9	3.8	2.3	1.2	100.0	2.77	1817
Peer Relationship	8.2	41.1	36.3	9.4	2.5	1.7	.9	100.0	2.66	1889
Friendship	12.8	35.6	28.9	12.6	5.2	2.6	2.2	100.0	2.79	1695
Acceptance by Others	5.5	32.2	37.1	17.2	4.5	2.3	1.3	100.0	2.95	1884
Respect from Others	3.9	24.6	37.0	23.2	6.0	3.8	1.5	100.0	3.20	1877
Interaction with Others	5.9	33.4	39.4	14.6	3.7	1.8	1.1	100.0	2.87	1882
School	4.9	24.2	31.3	18.2	8.2	7.1	6.1	100.0	3.46	1862
Fresh Air	9.6	26.0	26.7	14.9	9.5	8.4	4.9	100.0	3.33	1875
Noise	5.5	20.4	22.3	16.2	15.2	13.0	7.4	100.0	3.84	1878
Population Density	6.2	21.5	24.9	18.9	12.7	10.3	5.5	100.0	3.63	1866
Law and Order	4.9	18.0	25.4	15.6	15.5	13.1	7.5	100.0	3.88	1880
Living Environment	7.3	23.3	26.2	15.3	12.2	10.4	5.3	100.0	3.54	1878
School Education	5.5	27.9	31.6	18.9	6.6	5.1	4.3	100.0	3.26	1882
Life as a Whole	5.7	22.9	40.4	21.1	5.7	3.2	1.1	100.0	3.12	1892

*May not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

When we examine the mean scores of the items, which take into consideration the middle point of the scale, the pattern is quite consistent. With the exception of the first item (Government), all the other items show a mean score of less than four on a seven-point scale. This finding unmistakably shows that the respondents are generally satisfied with most of the items, from some global measures such as life as a whole to more specific life experiences such as entertainment through the media.

Multi-item Indices of Life Satisfaction

We have briefly described 26 different measures of life satisfaction. It would be advantageous if these items could be combined into a smaller number of indices. As Rodgers and Converse (1975) point out, the first advantage is practical. It would be cumbersome if we were to describe the behaviour of each of several life descriptions separately. A second advantage to be gained by using multi-item indices is to increase their reliability. Single-item measurements are often unreliable and therefore unsatisfactory. By compounding a number of items that appear to be measuring the same entity, a broader and more reliable measurement is established. Statistical tests, however, must ensure that indices thus established must be of acceptable reliability and validity. Following this rationale, six summary indices of life satisfaction are constructed. These indices are named: School Life, Family Life, Acceptance by Others, Government, Media, and Living Environment. The items composing each index are described below.

The index of **School Life** is composed of four items. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with:

(1) School life
(2) Extra-curricular activities in the school
(3) The school itself
(4) Education received in the school

Family Life consists of satisfaction with the following four items:

(1) Family life
(2) Relationship with father
(3) Relationship with mother
(4) Relationship with siblings

The third composite index, **Acceptance by Others**, consists of satisfaction with five items:

(1) Relationship with peers
(2) Friendship attained
(3) Acceptance by others
(4) Respect from others
(5) Interaction with others

Government, the fourth index, is constructed by combining satisfaction scores in the following four items:

(1) The Government in handling Hong Kong affairs
(2) The Executive and Legislative Councils in handling Hong Kong affairs
(3) The Urban Council in handling local affairs
(4) The District Boards in handling local affairs

The fifth index, **Media**, is composed of satisfaction with the following four items:

(1) News or entertainment from TV
(2) News or entertainment from radios
(3) News or entertainment from newspapers
(4) News or entertainment from magazines

The last index, **Living Environment**, consists of satisfaction with:

(1) Degree of air cleanliness in the neighbourhood
(2) Noise pollution in the neighbourhood
(3) Population density in the neighbourhood
(4) Law and order in the neighbourhood
(5) Living environment

All indices are constructed by a standard procedure. For each respondent, the scores of individual items included in each index are first summed and then divided by the number of items, resulting in a scale score of 1 to 7, with 1 being "very satisfied" and 7 "very dissatisfied". Thus regardless of the number of items in each index, the same scale range is established and all indices are comparable with one other.

Table 3.6 shows the distribution of mean scores of the newly constructed indices of life satisfaction.

Table 3.6 Distribution of Mean Scores of
Life Satisfaction Indices

Index	Mean	N
School Life	3.40	1894
Family Life	2.81	1895
Acceptance by Others	2.90	1893
Government	3.88	1887
Media	3.00	1889
Environment	3.65	1884
Life in General	3.12	1892

With a range of 1 to 7 and 1 being most satisfied, a lower mean score indicates a higher level of satisfaction. The respondents as a whole tend to perceive a rather high level of satisfaction in all the major domains of life, including life in general. The relatively low values of the mean scores show that the responses cluster toward the satisfied end of the scales.

When the mean scores of individual life domains are analyzed, it is found that adolescents in our sample perceive the highest level of satisfaction in their family life (2.81), followed by acceptance by others (2.90), media (3.00), life in general (3.12), school life (3.40), environment (3.65), and government (3.88). Thus, the respondents are most satisfied with their family life and least satisfied with the government.

After constructing these indices, a number of statistical tests were performed to check their reliability and validity.

We shall deal with reliability first. The split-half method is used to test the reliability of these newly-constructed scales. Items in each index are split into two halves, and each half is treated as a separate, but nearly identical measure as the other. If the index is reliable, these two sets of scores should be highly associated.

Table 3.7 Reliability Coefficients of Six
Life Satisfaction Indices

Index	Correlation Between Halves	Guttman Split-half Coefficient
School Life	.67	.80
Family Life	.68	.80
Acceptance	.70	.78
Government	.66	.79
Media	.62	.77
Environment	.62	.74

Table 3.7 shows that, for each index, two reliability coefficients are computed: correlation between halves and the Guttman Split-half coefficient. If T_1 and T_2 are the sums of the items in parts 1 and 2, the correlation between halves is the correlation between the sums T_1 and T_2. This correlation measures the extent to which the two halves measure the same thing. The coefficients for the six summary indices range from .62 to .70, indicating that these indices are rather stable over time.

The second reliability coefficient computed is the Guttman Split-half coefficient. This coefficient helps to answer the question: Given two parts, how reliable would the whole be if they are combined into one? Again, the high values of the coefficients, from .74 to .80, indicate that our six indices are highly reliable.

Next, we shall examine the question of validity. Essentially, validity refers to the degree to which any measure succeeds in doing what it purports to do. It reflects the extent to which the measure is free of systematic errors that represent some form of bias slanting the results in a particular direction.

It is quite easy to claim that the six life satisfaction indices have face validity. Face validity uses logic reasoning and is concerned with the extent to which the index "looks like" it measures what it is intended to measure. This is evidenced from the fact that items in each index measure different facets of the same entity, whether they are feeling satisfied about school, family, acceptance by others, government, media, or the environment.

As a further validity check, internal consistency among the items of each index is evaluated. If the items measure something in common, they should at least have a moderate level of internal consistency. Further, after an index has been constructed, it should be representative of the items from which the index is constructed. One way to do this would be to check the correlation coefficients between each of the original variables and the index. High correlation coefficients generally mean that the index is representative of the variables. Table 3.8 details the above validity of the School Life Index.

Table 3.8   Correlation Matrix of Items in
School Life Index

	V_1	V_2	V_3	V_4	Item-Index r
V_1	1.00	.57	.67	.46	.84
V_2		1.00	.52	.40	.78
V_3			1.00	.52	.85
V_4				1.00	.74

V_1= Satisfaction with school life
V_2= Satisfaction with extra-curricular activities in school
V_3= Satisfaction with school itself
V_4= Satisfaction with education received in school

Correlation cofficients (Pearson's r) in the above table are rather high, ranging from .46 to .67 among the four items. This indicates that the four items making up the School Life Index have a relatively high degree of internal consistency. Figures in the last column also show that there is indeed high correlation between individual items and the index, with values ranging from .74 to .85, indicating that the School Life index is a good representation of the four items involved. All the correlations are significant beyond the .001 level.

Similary, inter-item and item-index coefficients are also computed for the remaining five life satisfaction indices: Family Life, Acceptance by others, Government, Media, and Environment. As expected, both inter-item and item-index correlation coefficients are rather high, with the former above .40 and the latter above .70 in all cases. Such high correlation coefficients indicate that the

items making up the indices have a high degree of internal consistency and that the indices are good representation of the items involved. Furthermore, all the correlations are again significant beyond the .001 level.

In subsequent analysis in this report, the dependent variables of life satisfaction will be examined in terms of six composite indices (Family, School, Acceptance by Others, Government, Media, and Environment) and life in general which is a single item index.

IV. THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Three major independent variables will be used in the analysis of leisure behaviour and life satisfaction: (1) peer orientation, (2) parent orientation, and (3) schooling subculture. Since they all involve the construction of composite indices, they will be described here in some detail.

Peer Orientation

In this study, "peers" refers to classmates who are also good friends of the respondent. Peer orientation conceptually is the degree to which the adolescent feels attached to his peers, identifies with them, and takes them into consideration in his action. Operationally, it is a composite index consisting of six items. The items and their scoring scheme are as follows:

(1) "How interested are you in making friends?"

        1 = not so interested
        2 = average
        3 = very interested

(2) "How important is it for you to make your classmates like you and befriend you?"

        1 = does not matter
        2 = rather important
        3 = very important

(3) "When you are worried about something, whom would you want to discuss it with first?"

        0 = people other than good friends in the class
        3 = good friends in the class

(4) "Suppose your parents planned to take you to a movie and they wanted to take the whole family along. But then you had arranged to go to some other movie with your good friends on the very same evening and they expected you to show up. What do you think you would do?"

        0 = go with parents
        3 = go with good friends

(5) "In general, how would you rate your relationship with your good friends in your class? (Use a mark between 0 and 100, 100 being the highest.)"

        1 = 0 - 60
        2 = 61 - 70
        3 = 71 - 80
        4 = 81 - 90
        5 = 91 -100

(6) Relative closeness to friends as compared with closeness to parents. Two questions similar to the one above were asked concerning respectively the respondent's father and mother. A mean mark was first calculated. In cases where both parents were deceased, the overall mean mark was assigned. When only one parent was living, the mark for that parent was used. This mark was coded as in the question above after which it was compared with the code for relationship with good friends (i.e., both marks being coded as a five-point score). The result was recoded as follows:

        1 = parental score higher than peer score by
            2 points or more
        2 = parental score higher than peer score by
            only 1 point
        3 = parental score same as peer score
        4 = peer score higher than parental score by
            only 1 point
        5 = peer score higher than parental score by
            2 points or more

The Peer Orientation index score is formed by summing the scores of the above six items. The index scores range from 4 to 22.

To check the reliability of the index, we perform a simple item discrimination analysis. First, we divide the index scores into approximate quintiles. Then, we compare the top and bottom quintiles on each item. Essentially, if the items are consistently measuring the same concept, a low index score should reflect low scores on all the items while a high index score should reflect high scores on all the items. Table 4.1 shows the results of the comparison.

Table 4.1   Comparison of the Top and Bottom Quintiles
of the Peer Orientation Index Showing
Values of Its Component Items

Index Item	Bottom Quintile (n=379)[a]	Top Quintile (n=345)
	%	%
(1) Very interested in making friends	23.5	66.0
(2) Very important that friends like me	11.5	66.1
(3) Discuss worries with friends	2.9	78.3
(4) Would go to movies with friends rather than parents	4.0	80.1
(5) Relationship with friends rated high (81 or more out of 100)	0.1	59.3
(6) Relative closeness to friends higher than that to parents (by 1 point or more on the recoded 5-point scale)	0.0	58.5

[a]Base number for percentage of specified value of each item.

From the results given in Table 4.1, we can see that the differences in value of the six items between the top and bottom quintiles are all quite substantial. Thus, for example, 78 per cent of those in the top quintile of the index would discuss worries with their good friends first while only 2.9 per cent of those in the bottom quintile would do so. We can therefore regard the index as reasonably reliable.

