

**THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME (POP)**

***Opinion Survey on the Public Ranking of
Universities in Hong Kong 2005***

COMMISSIONED BY
MEDIA EDUCATION INFO-TECH CO. LTD
(Education 18.com)

SURVEY REPORT

Compiled by
Chung Ting-yiu Robert, Pang Ka-lai Karie and Chan Ka-man Carmen

APRIL 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENGLISH REPORT

Summary of Findings

APPENDICES

<i>Appendix 1</i>	<i>Demographic Profile of Respondents</i>
<i>Appendix 2</i>	<i>Frequency Tables</i>
<i>Appendix 3</i>	<i>Other Answers Submitted (Chinese)</i>
<i>Appendix 4</i>	<i>Questionnaire (English)</i>
<i>Appendix 5</i>	<i>Questionnaire (Chinese)</i>
<i>Appendix 6</i>	<i>Note of Caution (English)</i>
<i>Appendix 7</i>	<i>Note of Caution (Chinese)</i>
<i>Appendix 8</i>	<i>Press Release (Chinese & English)</i>
<i>Appendix 9</i>	<i>Newspaper Clippings</i>

**THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME (POP)**

**Opinion Survey on the Public Ranking of
Universities in Hong Kong 2005**

Commissioned by Media Education Info-Tech Co. Ltd.
(Education 18.com)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Research Team Members

Project Director : CHUNG Ting-yiu Robert
Project Manager : PANG Ka-lai Karie
Project Executive : CHAN Ka-man Carmen
Data Analyst : TSOI Pui-shing Tony
Copy Editor : CHUNG Sin-yan Yennice

April 2005

CONTACT INFORMATION

Date of survey : 23 – 30/3/2005 Sample size : 1,517 successful cases
Response rate : 60.5% Standard error : Less than 1.3%
Target population : Cantonese-speaking population of Hong Kong of age 18 or above
Survey method : Telephone survey with interviewers
Sampling method : Standard POP telephone sampling method was used. Telephone numbers were selected randomly from residential telephone directories and mixed with additional numbers generated by the computer. If more than one subject had been available, the one who had his/her birthday next was selected.
Weighting method : The data reported have been adjusted according to the age and gender distributions of the Hong Kong population as reported in the 2001 Population Census.

Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of The University of Hong Kong. CHUNG Ting-yiu Robert is responsible for the work of the Public Opinion Programme (POP) of The University of Hong Kong.

P r e a m b l e

The Public Opinion Programme (POP) was established in June 1991 to collect and study public opinion on topics which could be of interest to academics, journalists, policy-makers, and the general public. POP was at first under the Social Sciences Research Centre, a unit under the Faculty of Social Sciences of The University of Hong Kong, and was transferred to the Journalism and Media Studies Centre in the University of Hong Kong in May 2000. In January 2002, and was transferred back to the Faculty of Social Sciences in the University of Hong Kong. POP provides quality survey services to a wide range of public and private organizations, provided that they allow the POP Team to design and conduct the research independently, and to bear the final responsibilities.

In February 2005, POP was commissioned, for the fifth time, by Media Education Info-tech Co. Ltd. (which owns “Education 18.com”) to repeat the annual survey on the public’s perceptions of the eight universities in Hong Kong. The primary objective of this survey was basically the same as that of the previous years, i.e. to study the general public’s perception of the local universities, but with a slightly different instrument designed in line with the client’s new emphasis. In fact, the very first study of this subject was carried out in 2000, which was designed and coordinated entirely by the client using a different methodology. For this reason, any direct comparison between the results obtained from the first and the subsequent surveys is not recommended, while other comparison of results should also be made with great caution.

The questionnaires used in this and the previous years’ surveys were designed independently by the POP Team after consulting the client. Fieldwork, data analysis and interpretation were also carried out independently by the POP Team.

This year’s telephone survey was conducted during the period of 23 to 30 March 2005. A total of 1,517 Hong Kong Cantonese-speaking residents of age 18 or above were successfully interviewed. The overall response rate was 60.5% and the standard error due to sampling was no more than 1.3 percentage points. That means at 95% confidence level, the sampling error of percentage figures was less than plus/minus 2.6 percentage points. Yet, because some questions were only applicable to employers whose preference for university graduates were gauged, their valid sub-samples were smaller, and thus the sampling error for these questions has increased accordingly.

Research Design

The target population of this survey was Cantonese-speaking population of Hong Kong of age 18 or above. To minimize sampling bias, the following sampling technique was adopted:

Telephone numbers were first drawn randomly from the residential telephone directories as “seed numbers”, from which another set of numbers was generated using the “plus/minus one/two” method, in order to capture the unlisted numbers. Duplicated numbers were then filtered, and the remaining numbers were mixed in random order to produce the final telephone sample.