To check the validity of the index, we crosstabulate the index against

another item in the questionnaire asking how satisfied the respondent feels about being accepted by others (seven-point scale, with 6 and 7 representing "satisfied" and "very satisfied" respectively). We find that 47 per cent of those in the top quintile of the Peer Orientation index are "satisfied" or "very satisfied" while the corresponding figure in the bottom quintile is only 29 per cent. If we assume that those who are highly peer-oriented (i.e., taking peers into account more seriously) are more likely to be accepted by peers and hence more likely to be satisfied with such acceptance, then our Peer Orientation index does seem to possess construct validity.

For subsequent data analysis, the Peer Orientation index will be trichotomized into low (4 to 9), medium (10 to 13), and high (14 to 22), representing approximately 29 per cent, 38 per cent, and 33 per cent respectively of the sample.

Parent Orientation

Parent orientation is similar to peer orientation except that the point of reference is parents instead of peers. Thus, it refers to the degree to which the adolescent feels attached to his parents, identifies with them, and takes them into account in his action. As a composite index, it consists of the following five items:

(1) "How often do you have opinions different from those of your parents?"

        1 = constantly
        2 = often
        3 = occasionally
        4 = rarely
        5 = never

(2) "In general, how would you rate your relationship with your father and with your mother? (Use a mark between 0 and 100, 100 being the highest.)"
    Where this question applied to both parents, a mean mark was calculated. If only one parent was living, the mark for that parent was used. Where both parents were deceased, the overall mean was assigned. Whichever way, the mark was then coded as follows:

1 = 0 - 60
2 = 61 - 70
3 = 71 - 80
4 = 81 - 90
5 = 91 -100

(3) "How important is it for you to make your parents happy?"

    1 = does not matter
    2 = rather important
    3 = very important

(4) "When you are worried about something, whom would you want to discuss it with first?"

    0 = people other than parents
    3 = parents

(5) Going to the movies with good friends or with parents--as in the case of "peer orientation" but with codes changed to:

    0 = go with good friends
    3 = go with parents

Summing the values of the five items resulted in the composite Parent Orientation index whose scores range from 3 to 19.

As in the case of the Peer Orientation index, we perform an item discrimination analysis to check the reliability of the Parent Orientation index in terms of internal consistency. The results are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Comparison of the Top and Bottom Quintiles (approximate) of the Parent Orientation Index Showing Values of Its Component Items

Index Item	Bottom Quintile (n=340)[a]	Top Quintile (n=457)
	%	%
(1) Rarely or never have opinions different from those of parents	5.9	49.5
(2) Relationship with parents rated high (81 or more out of 100)	1.8	85.1
(3) Very important that parents are happy	17.9	84.0
(4) Discuss worries with parents	0.6	66.1
(5) Would go to movies with parents rather than with friends	2.9	86.9

[a]Base number for percentage of specified value of each item.

It can be seen that the differences in value of the five items between the top and bottom quintiles of the Parent Orientation index are all very substantial. That is, the items can all discriminate well between high index scorers and low ones. Thus, for example, 85 per cent of those in the top quintile rate relationship with parents rather highly while only less than 2 per cent of those in the bottom quintile do so. The index as a whole can thus be regarded as rather reliable.

As a test of the validity of the Parent Orientation index, we crosstabulate the index against two items asking how satisfied the respondent feels about his relationship with father and with mother, respectively. We find that nearly 75 per cent of those in the top quintile of the index, but only 20 per cent of those in the bottom quintile, are "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their relationship with father. Corresponding figures for satisfaction with relationship with mother are 83 per cent and 21 per cent respectively in the top and bottom quintiles. This supports the expectation that those who are highly

oriented towards their parents should tend to be in a harmonious relationship with their parents and hence feel satisfied with such relationship. We can claim, therefore, that our Parent Orientation index has construct validity.

For our data analysis, the Parent Orientation index will also be trichotimized into low (3 to 9), medium (10 to 13), and high (14 to 19), representing approximately 35 per cent, 41 per cent, and 24 per cent respectively of the sample.

Schooling Subculture

While "peer orientation" and "parent orientation" attempt to highlight the adolescent's orientation towards his significant others, there is a concept which embodies the adolescent's attitude towards his role as a student. This concept basically addresses the question: What kind of student is he? Two aspects are relevant to this question First, how interested the student is in his studies; second, how close he feels towards or how much he identifies with his school. These two aspects underlie the manner in which the adolescent looks at his student role. It certainly has implications for his performance as a student. We believe it has implications for his leisure behaviour and life satisfaction as well. For lack of a better term, we shall call the concept formed on the basis of these two aspects schooling subculture. The content of the two aspects and the construction of types of schooling subculture are described below.

Interest in studies is measured by the following four items:

(1) "What do you think is the chief purpose of schooling?"

　　1 = non-academic (satisfying parents; getting a
　　　　better-paid job; knowing friends; nothing in
　　　　particular)
　　2 = academic (getting a certificate; getting good
　　　　grades; acquiring knowledge)

(2) "Do you agree that getting homework done takes higher
　　priority over other matters?"

　　1 = do not agree
　　2 = cannot decide
　　3 = agree

(3) "Which of the following statements comes closer to how you
　　feel about your studies?"

　　1 = Studying is undoubtedly a painful burden.
　　2 = Sometimes I feel that there is no escape from
　　　　studying.
　　3 = Sometimes I feel that there is some joy to
　　　　studying after all.
　　4 = Studying is definitely beneficial and challenging
　　　　to me.

(4) "Would you agree that one need not be too serious about
　　one's studies?"

　　1 = strongly agree
　　2 = agree
　　3 = no opinion
　　4 = disagree
　　5 = strongly disagree

The above items are scored in such a way that a higher score represents stronger interest in studies. Summing the four items results in an "Interest in Studies" index with scores ranging from 4 to 14. Since we shall use this and another index to form a relatively simple fourfold classification of "schooling subculture," we need only dichotomize each index into "low" and "high." For the "Interest in Studies" index, scores of 4 to 10 are "low" (46 per cent of total) and those of 11 to 14 are "high" (54 per cent of total). This is the closest to a fifty-fifty cut. The results of an item discrimination analysis are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3   Comparison of the Upper and Lower Halves of the
             "Interest in Studies" Index Showing the Values
             of Its Component Items

Index Item	"Interest in Studies" Index	
	Low (n=809)[a]	High (n=964)
	%	%
(1) Chief purpose of schooling is academic learning	38.4	79.4
(2) Getting homework done has higher priority	26.8	77.8
(3) Studying is beneficial and challenging	3.5	31.1
(4) Strongly agree that one need not be too serious about one's studies	36.1	2.0

[a]Base number for percentage of specified value of each item.

The results of the analysis demonstrate rather clearly that the values of each of the four items of the index are sufficiently different between the lower and upper halves of the index to support our belief that the index is internally consistent. Take the last item, for example. Over one-third of the low scorers on the index agree strongly that one need not be too serious about one's studies, but only 2 per cent of the high scorers do so. This conforms very well with our expectation that those who are more interested in studies should tend to disagree with such a statement.

When a student is interested in his studies, he can be expected to be generally satisfied with the educational experience he is having. The two may well be part and parcel of an overall enthusiasm of the person in his role as a student. Indeed, when we crosstabulate the two variables, we find that 26 per cent of the low index scorers, as compared with 34 per cent of the high scorers,

say that they are "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their school education. Although the difference is not too big, which is partly accountable by the fact that the index scores are only dichotomized, it is in the expected direction. We can thus have a reasonable amount of faith in not only the reliability but also the validity of the "interest in studies" index.

We shall now turn to the second aspect of the concept of schooling subculture which we shall call "identification with school." The **Identification with School** index consists of the following three items:

(1) "Generally speaking, what is your school like to you?"

1 = like a stranger
2 = like an ordinary acquaintance whom you do not know well
3 = like an old friend
4 = like a close and dear family

(2) "How much of a sense of belonging do you have at your school?"

1 = no sense of belonging at all
2 = very little
3 = quite a bit
4 = a great deal

(3) "Would you agree that you wish you could switch to another school?"

1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = no opinion
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

The "Identification with School" index was formed by summing the three items, giving scores ranging from 3 to 13. Like the "Interest in Studies" index, the "Identification with School" index was dichotomized into "low" (scores of 3 to 8) and "high" (scores of 9 to 13). The lows account for about 55 per cent of the total and the highs 45 per cent. Results of an item discrimination analysis, to check the items' consistency, are given in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4   Comparison of the Upper and Lower Halves of the
            "Identification with School" Index Showing the
            Values of Its Component Items

Index Item	"Identification with School" Index	
	Low (n=961)[a]	High (n=811)
	%	%
(1) School like an old friend or close and dear family	17.4	70.4
(2) Quite a bit or a great deal of sense of belonging at school	37.8	94.0
(3) Agree or strongly agree that they wish to switch school	65.5	6.8

[a]Base number for percentage of specified value of each item.

Again, the analysis shows clearly that the items are rather consistent in that their values in the lower and upper halves of the index are very different. For example, while as many as nearly two-thirds of those scoring low on the index agree or strongly agree that they wish to switch to another school if possible, such feeling is shared by only less than 7 per cent of those scoring high on the index. Similarly, a substantial majority of those scoring high on the index have favourable feelings about their school and admit to having quite a bit or a great deal of sense of belonging there. In terms of internal consistency, then, the index may be said to be reliable.

To check the construct validity of the "Identification with School" index, we crosstabulate it against an item that asks about the respondent's degree of satisfaction with his school. We expect that students who identify with their school should tend to feel satisfied with what their school has to give them. Indeed, 21 per cent of those scoring low on the index are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their school but only 3 per cent of those scoring high have such dissatisfaction. The "Identification with School" index is thus reasonably valid.

Construction of "Schooling Subculture" Types

Having formed the "Interest in Studies" and "Identification with School" indices, we are in a position to construct the fourfold classification of "schooling subculture" types. According to its position on the two dimensions, we shall give each type a name mainly for convenience in our reference to the different types. Of course, the names should also serve to indicate, although perhaps not too accurately, the general nature of the schooling subculture in question. The typology, with percentage share of each type, is shown in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1   A Typology of "Schooling Subculture"

Identification with School	Interest in Studies	
	Low	High
High	School-oriented non-learners (16.7%)[a]	School-oriented learners (29.0%)
Low	Alienated non-learners (28.9%)	Independent learners (25.4%)

[a]Base number = 1773, excluding missing cases.

A brief description of some characteristics of our sample associated with the schooling subcultures may be of interest here. First, their distribution varies according to the type of school. Concentration of "school-oriented learners" is highest in Government schools but lowest in private schools. In fact, over a third of the sample subjects in private schools are "alienated non-learners." Second, girls' tendency to be "learners" is higher than boys' while boys are more likely to be "non-learners." This seems to be the case for both Form 1 and Form 4. Third, there is a systematic variation in class position from one schooling subculture to another. The "school-oriented learners" tend to rank highest in terms of position in class, followed by the "independent learners" and the "school-oriented non-learners." The "alienated non-

learners," by comparison, tend to rank the lowest. Details of these characteristics are given in Tables A.1 to A.3 in Appendix A.

Having described all the major independent variables, we shall proceed to present our findings. We shall first examine the relationships between peer orientation and parents orientation on the one hand and leisure behaviour and life satisfaction on the other. We shall then look at how leisure behaviour and life satisfaction vary with the four schooling subcultures.

V. PEER ORIENTATION, PARENT ORIENTATION, AND LEISURE

It will be recalled that, for our purposes, leisure activity is differentiated into just two general categories: "home-based" and "social/physical." The basic assumption is that peer companions are more likely to be present in social or physical activities than in home-based activities. Accordingly, categorizing leisure activity in this way, despite its crudeness, would be useful when we study its relationship with peer orientation.

This categorization applies to both (a) the most frequent leisure activity and (b) the most preferred leisure activity. In Chapter III, where the dependent variables were introduced, we noted that when asked about their actual most frequent leisure activity, 62 per cent of our respondents mentioned some home-based activity. But when asked about their most preferred leisure activity, only 46 per cent mentioned such an activity (see Table 3.2). That is, the tendency to prefer some social/physical leisure activity is greater than the tendency to actually engage in some such activity most frequently. Before bringing peer orientation and parent orientation into our analysis of the youths' leisure behaviour, let us first examine the distribution of leisure activity types for the two school class groups in our sample, i.e., Form 1 and Form 4.

Table 5.1   Distribution of Leisure Activity Types, Forms 1 and 4

Most Preferred Leisure Activity	Most Frequent Leisure Activity				ALL	
	Home-based		Social/Physical			
	F.1	F.4	F.1	F.4	F.1	F.4
Home-based	35.4[a]	35.6	10.1	11.5	45.5	47.1
Social/Physical	25.4	28.2	29.1	24.7	54.5	52.9
ALL	60.8	63.8	39.2	36.2	100.0 (N=839)	100.0 (N=903)

[a]Percentage based on total responses.

From Table 5.1, it can be seen that first, F.4 students tend to engage in home-based leisure activities somewhat more than F.1 students (63.8 per cent vs. 60.8 per cent). A heavier study load experienced by the older adolescents may account for this difference. Second, F.1 students are somewhat more likely than F.4 students to prefer social/physical activities (54.5 per cent vs. 52.9 per cent). Third, while the occurrence of the consistently home-based type is almost the same for the two classes (nearly 36 per cent), that of the consistently social/physical type is higher in F.1 (29.1 per cent) than in F.4 (24.7 per cent). It seems that, while home-based leisure is typically applicable to well over half of our respondents in both classes, students in the lower form are probably in a better position than their seniors to engage in and to prefer social/physical leisure activities.

Leisure Activity and Orientation

We shall now turn to analysis of the relationship between peer orientation and leisure behaviour. Specifically, we shall examine the relationship between peer orientation and (a) most frequently engaging in social/physical leisure activity, and (b) the four types of leisure orientation. Since we assume that peer companionship during leisure is more likely in social or physical activities that typically take place outside the home, we would expect to find some positive relationship between peer orientation and engagement in or preference for social/physical activity.

Peer orientation and parent orientation are both trichotomized ordinally into "low," "medium," and "high." Peer orientation is taken as the main independent variable, and parent orientation as a conditional variable for examining the relationship between peer orientation and leisure behaviour. The effect of peer orientation on leisure behaviour is likely to be modified by that of parent orientation.

Each leisure behaviour variable is treated as a dummy variable, with the leisure activity type in question coded as "1" and that otherwise as "0." In this way, we may treat it as an ordinal variable and Gamma may be used as a measure of association between peer orientation and leisure behaviour. Gamma is a measure of association between two ordinal variables. Taking on values between -1 and +1, the magnitude of Gamma represents the proportionate reduction in error in predicting order on one variable by using knowledge of order on the other variable instead of by chance alone.

The results presented in Table 5.2 indicate first the relationship between peer orientation and the leisure behaviour variable in question for both Form 1 and Form 4 students. Then, the conditional relationships, controlling for parent orientation (three levels) are shown to reveal variations, if any, in the strength and even direction of the original relationship separately for students of the two classes.

Table 5.2   Gammas Indicating Relationships between Peer Orientation and Leisure Behaviour Variables, by Class and Controlling for Parent Orientation

Leisure Behaviour	Original Relation- ships		Conditional Relationships					
			F.1			F.4		
			Parent Orientation					
	F.1	F.4	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High
Engage in social/ physical activity	-.02	.20**	-.07	-.09	.04	.23*	.12	.11
Leisure orientation types:								
(a) Consistently social/physical	-.05	.17*	-.10	-.10	-.03	.11	.18	.15
(b) Consistently home-based	-.09	-.18*	-.23	-.08	.07	-.21	-.13	-.12
(c) Engage in home-based but prefer social/physical	.13	-.01	.35*	.18	-.12	-.04	.04	.01
(d) Engage in social/ physical but prefer home-based	.06	.11	.05	.03	.13	.30	-.09	-.04

*p < 0.05   **p < 0.01

The first row of figures in Table 5.2 refer to engaging in social or physical activities most frequently during leisure. There is a moderate and significant positive association between peer orientation and this type of leisure involvement for Form 4 students (Gamma = .20) but not for Form 1 students (Gamma = -.02). That is, for Form 4 students, those who are more peer-oriented are more likely to participate in some form of social or physical

activity during leisure.

Not shown in the table, the percentage of our Form 4 respondents who engage in social/physical leisure activities most frequently varies from 29 per cent for those who are low on peer orientation to 43 per cent for those who are high. For Form 1 students, however, the extent of similar leisure participation is around 39 per cent regardless of the level of peer orientation. Thus, this form of leisure participation seems to respond to peer orientation not among Form 1 students but among Form 4 students. Indeed, when parent orientation is taken into consideration, we find that, as indicated by the partial Gammas in Table 5.2, the degree of association between peer orientation and engagement in social/physical leisure activities for Form 4 students is somewhat stronger and also significant under the condition of low parent orientation (G = .23) and diminished (G = .12, .11) when parent orientation is greater. By contrast, specifying parent orientation for Form 1 students does not result in any appreciable difference in the association between peer orientation and leisure behaviour.

What this means is that for the older adolescents, stronger attachment to peers is associated with more participation in social and physical activities during leisure, especially when attachment to parents is weak. In other words, if attachment to peers has the effect of promoting leisure behaviour outside the home, such effect is not evident until the adolescent has reached later years in secondary schooling. Further, during that period, that effect is even stronger if attachment to parents is weak.

Let us now examine the remaining four rows of figures in Table 5.2 which refer to the four leisure orientation types formed by the joint distribution of most frequently participated leisure activity and most preferred leisure activity. This part of the analysis takes up one leisure orientation type at a time to see how each type correlates with peer orientation. The following observations may be made:

(a) **Consistently social/physical.** This is the type applicable to those students whose most frequent leisure activity and most preferred leisure activity both belong to the social/physical type. Association with peer orientation is moderate and positive (G = .17) for Form 4 students but weak and negative for Form 1 students (G = -.05).

It seems that for these Form 4 students, the association between peer orientation and the tendency toward consistently social/physical leisure behaviour is maintained only when parent orientation is moderate or strong. This probably signifies an interaction effect between peer orientation and

parent orientation. If parents are supportive, peer orientation can be associated with a social/physical tendency in leisure behaviour. Short of further analysis, however, this is largely speculation.

(b) **Consistently home-based.** Students showing this type of leisure orientation mentioned some form of home-based leisure activity as both most frequently participated and most preferred. The figures in Table 5.2 indicate that the association between this type of leisure orientation and peer orientation is basically negative, especially among Form 4 students (G = -.18).

On controlling for parent orientation, the association between peer orientation and consistently home-based leisure behaviour varies appreciably. Among Form 4 students, the association is strengthened (G = -.21) if parent orientation is low. For Form 1 students, while the original association is rather weak (G = -.09), the much strengthened conditional association (G = -.23) corresponding to low parent orientation is noteworthy.

Thus, we can see that, in general, the more adolescents are oriented toward their peers, the less likely they are to demonstrate consistently home-based leisure behaviour. This is particularly so if they are at the same time little attached to their parents.

(c) **Actually home-based but preferring social/physical.** This type of leisure orientation does not seem to correlate at all with peer orientation for Form 4 students. It does, however, correlate positively with peer orientation for Form 1 students (G = .13). When parent orientation is low, the relationship is even stronger and significant (G = .35). This means that, in the case of the younger adolescents who most often participate in home-based leisure and who are weakly attached to parents, greater peer orientation is likely to be associated with a preference for social or physical leisure activities.

(d) **Actually social/physical but preferring home-based.** This last of the four leisure behavioral orientation types is the least common. Only about 11 per cent of our respondents are so oriented. Its relationship with peer orientation is generally quite weak.

The only conditional relationship that is relatively substantial is when parent orientation is low among Form 4 students (G = .30). Under this condition, greater peer orientation is associated with a somewhat greater tendency of preferring home-based leisure activity while actually most often engaged in social or physical activity. Perhaps these students feel that their participation in non-home leisure is a bit too much for them. This tendency, however, is only limited because for all levels of peer orientation, the majority (over 80 per cent) do not exhibit such a tendency.

Spending Leisure with Others

As shown above, peer orientation has some effect on the kind of leisure activity that the youths are most likely to engage in or to prefer most. Now we shall go on to examine if peer orientation may also have any effect on how the youths enjoy others' company during leisure. Specifically, we shall examine the relationship between peer orientation and two items: (1) amount of time spent with friends during leisure, (2) whether the respondent feels happiest in the company of friends during leisure. The results are shown in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3   Gammas Indicating Relationships between Peer Orientation and Spending Leisure with Others, by Class and Controlling for Parent Orientation

Spending Leisure with Others	Original Relationships		Conditional Relationships					
			F.1			F.4		
			Parent Orientation					
	F.1	F.4	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High
Time spent with good friends during leisure[a]	.13**	.32**	.22	.09*	.06*	.36**	.35**	.40**
Happiest with good friends during leisure[b]	.32**	.36**	.27**	.26**	.35**	.31**	.42**	.16

*p < 0.05   **p < 0.01

[a]Five ordinal categories are used: (1) less than a quarter of leisure time, (2) about a quarter, (3) about one-half, (4) about three quarters, and (5) more than three quarters.

[b]"Good friends" is coded "1", all other categories, including family members, are coded "0".

We can see that <u>peer orientation is clearly related to the amount of time spent with good friends during leisure, especially for Form 4 students.</u> The more they are attached to their peers, the more time they are likely to spend with their peers during leisure. For them, not only is the original relationship fairly strong (G = .32), but the conditional relationships (controlling for parent orientation) are also equally strong or stronger. For Form 1 students, however, it seems that it is only when parent orientation is low that peer orientation has a relatively substantial effect on time spent with good friends during leisure (G = .22). That is, if they are little attached to their parents, the Form 1 students will tend to spend more time with their good friends during their leisure if they are highly oriented toward their peers.

To show these effects more clearly, we crosstabulate peer orientation against parent orientation in which the percentages of respondents saying that they spend <u>half or more</u> of their leisure time with their good friends are listed, as in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Per Cent Spending Half or More of Their Leisure Time with Good Friends by Peer Orientation by Parent Orientation by Class

Parent Orientation	Form 1			Form 4		
	Peer Orientation					
	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High
High	23.8	25.3	34.5	23.7	24.0	53.0
	(107)[a]	(129)	(52)	(59)	(78)	(17)
Medium	12.4	28.5	21.4	18.0	28.8	40.2
	(75)	(166)	(113)	(105)	(140)	(124)
Low	29.0	27.2	37.6	12.8	19.3	36.8
	(37)	(66)	(113)	(28)	(106)	(214)

[a]Numbers in parentheses are base numbers for the percentages.

From Table 5.4, it can be seen that, for Form 1 students, the percentage saying that half or more of their leisure time is spent with good friends does not always vary monotonically with peer orientation. The percentage difference in this variable due to changes in peer orientation is no more than 11 percentage points. By comparison, in the case of Form 4 students, the percentage saying that half or more of their leisure time is spent with good friends varies monotonically with peer orientation at all three levels of parents orientation. The percentage difference due to changes in peer orientation is at least 22 percentage points (when parent orientation is medium). Thus, we can state fairly safely that peer orientation has a stronger effect on amount of leisure time spent with good friends among Form 4 students than among their younger counterparts.

Moreover, if we examine the results carefully, we find that <u>not only is the effect of peer orientation on leisure time spent with friends more clear-cut among Form 4 youths, but such effect is also stronger than that of parent orientation.</u> That is, increasing peer orientation makes a greater difference in the likelihood of spending more leisure time with good friends than does increasing parent orientation. This perhaps demonstrates nicely the importance of peers for adolescents. Interestingly, peer orientation and parent orientation together have an interacting effect. Thus, when both orientations are high, the tendency to spend a substantial proportion of leisure time with peers is strongest.

Finally, the remaining figures of Table 5.3 show that, for both Form 1 and Form 4 students, <u>those who are more peer oriented tend to say that they are happiest with their good friends during their leisure, practically regardless of the level of parent orientation.</u> The Gammas measuring the associations are nearly all of relatively substantial magnitudes and are all positive in direction.

VI. SCHOOLING SUBCULTURES AND LEISURE

In this chapter, we shall present findings concerning variations in the patterns of leisure behaviour associated with the four schooling subcultures of the adolescents. It will be remembered that these subcultures are constructed on the basis of two dimensions that we believe are significant for describing and characterizing the ethos and the social environment in which the adolescent students live out their roles. These dimensions are (a) the degree to which the students identify with their school, and (b) the extent of their interest in studies. Combining these two dimensions, each dichotomized into "low" and "high", four types of schooling subculture have been constructed:

(1) **Alienated non-learners**, who are low on identification with school and low on interest in studies.

(2) **School-oriented non-learners**, who are high on identification with school and low on interest in studies.

(3) **Independent learners**, who are low on identification with school and high on interest in studies.

(4) **School-oriented learners**, who are high on identification with school and high on interest in studies.

The types of leisure orientations are those used in examining the effects of peer orientation, i.e., (1) consistently home-based, (2) actually social/physical but preferring home-based, (3) actually home-based but preferring social/physical, and (4) consistently social/physical.

We shall first examine the overall relationship between the four schooling subcultures and the four types of leisure behaviour orientation. Then we shall further examine this relationship in greater detail when both class and sex are taken into consideration.

Leisure Orientation by Schooling Subculture

Table 6.1 shows the distribution of leisure orientation for each of the four schooling subcultures. The following observations may be made:

First, the major difference in the distribution of leisure orientation seems to be that between the "non-learners" and the "learners," while there is

considerable similarity between the two groups of non-learners and between the two groups of learners.

Second, the non-learners demonstrate a greater degree of variation in leisure orientation than do the learners. The learners show a greater tendency towards consistently home-based leisure (40 to 41 per cent) while the non-learners show a wider spread over the four types of leisure orientation. Thus, when the comparison is made between these two larger groups collectively, the non-learners are also more inclined towards both (a) actually home-based but preferring social or physical leisure and (b) consistently social or physical leisure.

Table 6.1 Leisure Behaviour Orientation by Schooling Subculture

Leisure Orientation[*]	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-learners (AN)	School-oriented Non-learners (SN)	Independent Learners (IL)	School-oriented Learners (SL)
	%	%	%	%
H	29.6	28.9	41.1	40.0
H > SP	11.3	11.9	9.8	9.8
SP > H	29.7	28.8	25.4	26.5
SP	29.4	30.4	23.7	23.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(463)	(267)	(416)	(485)

$x^2 = 22.92$ $p < 0.01$

[*]H: consistently home-based activities
H > SP: frequently engaged in social/physical activities but preferring home-based activities
SP > H: frequently engaged in home-based activities but preferring social/physical activities
SP: consistently social/physical activities

Leisure Orientation by Schooling Subculture by School Class and Sex

Further analyses are conducted separately for Form 1 and Form 4, making comparisons between male and female students, as shown in Tables 6.2 and 6.3.

Table 6.2 Leisure Behaviour Orientation by Schooling Subculture of Male and Female Form 1 Students

Leisure Orientation	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-learners (AN)	School-oriented Non-learners (SN)	Independent Learners (IL)	School-oriented Learners (SL)
	%	%	%	%
H	29.3 (38.0)	34.0 (21.7)	34.1 (42.9)	29.0 (42.8)
H > SP	9.9 (8.6)	8.9 (10.4)	8.1 (10.2)	11.7 (8.7)
SP > H	17.4 (30.9)	8.8 (42.9)	13.4 (31.3)	18.8 (34.5)
SP	43.4 (22.5)	48.3 (25.0)	44.4 (15.6)	40.5 (14.0)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(106, 85)	(53, 51)	(80, 126)	(96, 181)

Note: The percentage figures in parentheses refer to girls and those not in parentheses refer to boys. The first base number of each column is for boys, the second for girls. For explanation of the notation of the four leisure behaviour orientations, refer to Table 6.1.

x^2 for males = 4.10, not significant
x^2 for females = 11.74, not significant

Table 6.3 Leisure Behaviour Orientation by Schooling Subculture of Male and Female Form 4 Students

Leisure Orientation	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-learners (AN)	School-oriented Non-learners (SN)	Independent Learners (IL)	School-oriented Learners (SL)
	%	%	%	%
H	27.5 (26.2)	32.0 (27.3)	31.4 (48.5)	30.9 (48.2)
H > SP	15.5 (10.7)	10.6 (15.5)	6.1 (12.3)	8.5 (10.8)
SP > H	34.1 (34.6)	24.6 (36.2)	26.0 (26.6)	20.8 (24.8)
SP	22.9 (28.5)	32.8 (21.0)	36.6 (12.6)	39.9 (16.2)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(115, 155)	(74, 89)	(71, 139)	(75, 130)

Note: See note under Table 6.2.
x^2 for males = 14.06, not significant
x^2 for females = 31.97, p < 0.01

Upon examining Tables 6.2 and 6.3, we may make the following general observations:

Female students   In both Form 1 and Form 4, the "learners" tend to display the consistently home-based leisure orientation more strongly than do the "non-learners."   The latter, by contrast, are more inclined towards consistently social/physical activities.

In fact, this pattern is particularly noticeable among the Form 4 students for whom the difference in leisure orientation between the "learners" and the "non-learners" collectively is even sharper.   (Chi-square test showed that the variation in leisure orientation by subculture in Form 4 is significant beyond the .01 level.)   Not only are the "non-learners" more inclined towards consistently social/physical activities (over 20 per cent versus much less among the "learners"), but they are also more oriented (well over one-third versus about one-fourth among the "learners") towards the SP > H type (i.e., frequently engaged in home-based leisure but preferring social/physical activities).

Male students   Examination of the figures for male students shows that there is not the same kind of difference in leisure orientation between the "learners" and "non-learners" as we find for female students. Male students who are "learners" are not particularly more oriented towards consistently home-based leisure behaviour than are the "non-learners." Besides, variation in the distribution of leisure orientation across the four subcultures is not statistically significant (at the .05 level) by the chi-square test.

However, unlike the case of the female students who display a good amount of similarity in leisure orientation from Form 1 to Form 4, there are some general differences between Form 1 and Form 4 in the leisure orientation of male students. We may note the following:

(a) Form 1 boys are more typically inclined (over 40 per cent) towards consistently social/physical leisure behaviour almost regardless of the subculture. In Form 4, the tendency towards such behaviour is more varying, being strongest among the "school-oriented learners" (40 per cent) and weakest among the "alienated non-learners" (23 per cent). Thus, being interested in studies and feeling identified with the school seems to have an implication for leisure behaviour that is not present among the younger students.

(b) The extent of the SP > H orientation is generally greater in Form 4 than in Form 1. In Form 4, such orientation is most evident among the "alienated non-learners" (34 per cent) who are those not interested in studies and feeling negatively toward their school.

Male and Female Students Further Compared

While some comparisons between male and female students have been mentioned above, some further general comparisons may be of interest here. To do so succinctly, we shall focus on only the two major leisure preferences: home-based (H and H > SP combined) and social/physical (SP > H and SP combined). These are what the respondents said they would prefer to do most during their leisure. Combining Tables 6.2 and 6.3 and focusing on these two leisure preferences, we have Table 6.4.

Table 6.4 Leisure Preference by Schooling Subculture by Class and Sex

| Class | Leisure Preference | Schooling Subculture | | | |
		Alienated Non-learners (AN)	School-oriented Non-learners (SN)	Independent Learners (IL)	School-oriented Learners (SL)
Form 1		%	%	%	%
	Home-based	39.2 (46.6)	42.9 (32.1)	42.2 (53.1)	40.7 (51.5)
	Social/physical	60.8 (53.4)	57.1 (67.9)	57.8 (46.9)	59.3 (48.5)
Form 4	Home-based	43.0 (36.9)	42.6 (42.8)	37.5 (60.8)	39.4 (59.0)
	Social/physical	57.0 (63.1)	57.4 (57.2)	62.6 (39.2)	60.7 (41.0)

Note: This table is actually combined from Tables 6.2 and 6.3 with the leisure orientations simplified to show only the two major kinds of leisure preference. The percentages in parentheses refer to girls and those not in parentheses refer to boys. The base numbers for the percentages within each schooling subculture, not shown in this table, are the same as those in Tables 6.2 and 6.3.

(1) It is clear that in the "learners" subculture (SL and IL in Table 6.4), the girls prefer home-based leisure activities more than boys do. Boys, on the other hand, are more likely to prefer social/physical activities. These gender differences are more pronounced in Form 4 than in Form 1, as one can tell from the figures in Table 6.4. This seems to suggest that, <u>for those youths who are interested in their studies, girls become more home-bound and less "outside-oriented" when they are older while for boys it is just the reverse.</u>

(2) For the "school-oriented non-learners" (SN) who identify with their school but are not too interested in their studies, the comparison observed in (1) does not apply. Younger girls (Form 1) tend to prefer social/physical activities more and home-based activities less than do boys. These girls' level of preference for social/physical activities, for some reason, is considerably above that of those of the other subcultures in Form 1.

In Form 4, however, the leisure preferences of boys and girls belonging to the SN subculture are practically the same. The girls have become not as strongly inclined towards social/physical activities as their Form 1 counterparts.

(3) In the case of the "alienated non-learners" (AN), i.e., students who neither identify with their school nor are interested in their studies, what we observed in (1) applies to Form 1 but not to Form 4. That is, girls are more likely to prefer home-based activities than do boys and boys are more likely to prefer social/physical activities than do girls although more than half of both boys and girls prefer social/physical activities.

In Form 4, the AN boys become somewhat less oriented towards social/physical activities but the AN girls somehow become more interested in these activities.

Thus, we have seen that while there are basic differences in leisure orientation between the two "learners" subcultures on the one hand and the two "non-learners" subcultures on the other, there are finer variations when we take gender and class into consideration. Knowing the schooling subculture is of some help in predicting the adolescent's leisure behaviour pattern. Mainly, "learners" tend to be home-based in their leisure. But if we specify further, we may be able to tell more. Thus, older female "learners" are even more likely to be home-based in their leisure. Further, although "non-learners" are generally more likely to prefer social or physical activity, we have seen that older male "learners" are no less so.

VII. LIFE SATISFACTION

In this chapter, we shall examine in some detail the relationship between the indices of peer orientation, parent orientation, schooling subculture and the dependent variables of life satisfaction, i.e., satisfaction with school, family, acceptance by others, government, media, environment, and life in general. As in the earlier discussion on leisure behaviour, peer orientation and parent orientation are both scored as high, medium, and low. Also as before, four different types of schooling subculture subculture are distinguished, depending on the respondent's interest in study and his identification with the school. The dependent variables of life satisfaction all contain values ranging from one to seven, one being most satisfied and seven being most dissatisfied. In other words, the lower the scores in the dependent variables, the more satisfied the respondent is.

Peer Orientation and Life Satisfaction

Table 7.1 below shows the relationship between the independent variable of peer orientation and dependent variables of life satisfaction for Form 1 and Form 4 students, in terms of the mean scores and the number of cases of the dependent variables.

Table 7.1   Life Satisfaction Mean Scores by Peer Orientation

Domain of Life Satisfaction	Class	N	Low	Medium	High	All
				Peer Orientation		
School	F.4	(959)	3.95	3.65	3.45	3.66**
	F.1	(935)	3.42	3.17	3.04	3.21**
Family	F.4	(959)	2.75	2.71	3.06	2.85**
	F.1	(935)	2.49	2.58	2.77	2.61**
Acceptance	F.4	(957)	3.10	2.94	2.73	2.90**
	F.1	(935)	3.13	2.91	2.61	2.89**

Table 7.1 (Cont'd)

Government	F.4	(959)	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.15**
	F.1	(928)	3.73	3.59	3.51	3.61 n.s.
Media	F.4	(959)	3.21	3.11	3.00	3.09*
	F.1	(931)	2.90	2.97	2.83	2.91 n.s.
Environment	F.4	(954)	3.76	3.71	3.67	3.71 n.s.
	F.1	(930)	3.57	3.64	3.52	3.58 n.s.
Life in	F.4	(960)	3.22	3.17	3.32	3.24 n.s.
General	F.1	(932)	2.90	2.97	3.14	3.00*

The significance of difference among the mean scores at the three levels of Peer Orientation is indicated by :

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ n.s. not significant

An examination of the mean scores in Table 7.1 does not show a clear relationship between peer orientation and the dependent variables of life satisfaction. However, several points are worth mentioning.

First, for both Form 1 and Form 4 students, those with low peer orientation show a higher level of satisfaction with their family life. Furthermore, Form 1 students show a higher level of satisfaction than their Form 4 counterparts in this regard (mean scores equal to 2.49 for Form 1 students and 2.75 for Form 4 students). These findings are understandable as low scores in the Peer Orientation index mean less attachment to peers. These adolescents are accordingly more likely to be attached to their family and show a higher level of satisfaction with their family life. Form 1 students, being younger and therefore less exposed to the environment outside the family, show a higher level of satisfaction with family life.

Second, respondents with high scores in the Peer Orientation index are more satisfied with school, government, media, and feel more accepted by others. For both Form 1 and Form 4 students, those who score highly in peer orientation form a more favourable view of their school life and feel more accepted by others. The positive relationships between peer orientation and the indices of government and media are shared by Form 4 students only.

Perhaps this indicates that the younger Form 1 students, despite their association with peers, have not yet formed a definite opinion of the government and the media.

Third, the relationship between peer orientation and the index of environment is statistically insignificant at the .05 level, for both Form 1 and Form 4 students in our sample.

Fourth, the relationship between peer orientation and life in general is significant for Form 1 students only, i.e., those with low scores in peer orientation are more satisfied with life in general. This finding indicates that those who identify more with their peers are not necessarily those who are happy with their lives. On the contrary, those respondents who identify less with their peers are the more satisfied ones. This is at least true for the younger students.

Despite the lack of a clear-cut relatinship between peer orientation and life satisfaction, respondents with high scores in peer orientation seem to be more satisfied with school life and feel more accepted by others (for both Form 1 and Form 4 students), and more satisfied with the government and the media (for Form 4 students). On the other hand, those with low scores on the peer orientation index are more satisfied with their family life (for both groups of students) and life in general (for Form 1 students). Thus, those high on the index are happy with some domains of life only, while others low on the same index are happy with other life domains. Form 1 and Form 4 repondents do not share a uniform picture either. Perhaps this is a reflection of the vicissitudes of adolescence. While adolescents may find attachment to and identification with their peers extremely important, such attachment or identification does not necessarily mean they are satisfied with every aspect of their lives.

Parent Orientation and Life Satisfaction

The relationship between parent orientation and life satisfaction is further examined. Like peer orientation, parent orientation is also a composite index, as described in Chapter IV, except that the point of reference is parents. It consists of five items and measures the extent to which the adolescent identifies with and is attached to his parents. Table 7.2 below shows the relationship between parent orientation and the six areas of life satisfaction as well as satisfaction with life in general.

Table 7.2   Life Satisfaction Mean Scores by Parent Orientation

Domain of Life Satisfaction	Class	N	Parent Orientation			
			Low	Medium	High	All
School	F.4	(959)	3.95	3.48	3.34	3.66**
	F.1	(935)	3.64	3.23	2.81	3.21**
Family	F.4	(959)	3.50	2.50	2.04	2.85**
	F.1	(935)	3.33	2.58	2.05	2.61**
Acceptance	F.4	(957)	3.15	2.77	2.60	2.90**
	F.1	(935)	3.03	2.97	2.67	2.89**
Government	F.4	(959)	4.31	4.08	3.90	4.15**
	F.1	(928)	3.83	3.64	3.38	3.61**
Media	F.4	(959)	3.16	3.05	3.03	3.09 n.s.
	F.1	(931)	2.97	2.98	2.76	2.91**
Environment	F.4	(954)	3.85	3.69	3.44	3.71**
	F.1	(930)	3.82	3.61	3.34	3.58**
Life in General	F.4	(960)	3.63	3.01	2.79	3.24**
	F.1	(932)	3.46	2.94	2.71	3.00**

The significance of difference among the mean scores at the three levels
of Parent Orientation is indicated by:

** $p < .01$ n.s. not significant

An examination of Table 7.2 reveals a rather clear-cut relationship between parent orientation and life satisfaction. With the exception of the relationship between parent orientation and media satisfaction for Form 4 students, all relationships are significant beyond the .01 level. Adolescents who score highly on the parent orientation index seem to be more satisfied with every domain of life than do their counterparts with medium or low scores on the index. Respondents who identify with and are attached to their parents are more satisfied with their school and family life, more likely to feel accepted by

others, more satisfied with the government, the media, the environment, and life in general. This is evidenced from the relatively low mean scores of the life satisfaction indices associated with high parent orientation. In particular, those who are high on the parent orientation index are most satisfied with their family life, for both Form 1 and Form 4 students, showing low mean values of 2.05 and 2.04 respectively. In other words, these groups of respondents are typically either "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their family life on the seven-point life satisfaction scale. In other life satisfaction domains, their mean scores are all below 3.5 on the seven-point scale, indicating a rather high level of satisfaction.

In contrast to peer orientation which shows a rather mixed relationship with life satisfaction, the relationship between parent orientation and life satisfaction is quite straightforward. That is to say, the higher their level of parent orientation, the higher their level of satisfaction in every domain of life as well as life in general. In this regard, parent orientation is a better variable than peer orientation for predicting an adolescent's life satisfaction.

It is worth noting that the life satisfaction scores associated with parent orientation, in contrast to those associated with peer orientation, have relatively lower values on the seven-point scale, i.e., indicating higher levels of satisfaction. In other words, not only does parent orientation predict life satisfaction better than peer orientation does, but a strong parent orientation is also associated with higher levels of life satisfaction in all the indices considered as well as life in general. As far as life satisfaction is concerned, such findings suggest that the importance of parents surpasses that of peers. In a Chinese society like Hong Kong, it seems that the family is still the most integrating institution and good relationship with parents is associated with a higher level of life satisfaction.

Schooling Subculture and Life Satisfaction

The third independent variable to be tested against life satisfaction is schooling subculture. As detailed earlier in this paper, schooling subculture basically addresses the adolescent's role as a student. By combining the adolescent's interest in study and his identification with his school, four schooling subculture types are identified: alienated non-learners, school-oriented non-learners, independent learners, and school-oriented learners. Table 7.3 shows the relationship between these four schooling subculture types and life satisfaction.

Table 7.3   Life Satisfaction Mean Scores by Schooling Subculture

Domain of Life Satis- faction	Class	N	Alien- ated Non- Learners	School- Oriented Non- Learners	Inde- pendent Learners	School- Oriented Learners	All
School	F.4	(912)	4.23	3.25	4.05	2.84	3.66^{**}
	F.1	(857)	3.91	3.05	3.33	2.57	3.18^{**}
Family	F.4	(912)	3.11	2.76	2.85	2.61	2.86^{**}
	F.1	(857)	2.87	2.80	2.66	2.33	2.62^{**}
Acceptance	F.4	(911)	3.07	2.88	2.96	2.70	2.92^{**}
	F.1	(858)	3.01	2.95	3.00	2.65	2.88^{**}
Government	F.4	(912)	4.41	4.01	4.23	3.84	4.15^{**}
	F.1	(853)	3.80	3.84	3.62	3.39	3.62^{**}
Media	F.4	(912)	3.10	3.06	3.09	3.13	$3.10^{n.s.}$
	F.1	(855)	3.01	2.96	2.88	2.85	$2.91^{n.s.}$
Environment	F.4	(911)	3.79	3.80	3.65	3.69	$3.73^{n.s.}$
	F.1	(857)	3.78	3.46	3.57	3.45	3.57^{*}
Life in General	F.4	(911)	3.46	3.19	3.40	2.89	3.26^{**}
	F.1	(853)	3.25	3.07	3.08	2.78	3.02^{**}

The significance of difference among the mean scores for the four types of schooling subculture is indicated by:
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ $^{n.s.}$ not significant

A preliminary examination of Table 7.3 reveals several points in the relationship between schooling subculture types and life satisfaction. First, different schooling subculture types do make a difference in life satisfaction. With the exception of the life satisfaction index of media for both Form 1 and Form 4 students and the index of environment for Form 4 students, the relationship between schooling subculture types and the other life satisfaction

indices is significant beyond the .05 level.

Second, the school-oriented learners seem to enjoy the highest level of life satisfaction. In fact, they consistently demonstrate a higher level of satisfaction than the other subculture types in nearly all of our indices of life satisfaction and where a statistically significant difference obtains comparing the four subcultures. That is, the school-oriented learners are more satisfied with their school and family life, the government, and the environment (for Form 1 students). They also feel more accepted by others and are happier with their life in general.

Third, the alienated non-learners have the lowest level of life satisfaction. They do not enjoy their school and family life as much as members of the other three subcultures and are not as satisfied as the latter with the government or the environment (for Form 1 students). Furthermore, they tend to feel less accepted by others and do not enjoy life generally as much as members of the other subcultures. Thus, adolescents who do not find schooling appealing are at the same time likely to feel dissatisfied with various aspects of life.

Fourth, the other two subculture types--the school-oriented non-learners and the independent learners--enjoy intermediate levels of life satisfaction. Just comparing these two subculture types, however, we find that the school-oriented non-learners perceive a somewhat higher level of satisfaction than the independent learners in most life satisfaction indices. They also express a higher level of satisfaction in life as a whole. Perhaps this points to the importance of identification with something that one values, in this case the school, for attaining a higher level of life satisfaction.

Finally, in most cases, Form 1 students tend to feel a higher level of life satisfaction than their Form 4 counterparts. This is true of all the four schooling subculture types.

When the absolute values of the mean scores of life satisfaction indices are considered, schooling subculture seems to be a less desirable predictor of life satisfaction than parent orientation. With the notable exception of the school-oriented learners who are associated with a higher level of satisfaction in school life, strong parent orientation is associated with similar or higher levels of satisfaction in all other life domains. Besides, the variation in mean scores of life satisfaction indices, other than that of satisfaction with school life, that is associated with different levels of parent orientation, is generally larger than that associated with different schooling subcultures. When satisfaction with life in general is considered, parent orientation again emerges as a better predictor than schooling subculture, for both Form 1 and Form 4 students.

Form 1 and Form 4 Students Compared and Overall Observations

The "all" column of Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 indicates the overall levels of satisfaction with each domain of life as well as the difference between Form 1 and Form 4 respondents in each life domain. The slight difference in mean scores between tables is due to the difference in the number of respondents in each category.

An examination of the figures reveals that respondents in our sample do perceive various life domains differently, i.e., they show different levels of satisfaction. On the whole, adolescents in our sample are most satisfied with their family life, followed by acceptance by others, media, life in general, school life, environment, and finally government. This again indicates the importance of the family in the life satisfaction of adolescents in Hong Kong, with the family ranking much higher than the school. Not surprisingly, adolescents also find high satisfaction in acceptance by others, mostly from their peers. By comparison, adolescents in our sample appear to be least satisfied with the environment and the government.

When the two class groups, i.e., Form 1 and Form 4, are compared, it is clear that the younger respondents feel a higher level of satisfaction in every domain of life than their older counterparts do. This is true of the six life satisfaction indices as well as of life in general. Compared with Form 4 respondents, Form 1 students are more satisfied with their family and school life, like the media, government, and the environment more, and feel more accepted by others. They are also more satisfied with life as a whole. These findings suggest that the process of growing up is associated with greater critical response to life as the adolescent gains maturity and exposure to people, things and events around him.

When the mean scores are examined, it can be said that the level of satisfaction in every domain of life is quite high. Only in one group (Form 4 students on government) is the mean score somewhat above four on the seven-point satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale, which means the level of satisfaction is equal to the level of dissatisfaction. All other mean scores are substantially below four on the scale, meaning that most of the responses cluster around the "satisfied" categories. Therefore the statement that the respondents are more satisfied with some domains of life and less satisfied with others should be qualified to include the observation that their overall level of satisfaction is quite high despite the difference.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study is concerned with the leisure behaviour and life satisfaction of adolescents in secondary schools in Hong Kong. In particular, it attempts to examine how these two aspects of life are affected by peer orientation, as opposed to parent orientation, and by membership in one of several "schooling subcultures."

Peer orientation is basically the degree to which the adolescent is likely to be influenced by peers and to take them into consideration in doing certain things. Similarly, parent orientation refers to the extent to which parents may exert influence on the adolescent's behaviour. The home and the school are two major spheres in which schooling adolescents live and act. Hence it is both theoretically and practically important that we have some understanding of the relative weight or influence of parents and peers on the adolescent's leisure and life satisfaction.

"Schooling subculture," as used in this study, is a construct that attempts to characterize the adolescent student's attitude towards his role as a student. Specifically, it measures both his interest in studies and his identification with his school. Combining these two dimensions, four subcultures have been "created," namely, school-oriented learners, independent learners, school-oriented non-learners, and alienated non-learners. Being learners or school-oriented or both is likely to involve different patterns of time use and association with schoolmates, and may therefore affect leisure behaviour. Further, various pleasures and frustrations are likely to be experienced by adolescents in the process of their learning and socialization in the context of schooling. It would thus be important to study how life satisfaction varies with being in one or another of the four schooling subcultures.

Leisure

In this study, leisure behaviour is reduced to two basic general categories, namely, (a) home-based and (b) social or physical activities. The latter are assumed to take place usually outside the home. Both actual and preferred activities are taken into consideration, thus producing four types of what may be called "leisure orientations." Of particular interest are the "consistently home-based" and the "consistently social or physical" orientations when both actual and preferred leisure activities are of the same general category.

Our findings indicate that peer orientation is a "good" predictor of leisure behaviour for the older adolescents (Form 4) rather than for the younger ones (Form 1). For Form 4 students, high peer orientation is significantly associated with actually engaging in social or physical leisure activities. That this is the case says something about the role of peers for the developing adolescent. The home is therefore not the typical location where social interaction with the adolescent's peers occurs during leisure, particularly for the older adolescents. That peer orientation probably has a stronger effect on leisure behaviour of older adolescents is also indicated by the finding that the percentage claiming that half or more of leisure time is spent with good friends is generally highest among Form 4 students who are highly peer-oriented.

Peer orientation was also found to be significantly associated with the "consistently social or physical" leisure orientation, but negatively associated with the "consistently home-based" leisure orientation. This suggests that, given strong peer orientation, the adolescent tends to be happy with his or her leisure experience in social or physical activities so much so that such activities are more preferable than home-based activities.

We further found that, for Form 4 students, the association between peer orientation and actual engagement in social or physical activities is somewhat stronger when parent orientation is weak. In fact, weak parent orientation is also a condition under which peer orientation is more negatively associated with a tendency towards "consistently home-based" leisure orientation. In other words, when attachment to parents is weak, the more the adolescent is peer-oriented, the less he or she is likely to treat the home as a leisure setting.

Evidently, the influence of peers on adolescents' leisure behaviour becomes greater when attachment to parents is weak. Of course, this finding itself does not tell us whether peer influence is greater because parental influence is weaker or vice versa. But it does show that in families in which children attach little importance to parents, peers are likely to occupy a substantial place in their leisure life.

What about the effect of "schooling subculture" on the students' leisure behaviour? This effect seems to be quite complex, judging from the varying patterns we found when both school class and sex were taken into consideration. In general, however, we can say this: "Learners," or those who have a greater amount of interest in studies, are more likely to be consistently home-based in their leisure orientation while the "non-learners" are more likely to be consistently social or physical. In other words, those who are

interested in studies are more inclined to treat their home as a major site for leisure activities.

However, complications arise when we take sex and school class into consideration. We found that learners are proportionally more dominant among girls (60 per cent) than among boys (47 per cent) and that, for girls, learners tend very much (but not overwhelmingly so) to be consistently home-based in leisure orientation. This tendency seems clearer in Form 4 than in Form 1. Thus, the observation that learners are more likely to be consistently home-based in leisure orientation is probably applicable to older girls rather than to boys.

If we take the consistently social or physical leisure orientation, we find a rather interesting situation of sex difference. In Form 1, schooling subculture does not make any significant difference among boys, although for girls non-learners are somewhat more likely than learners to be consistently social or physical oriented in leisure. In Form 4, girls who are non-learners are also more likely to be consistently social or physical in leisure orientation, but for boys it is the learners rather than the non-learners who are more likely to be so oriented.

Thus, on the whole, we can draw two main conclusions about the possible effect of schooling subculture on leisure orientation. First, the major difference in the distribution of leisure orientation (particularly when we focus on the two consistent types) is that between the learners and the non-learners. That is, whether the youth is interested in his or her studies, but not so much whether he or she identifies strongly with the school, makes a difference in the type of leisure orientation adopted. Perhaps interest in studies, as compared with identification with the school, has somewhat clearer implications for the use of time and where one is likely to spend leisure time. Thus it is possible that one who is very studious feels like staying home more than going out.

Second, the effect of schooling subculture on leisure orientation follows different patterns depending on sex, particularly among older students. This means what is said under the first observation needs some qualification. For girls, the difference between learners and non-learners is that the former are more attracted to home-based leisure and the latter to social or physical leisure. Such cannot be said of boys. In fact, male learners, especially those who identify closely with their school, are rather attracted to social or physical leisure. This probably says something about the difference in sex role expectations. It could be possible that for girls, a serious student is expected to be more home-oriented while for boys a good student should be "all-round" in a greater variety of leisure activities both inside and outside the home. This is

what our findings seem to suggest but cannot be verified yet given the data we have.

Life Satisfaction

In this study, six life-domains are identified which can be regarded as important facets of an adolescent's life, namely, the school, the family, the government, the mass media, the environment, and acceptance by others. Perceived satisfaction with each of these domains is assessed with a seven-point scale. In addition, satisfaction with "life in general" is similarly measured. Analysis is performed separately for Form 1 students and for Form 4 ones.

One findings support the assumption that adolescents perceive various life domains differently. On the whole, adolescents are most satisfied with their family life, followed by acceptance by others, media, life in general, school life, environment, and the government. The family, for the adolescents at least, ranks much higher than the school in terms of perceived life satisfaction.

The main purpose of this study, as far as adolescents' life satisfaction is concerned, is to examine how life satisfaction varies with peer orientation, parent orientation, and schooling subculture. Our findings show that, of the three independent variables, parent orientation is the best predictor of the adolescents' life satisfaction. The relatinship between parent orientation and life satisfaction is straightforward, for both Form 1 and Form 4 students. Adolescents with high scores on the parent orientation index are found to be more satisfied with every domain of life than adolescents with medium or low scores on the index. Adolescents who are attached to their parents are more satisfied with their school life, family life, the government, the media, and the environment. They are more likely to feel accepted by others and to be satisfied with their life as a whole.

Not only is parent orientation a better predictor of satisfaction with the various life domains, but strong parent orientation is also associated with greater life satisfaction. To some extent, this indicates that in a predominantly Chinese society like Hong Kong, the family remains a highly important determinant of the adolescents' life satisfaction. Our findings lead us to believe that the importance of the family, expressed in parent orientation, probably surpasses that of either peer orientation or schooling subculture in predicting life satisfaction of adolescents in Hong Kong.

We found that while it may not be as discriminating as parent orientation, schooling subculture is nonetheless a useful predictor of life

satisfaction of adolescents. Findings show that different schooling subculture types do make a difference in life satisfaction. With few exceptions, the school-oriented learners (those who identify with their school and are interested in their studies) have consistently expressed a higher level of satisfaction in various life domains as well as life in general. By contrast, the alienated non-learners (those who find no identification with their school and no interest in their studies) have expressed the lowest level of life satisfaction among the four subculture types. The other two subculture types, i.e., the school-oriented non-learners and the independent learners, have expressed intermediate levels of life satisfaction, with the former group reporting slightly higher levels of satisfaction in most life domains. These findings suggest the importance of identification with the school for establishing a higher level of life satisfaction. Where such identification is present, the school is like a good friend or a big family to which one feels close. It makes sense that this would be conducive to feeling happy and satisfied.

Of the three independent variables, peer orientation is the least discriminating in predicting life satisfaction. The relationship between peer orientation and life satisfaction is a mixed one. Adolescents with weak peer orientation display a higher level of satisfaction in the domain of family life while those with strong peer orientation are more satisfied in other life domains, such as the school, media, government, and acceptance by others. Such findings perhaps indicate that the adolescents who identify more with their peers are not necessarily happy with every aspect of their lives.

The effects of peer orientation, parent orientation, and schooling subculture on life satisfaction, as reported above, have been found to be essentially the same for the younger (Form 1) and the older (Form 4) adolescents. However, in most cases, the younger adolescents tend to perceive a higher level of satisfaction than their older counterparts. Indeed, when the mean satisfaction scores of the two class groups are compared, it is clear that Form 1 students are more satisfied than Form 4 students with life in general and in every life domain that we consider.

Thus, we may conclude that there are two sets of forces at work that have a bearing on adolescents' life satisfaction. One of these, as we have demonstrated, is related to how the adolescent plays his or her role with reference to peers, parents, and the schooling experience. It is interesting that variations in these aspects should produce effects on adolescents' life satisfaction that are similar for the two class groups under study. The other set of forces affecting their life satisfaction has to do with age. Since young people generally tend to encounter more problems and even frustrations as they grow older and become increasingly preoccupied with identity-seeking, it is not too

surprising that the older adolescents are less satisfied with life than are their younger counterparts.

A Last Word

We have thus completed a study of leisure behaviour and life satisfaction of secondary school adolescents in Hong Kong. It attempts to understand how variations in these areas are related to those in three selected independent variables, namely, peer orientation, parent orientation, and schooling subculture. We have seen that while peers may play a significant role in the socialization experience of the adolescent such as when the latter spends leisure, the influence of parents should not be overlooked if we want to understand the adolescent's world better. The introduction of schooling subculture into the study of adolescents' leisure and life satisfaction is a new attempt in the context of Hong Kong society. Judging from the findings, we believe that the utility of this concept in a study of this kind is rather promising. Certainly, further research along this direction is much needed, both to improve the measurement of the key variables and to explore deeper into the mechanisms involved in the shaping of adolescents' leisure behaviour and life satisfaction.

APPENDIX

There are twelve tables in this appendix to give a somewhat clearer picture of certain characteristics of the youths included in this study when they are classified in terms of the four "schooling subcultures." Tables A.1 and A.2 show the distribution of these four subcultures according to type of school, school class, and sex. Table A.3 indicates the distribution of position in class in each subculture type. In Tables A.4 through A.12, we have a rather detailed profile of the actual leisure participation in television watching and various other activities. The data reported in these tables thus supplement the findings reported in Chapter VI. The variations in such participation can be very specific and may not show simple and clear-cut patterns. However, some interesting and meaningful regularities are worth further attention and study. For example, it may be noted here that the "learners" are not only more home-based in their leisure behaviour than the "non-learners" (this is already pointed out in Chapter VI), they are also, specifically, more exposed to the print media and more inclined towards "interest" and "domestic" activities (see Table A.8).

Table A.1   Schooling Subculture by Type of School

Schooling Subculture	Type of School		
	Government	Aided	Private
	%	%	%
Alienated Non-Learners	19.1	27.2	35.0
School-Oriented Non-Learners	24.3	18.5	10.9
Independent Learners	13.2	20.9	38.9
School-Oriented Learners	43.4	33.4	15.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)*	(111)	(1174)	(488)

*Overall number of missing cases = 134

Table A.2   Schooling Subculture by Class by Sex

Schooling Subculture	Male		Female	
	Form 1	Form 4	Form 1	Form 4
	%	%	%	%
Alienated Non-Learners	32.5	34.5	19.7	30.5
School-Oriented Non-Learners	16.7	22.3	12.2	17.3
Independent Learners	24.4	20.8	27.5	27.4
School-Oriented Learners	26.4	22.4	40.6	24.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)*	(381)	(362)	(478)	(548)

*Overall number of missing cases = 138

Table A.3   Position in Class by Schooling Subculture

Position in Class	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
1st to 10th	19.2	26.0	29.4	28.8
11th to 20th	26.8	24.4	27.4	31.2
21st to 30th	28.0	27.9	25.4	25.6
31st to last	26.0	21.7	17.8	14.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)*	(390)	(243)	(340)	(403)

*Overall number of missing cases = 531

Table A.4   Per Cent Who Had Participated in Selected Types of Leisure
             Activity in the Preceding Month by Schooling Subculture

Leisure Activity	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners (N = 512)	School-Oriented Non-Learners (N = 297)	Independent Learners (N = 448)	School-Oriented Learners (N = 513)
	%	%	%	%
Reading non-school books	47.2*	53.1	52.8	61.0
Listening to radio, Hi-Fi	84.9	83.0	78.3	79.7
Watching television	93.9	92.1	88.6	92.6
Watching movies	61.3	58.6	55.2	44.3
Taking pictures	25.5	29.8	21.5	20.9
Going out	74.7	74.6	63.1	61.2
Playing in video game centres	37.0	26.6	17.5	14.5
Going to discos	8.4	6.0	3.7	1.2
Ball games	45.9	56.4	47.9	53.1
Other sports	50.3	54.2	46.7	46.2
Martial arts	5.8	4.1	3.4	2.8

*Cell entry is percentage of a given schooling subculture who had
 participated in a particular type of leisure activity. Overall
 number of missing cases = 137.

Table A.5   Time Spent Per Day on Televison (Monday to
             Friday) by Schooling Subculture

Time Spent Per Day on Television	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Up to 2 hours	20.1	20.4	28.0	27.0
2 to 4 hours	44.3	45.7	42.8	48.5
Over 4 hours	35.6	33.9	29.2	24.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)*	(501)	(288)	(439)	(500)

*Overall number of missing cases = 179

Table A.6   Time Spent Per Day on Television (Saturday and
Sunday) by Schooling Subculture

		Schooling Subculture		
Time Spent Per Day on Television	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Up to 2 hours	17.7	15.2	20.5	19.3
2 to 4 hours	37.2	42.1	43.3	45.2
Over 4 hours	45.1	42.7	36.2	35.5
Total (N)*	100.0 (504)	100.0 (284)	100.0 (442)	100.0 (504)

*Overall number of missing cases = 174

Table A.7   Per Cent Who Had Watched Selected Types of Televison
Programme in the Preceding Month by Schooling Subculture

	Schooling Subculture			
Type of Television Programme	Alienated Non-Learners (N = 511)	School-Oriented Non-Learners (N = 296)	Independent Learners (N = 450)	School-Oriented Learners (N = 514)
	%	%	%	%
News reports	79.4*	85.6	81.4	88.3
News commentary	49.4	60.0	56.8	58.9
Historical drama serials	72.1	72.4	66.1	67.9
Modern drama serials	89.2	86.5	80.7	86.9
Educational TV	17.4	17.9	25.1	23.9
Variety shows	75.7	77.4	66.0	68.1
Youth programmes	71.8	74.2	69.6	76.5
Sports programmes	61.3	65.3	57.4	56.5
Popular music programmes	81.7	81.2	74.7	71.3
Foreign movies	49.6	51.7	43.8	41.5
Cantonese movies	41.3	43.0	38.5	38.8

*Cell entry is percentage of a given schooling subculture who had
watched a particular type of television programme in the preceding
month. Overall number of missing cases = 136.

Table A.8   Most Frequent Leisure Activity by Schooling Subculture

Most Frequent Leisure Activity	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Home-based				
Books, newspapers, magazines	5.7	6.5	12.6	13.9
Radio	22.4	22.0	22.0	17.1
Television	21.5	20.6	17.4	19.0
Interests[a]	3.5	2.6	6.7	7.4
Domestic[b]	2.0	1.9	5.5	6.1
Personal computer	1.4	2.0	1.5	1.1
Subtotal	56.5	55.6	65.7	64.6
Social				
Movies	2.0	3.9	1.9	1.5
Going out	3.6	5.8	4.0	2.8
Video Games	3.0	1.3	.8	1.6
Chatting	10.0	5.4	5.5	5.3
Other social[c]	4.0	2.7	2.9	1.9
Subtotal	22.6	19.1	15.1	13.1
Physical				
Ball games	5.9	12.5	11.4	10.8
Outdoors	1.5	1.7	.3	1.3
Other sports	8.1	7.8	5.7	7.5
Subtotal	15.5	22.0	17.4	19.6
Others	5.3	3.4	1.7	2.8
Total[d]	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.1
(N)	(493)	(282)	(434)	(499)

[a]playing music instruments, singing, handicraft, model-making, collecting objects, painting
[b]cooking, knitting, household work, flower arrangement, caring for plants
[c]picture-taking, playing cards, chess, going to teahouses, going to discos
[d]total may not add up to 100.00 owing to rounding errors; overall number of missing cases = 199

Table A.9   Most Frequent Leisure Activity by Schooling Subculture: Form 1 Male Students

Most Frequent Leisure Activity	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Home-based				
Books, newspapers, magazines	2.5	4.2	9.9	7.5
Radio	13.6	14.0	19.0	4.8
Television	21.5	15.1	10.9	19.5
Interests[a]	3.6	4.6	3.6	11.7
Domestic[b]	1.4	.4	3.4	1.4
Personal computer	1.3	.7	---	1.4
Subtotal	43.9	39.0	46.8	46.3
Social				
Movies	1.1	2.1	4.3	2.1
Going out	3.6	8.0	1.4	1.7
Video Games	8.9	4.2	2.2	4.7
Chatting	6.4	2.8	1.4	2.5
Other social[c]	6.6	2.1	5.0	2.8
Subtotal	26.6	19.2	14.3	13.8
Physical				
Ball games	8.6	23.4	22.1	21.9
Outdoors	1.4	3.1	---	.2
Other sports	13.4	11.2	13.4	14.8
Subtotal	23.4	37.7	35.5	36.9
Others	6.1	4.2	3.4	2.9
Total[d]	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9
(N)	(113)	(58)	(84)	(99)

[a]playing music instruments, singing, handicraft, model-making, collecting objects, painting
[b]cooking, knitting, household work, flower arrangement, caring for plants
[c]picture-taking, playing cards, chess, going to teahouses, going to discos
[d]total may not add up to 100.00 owing to rounding errors

Table A.10 Most Frequent Leisure Activity by Schooling Subculture:
Form 1 Female Students

Most Frequent Leisure Activity	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Home-based				
Books, newspapers, magazines	8.4	4.6	12.0	14.1
Radio	21.4	18.3	17.4	19.8
Television	30.3	35.8	22.3	24.4
Interests[a]	5.3	2.3	11.1	5.5
Domestic[b]	1.3	2.7	10.7	11.9
Personal computer	---	---	1.0	---
Subtotal	66.7	63.7	74.5	75.7
Social				
Movies	.2	.4	1.3	---
Going out	5.1	2.3	3.6	4.4
Video Games	.2	---	---	---
Chatting	12.8	5.8	9.0	6.5
Other social[c]	4.2	5.0	1.0	2.3
Subtotal	22.5	13.5	14.9	13.2
Physical				
Ball games	2.2	7.6	3.3	5.2
Outdoors	1.3	---	---	.1
Other sports	2.7	12.6	7.3	3.9
Subtotal	6.2	20.2	10.6	9.2
Others	4.6	2.7	---	1.8
Total[d]	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9
(N)	(92)	(53)	(128)	(185)

[a]playing music instruments, singing, handicraft, model-making, collecting objects, painting
[b]cooking, knitting, household work, flower arrangement, caring for plants
[c]picture-taking, playing cards, chess, going to teahouses, going to discos
[d]total may not add up to 100.00 owing to rounding errors

Table A.11 Most Frequent Leisure Activity by Schooling Subculture:
Form 4 Male Students

Most Frequent Leisure Activity	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Home-based				
Books, newspapers, magazines	5.5	5.8	13.8	5.7
Radio	28.1	31.0	19.2	19.0
Television	16.7	10.6	10.7	12.5
Interests[a]	2.5	2.1	3.8	7.1
Domestic[b]	1.0	---	2.2	.3
Personal computer	3.6	5.0	7.1	5.0
Subtotal	57.4	54.5	56.8	49.6
Social				
Movies	3.5	8.9	4.1	2.1
Going out	1.8	2.1	1.7	---
Video Games	3.6	1.6	2.5	4.2
Chatting	5.1	.3	2.2	1.1
Other social[c]	2.0	3.2	5.8	1.6
Subtotal	16.0	16.1	16.3	9.0
Physical				
Ball games	8.7	20.7	20.9	24.3
Outdoors	2.3	2.1	---	3.1
Other sports	8.7	2.9	3.9	9.9
Subtotal	19.7	25.7	24.8	37.3
Others	6.9	3.7	2.2	4.2
Total[d]	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1
(N)	(124)	(77)	(74)	(78)

[a]playing music instruments, singing, handicraft, model-making, collecting objects, painting
[b]cooking, knitting, household work, flower arrangement, caring for plants
[c]picture-taking, playing cards, chess, going to teahouses, going to discos
[d]total may not add up to 100.00 owing to rounding errors

Table A.12 Most Frequent Leisure Activity by Schooling Subculture:
Form 4 Female Students

Most Frequent Leisure Activity	Schooling Subculture			
	Alienated Non-Learners	School-Oriented Non-Learners	Independent Learners	School-Oriented Learners
	%	%	%	%
Home-based				
Books, newspapers, magazines	6.6	9.6	13.9	23.0
Radio	24.2	21.6	29.0	21.7
Television	20.5	23.7	20.2	15.4
Interests[a]	3.0	2.0	6.2	6.3
Domestic[b]	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.2
Personal computer	.8	1.3	---	---
Subtotal	58.7	62.1	73.4	70.6
Social				
Movies	2.5	3.0	---	2.7
Going out	4.1	9.6	6.9	3.0
Video Games	---	---	---	---
Chatting	14.8	10.9	6.3	8.3
Other social[c]	4.0	1.3	1.9	.9
Subtotal	25.4	24.8	15.1	14.9
Physical				
Ball games	4.0	1.8	7.7	2.9
Outdoors	1.0	1.3	.8	2.7
Other sports	7.2	7.0	.8	5.6
Subtotal	12.2	10.1	9.3	11.2
Others	3.8	3.1	2.1	3.3
Total[d]	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.0
(N)	(162)	(93)	(147)	(135)

[a]playing music instruments, singing, handicraft, model-making, collecting objects, painting
[b]cooking, knitting, household work, flower arrangement, caring for plants
[c]picture-taking, playing cards, chess, going to teahouses, going to discos
[d]total may not add up to 100.00 owing to rounding errors

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Arts and Sciences
1971   Twelve to Sixteen: Early Adolescence (Daedalus Fall 1971). Cambridge, Mass.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Andrews, Frank M.
1974   "Social Indicators of Perceived Life Quality." Social Indicators Research 1: 279-299.

Andrews, Frank M., and Withey, Stephen B.
1974a   "Developing Measures of Perceived Life Quality: Results from Several National Surveys." Social Indicators Research 1: 1-26.

Andrews, Frank M., and Withey, Stephen B.
1974b   "Assessing the Quality of Life as People Experience It." Paper for presentation to the American Sociological Association Annual Convention, Montreal (August).

Andrews, Frank M., and Withey, Stephen B.
1976   Social Indicators of Well-Being: American's Perceptions of Life Quality. New York: Plenum.

Appleyard, Donald, and Lintell, Mark
1972   "The Environmental Quality of City Streets: The Residents' Viewpoint." Journal of the American Institute of Planners (March): 84-101.

Avery, Robert K.
1979   "Adolescents' Use of the Mass Media." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 23, No.1, 53-69.

Bates, Paul B., and Schaie, K. Warner
1973   Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Personality and Socialization. New York: Academic Press.

Boys and Girls Clubs Association
1982   Report of the Project On Leisure Life Patterns of Hong Kong Pupils. (In Chinese) Hong Kong: Boys and Girls Clubs Association.

Bubolz, Margaret M. et al.
 1980   "A Human Ecological Approach to Quality of Life: Conceptual
         Framework and Results of a Preliminary Study." Social
         Indicators Research 7: 103-136.

Campbell, Angus
 1981   The Sense of Well-Being in America New York: McGraw-Hill.

Campbell, Angus, and Converse, Philip E.
 1972   The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Russell Sage
         Foundation.

Campbell, Angus; Converse, Philip E.; and Rodgers, Willard L.
 1976   The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluation, and
         Satisfactions. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Carley, Michael
 1981   Social Measurement and Social Indicators. London: George Allen
         & Unwin.

Carp, Frances M. et al.
 1976   "Dimensions of Urban Environmental Quality." Environment and
         Behavior. Vol.8, No.2 (June): 239-264.

Chan, Y.K.
 1978   "Life Satisfaction in Crowded Urban Environment." Hong Kong:
         Social Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Cheek, Neil H., Jr., and Burch, William R., Jr.
 1976   The Social Organization of Leisure in Human Society. New York:
         Harper & Row.

Coleman, James S.
 1961   The Adolescent Society: The Social Life of the Teenager and Its
         Impact on Education. New York: Free Press.

Coleman, John C.
 1980   The Nature of Adolescence. London: Methuen

Dalkey, Norman et al.
 1972   Studies in the Quality of Life. Toronto: Lexington.

Dusek, Jerome B.
 1987   Adolescent Development and Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
         Prentice-Hall.

Elgin, Duane et al.
 1974   City Size and the Quality of Life. Stanford Research Institute.

Emmett, Isabel
 1971   Youth and Leisure in an Urban Sprawl. Manchester: Manchester
         University Press.

Ferriss, Abbott L.
 1975   "National Approaches to Developing Social Indicators." Social
         Indicators Research 2: 81-92.

Fong, M.K. Lee
 n.d.   "Some Observations on the Degree of Satisfaction of the Residents
         of Tai Po on their Living Environment." Hong Kong. Mimeo.

Glyptis, Susan A.
 1981   "Leisure Life-styles." Regional Studies. Vol. 15, No.5, 311-326.

Hempel, Donald, and Tucker, Lewis, Jr.
 1979   "Citizen Preferences for Housing as Community Social Indicators."
         Environment and Behavior. Vol. 11, No.3 (September): 399-428.

Hendry, Leo B.
 1978   School, Sport and Leisure. London: Lepus Books.

Hendry, Leo B.
 1983   Growing Up and Going Out: Adolescents and Leisure. Aberdeen:
         Aberdeen University Press.

Johnston, Denis F.
 1979   "Discussion: Problems in Social Indicator Development." Social
         Indicators Research 6: 207-213.

Kelly, John R.
 1982   Leisure. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kennedy, Leslie W. et al.
 1978   "Subjective Evaluation of Well-Being: Problems and Prospects."
         Social Indicators Research 5: 457-474.

Kline, F. Gerald, and Clarke, Peter, eds.
1971   Mass Communications and Youth: Some Current Perspectives.
        Beverley Hills: Sage.

Knox, Paul L.
1975   Social Well-Being: A Spatial Perspective. London: Oxford
        University Press.

Knox, Paul L.
1976   Social Priorities for Social Indicators. Occasional Paper, No.4,
        Department of Geography, University of Dundee.

Kuz, T.J.
1978   "Quality of Life: An Objective and Subjective Variable Analysis."
        Regional Studies. Vol. 12: 409-417.

Liu, Ben-Chieh
1974   "Quality of Life Indicators: A Preliminary Investigation." Social
        Indicators Research 1: 187-208.

Liu, Ben-Chieh
1976   Quality of Life Indicators in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. New York:
        Praeger.

McCall, Storrs
1975   "Quality of Life." Social Indicators Research 2: 229-248.

Milbrath, Lester W., and Sahr, Robert C.
1975   "Perceptions of Environmental Quality." Social Indicators Research
        1: 397-438.

Millar, Sheelagh
1979   The Biosocial Survey in Hong Kong. Canberra: Australian National
        University Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies.

Mitchell, Robert E.
1969   Pupil, Parent, and School: A Hong Kong Study. Taipei: Orient
        Cultural Service.

Murdock, G., and Phelps, G.
1973   Mass Media and the Secondary School. London: MacMillan.

Neuglinger, John
1974   The Psychology of Leisure: Research Approaches to the Study of
        Leisure. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Newcomb, Theodore M., and Wilson, Everett K.
1966   College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
1982   The OECD List of Social Indicators. Paris: Organization for
        Economic Co-operation and Development.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
1982   The OECD Social Indicator Development Programme: Special
        Studies. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and
        Development.

O'Riordan, Timothy
1971   "Public Opinion and Environmental Quality." Environmental and
        Behavior (June): 191-214.

Phillips, John C., and Schafer, Walter B.
1971   "Consequences of Participation in Interscholastic Sports: A Review
        and Prospectus." In Sociology of Leisure, edited by Theodore B.
        Johannis, Jr. and C. Neil Bull, 93-103. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Poole, Millicent E.
1983   Youth: Expectations and Transitions. Melbourne: Routledge &
        Kegan Paul.

Rapoport, Rhona, and Rapoport, Robert N.
1975   Leisure and the Family Life Cycle. London: Routledge & Kegan
        Paul.

Roberts, Kenneth
1978   Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure. London:
        Longman.

Rodgers, Willard L., and Converse, Philip E.
1975   "Measures of the Perceived Overall of Life." Social Indicators
        Research 2: 127-152.

Schmandt, Henry, and Bloomberg, Warner, eds.
1969   The Quality of Urban Life. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Schneider, Mark
1975   "The Quality of Life in Large American Cities: Objective and
        Subjective Social Indicators." Social Indicators Research 1: 495-
        509.

Social Science Society, University of Hong Kong
1982   Hong Kong Youths of the 1980s: Mentality of Secondary School
        Students and the Mass Media--A Research Report. (In Chinese)
        Hong Kong: Social Science Society, University of Hong Kong.

Sociology Society, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
1983   Primary School Pupils and Television: A Survey Report. (In Chinese)
        Hong Kong: Sociology Society, The Chinese University of Hong
        Kong.

Spady, William G.
1970   "Lament for the Letterman: Effects of Peer Status and Extra-
        curricular Activities on Goals and Achievement." American
        Journal of Sociology, 75: 680-702.

Strumpel, B., ed.
1974   Subjective Elements of Well-Being. Paris: Organization for
        Economic Co-operation and Development.

Sugarman, B.
1967   "Involvement in Youth Culture, Academic Achievement and
        Conformity in School." British Journal of Sociology, 18: 157-164.

Szalai, Alexander, and Andrews, Frank M., eds.
1980   The Quality of Life: Comparative Studies. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Tuan, Yi-Fu
1978   "Environment and the Quality of Life." in Kenneth A. Hammond,
        et al. (eds.) Sourcebook on the Environment. Chicago: University
        of Chicago.

Tunstall, Daniel B.
1979   "Developing Indicators of Environmental Quality: The Experience
        of the Council of Environmental Quality." Social Indicators
        Research 6: 301-347.

UNESCO
1974   Social Indicators: Problems of Definition and of Selection. Paris:
        UNESCO, Department of Social Sciences.

Van Dusen, Roxann A., ed.
1974   Social Indicators, 1973: A Review Symposium. Washington, D.C.:
        Social Science Research Council.

White, Graham
1977   Socialization. London: Longman.

友儕取向、父母取向、和學校次文化對香港青少年的閒暇行為和生活滿足感的影響

（中文摘要）　　　　吳白弢、文直良合著

　　本研究的主要目的是探討香港中學生的閒暇行為和生活滿足感，怎樣受友儕取向、父母取向、和學校次文化影響。

　　友儕取向基本上是青少年受友儕影響繼而在行為上亦被感染的程度。同樣，父母取向是指父母對青少年行為的影響力。家庭和學校是青少年學生活動的兩大圈子，我們如能多點認識父母和友儕對青少年閒暇行為和生活滿足感的影響，在理論上和實際生活上，都頗為重要。

　　「學校次文化」是本研究的一個新構念，用以辨別青少年對本身學生角色的態度。量度指標包括學習興趣和學校認同；由兩者各分「高」「低」進而組合產生的四種次文化分別為：「學校取向學習型」、「獨立學習型」、「學校取向非學習型」和「疏離非學習型」。隸屬不同次文化的青少年由於時間利用和同學間交往的差異因而可能有不同的閒暇行為。再者，他們在學習和社化過程中因為經歷不同的生活體驗而產生不同程度的生活滿足感。

閒　　暇：

　　在本研究中，閒暇行為分兩大類型：一是家居活動，二是社交或體力活動（以下簡稱社體活動）；我們假定後者為通常在家居以外進行的。另一方面，閒暇活動又分為實際參與的和期望參與的。由此我們劃出四種不同的「閒暇取向」；其中以一致取向（即「一致家居取向」和「一致社體取向」）較具興趣。所謂「一致」取向，意思是青少年通常實際參與和期望參與的閒暇活動皆屬同一類型。

　　結果顯示友儕取向比較能正確預測高年級（中四）青少年的閒暇行為，而預測低年級（中一）青少年的準確性則較低。在中四學生中，友儕取向愈強，愈多實際參與社體活動。同時，他們亦有超過一半的閒暇是跟好朋友在一起的。

　　至於友儕取向、父母取向跟一致閒暇取向的關係，結果顯示友儕取向愈強，傾向一致社體閒暇取向愈高，而傾向一致家居閒暇取向則愈低。又尤其在父母取向較弱的情況下，假如青少年的友儕取向愈強，他們把家居作為閒暇場地的可能性則愈低。雖然本研究所得未能確定友儕取向和父母取向的相互因果關係，但很明顯地，假如父母對青少年的影響較弱，則友儕關係對青少年的閒暇行為是相當重要的。

　　至於學校次文化對青少年閒暇行為取向的影響，概括來說，學習型（包括獨立和學校取向）的青少年較傾向於家居活動，而非學習型（包括疏離和非學校取向）則較傾向於社體活動。將性別和年級加入分析後，結果發現屬於學習型的女性（60%）較男性（47%）為多。而學習型的女性中，一致家居的閒暇取向較屬典型；這現象在中四年級尤為清晰。

　　我們發現閒暇取向因性別不同而有若干差異。以中一學生來說，不同學校次文化的男性就閒暇取向並沒有多大差別，而非學習型的女性則較傾向於一致社體閒暇取向。至於中四學生，非學習型的女性亦較多具一致社體閒暇取向；然而，在男性方面，有此閒暇取向的卻多屬學習型。

　　總的來說，在學校次文化的類型中，以學習型和非學習型的青少年在閒暇取向（特別是一致家居取向和一致社體取向）的分別最為明顯。這可能是由於學習興趣比學校認同更能影響青少年對時間的利用，例如學習興趣濃厚的可能比較喜歡留在家裡。另一方面，學校次文化與閒暇取向的關係亦視乎性別而有所不同，尤以高年級為然。學習型女性較喜歡家居閒暇活動，非學習型女性則較喜歡社體閒暇活動。但男性卻相反，即以學習型的比較多選擇社體活動。這可能是由於在傳統觀念中，一個勤奮的女學生是應該比較內向（「黐」家）；而相反地，一個模範的男學生則似乎應較全面發展，培養多方面興趣。不過，我們的資料未足以證實這點。

生活滿足感：

　　本研究將青少年的生活內容分為六個環節：學校、家庭、政府、大眾傳媒、環境、及他人接受。我們用一個七點尺度去測量青少年對每個環節的滿意程度。此外，一般生活感受亦以同樣方法量度。調查結果發現青少年對不同生活環節有不同的滿意程度。最滿意的是家庭生活，然後依次序為：他人接受、大眾傳媒、一般生活、學校生活、環境、政府。

　　友儕取向和父母取向跟青少年生活滿足感有何關係？分析的結果顯示，無論高低年級，父母取向最能預測青少年的生活滿足感。父母取向愈強，青少年生活滿意程度愈高。由此可見，以中國人為主的香港社會裡，家庭對青少年的生活感受及滿足大概仍是一個重要的決定因素。

　　學校次文化對青少年滿足感也是一個有用的預測指標。「學校取向學習型」顯示較高度的生活滿足感；相反，「疏離非學習型」則表現最低生活滿足感。至於「學校取向非學習型」和「獨立學習型」則介乎兩者之間，並以前者所表示的滿意程度稍高於後者。換言之，對青少年來說，學校認同（以別於學習興趣）

是建立高度生活滿足感的一個重要因素。

　　　　以預測青少年生活滿足感來說，友儕取向是本研究的三個主要自變項中較弱的一個。此外，調查結果顯示友儕取向較弱的青少年對家庭生活較滿意，而友儕取向較強的青少年則對其他生活環節感到較為滿意。

　　　　如以年級組別加入分析，上述三個自變項跟生活滿足感的關係亦有一定的模式，較為突出的是低年級（中一）青少年的各項生活滿意程度都較高年級的（中四）為高。原因可能是，青少年越成長越會多遇困難和挫折，故此高年級的青少年對周遭事物感到較多不滿是可以理解的。

　　　　總的來說，要瞭解青少年的生活滿足感，我們必須考慮他們對友儕、父母和學校的取向，同時也要考慮他們的生活經驗於不同年齡時的差別。

結　　論：

　　　　本研究嘗試從三方面，就是友儕取向、父母取向、和學校次文化，去瞭解香港青少年學生的閒暇行為和生活滿足感。結果發現友儕和父母對青少年的閒暇和生活滿足感都扮演頗重要的角色。至於「學校次文化」亦甚具研究價值，希望將來能更精確量度這些變項和更深入探討影響香港青少年閒暇行為和生活滿足感的機鍵。