When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one person of age 18 or above was selected. If more than one qualified subject had been available, selection was made using the “next birthday rule” which selected the person who had his/her birthday next from all those present. Please refer to Appendix 1 for the demographic profile of the respondents.

Telephone interviews were carried out between 23 and 30 March 2005. Data were collected by interviewers using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI) system under close supervision.

As shown from the detailed breakdown of the contact information, among the 12,166 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 4,309 were confirmed ineligible, among them 581 were fax or data lines, 2,683 were invalid telephone numbers, 63 were call-forwarding numbers, while another 617 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 212 of them were invalidated due to special technological circumstances, while 153 cases were voided because no eligible respondents were available at the numbers provided.

Meanwhile, a total of 4,090 telephone numbers were invalidated since the research team could not confirm their eligibility. Among them 281 were busy lines, 2,173 were no-answer calls, 63 cases were diverted to answering devices while 273 were blocked. In addition, 390 cases were treated as ineligible because of language problems, 900 interviews were terminated before the screening question, while 10 cases were voided for other problems.

Of the remaining 3,767 eligible cases, 2,250 failed to complete the interview. Among them 18 rejected the interview immediately after their eligibility was confirmed, 2,150 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Besides, 73 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 9 were classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 1,517 were successful cases (Table 1).

Table 1 Breakdown of contact information of the survey

	Frequency	Percentage
Telephone numbers' ineligibility confirmed	4,309	35.5
<i>Fax/ data line</i>	581	4.8
<i>Invalid number</i>	2,683	22.1
<i>Call-forwarding/ mobile/ pager number</i>	63	0.5
<i>Non-residential number</i>	617	5.1
<i>Special technological circumstances</i>	212	1.7
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	153	1.3
Telephone numbers' or respondents' eligibility not confirmed	4,090	33.6
<i>Line busy</i>	281	2.3
<i>No answer</i>	2,173	17.9
<i>Answering device</i>	63	0.5
<i>Call-blocking</i>	273	2.2
<i>Language problem</i>	390	3.2
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	900	7.4
<i>Others</i>	10	0.1
Telephone numbers' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	2,250	18.5
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	4	0.0
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	14	0.1
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	2,150	17.7
<i>Partial interview</i>	73	0.6
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	9	0.1
Successful cases	1,517	12.5
Total	12,166	100.0

To sum up, a total of 1,517 Hong Kong residents of age 18 or above were successfully interviewed in the survey. The effective response rate was 60.5% as shown in the following calculation. The standard error due to sampling was no more than 1.3 percentage points.

Table 2 Calculation of overall response rate

Overall response rate = [Successful cases / (Successful cases + Refusal cases + Incomplete cases)] 100% = [1,517 / (1,517 + 18 + 973)] 100% = 60.5%
--

The data collected have been adjusted according to the age and gender distributions of the Hong Kong population as reported in the 2001 Population Census. All analyses in this report are based on the weighted data.

Statistical tests of “difference-of-proportions” and “difference-of-means” have been employed whenever applicable, in order to check for significant changes. Figures marked with double asterisks (**) indicated that the variation has been tested to be statistically significant at $p=0.01$ level, whereas those with single asterisk (*) denoted statistical significance at $p=0.05$ level.

The researcher is aware that the POP Team is part of the University of Hong Kong, which is one of the universities rated by the respondents. As a precaution to eliminate any possible bias due to desirability effect, all respondents were explicitly told at the beginning of the interview that the POP Team was an independent research team, and the respondents should simply report honestly what they felt.

Summary of Findings

The first part of the survey was to study the general public's perception of the local universities, namely, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), The City University of Hong Kong (CityU), The Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU), The Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIEd), The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), The Lingnan University (Lingnan), The Polytechnic University of Hong Kong (PolyU) and The University of Hong Kong (HKU), order rotated randomly in different questionnaires in order to eliminate possible bias due to ordering. By means of a rating scale from 0-10, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half, these universities were assessed one by one with regard to their overall performance.

A. Overall Performance of University

First of all, all respondents were asked to evaluate each of these local universities based on their perception of its overall performance using a scale of 0-10, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. Respondents were suggested to take into account the university's local and international reputation, facilities, campus environment, qualification of its teaching staff, academic research performance, conduct and quality of its students, its learning atmosphere, as well as the diversification and degree of recognition for its courses. Survey results indicated that, in terms of public perception, HKU received the highest mean score of 7.85 as rated by 1,314 respondents, CUHK came 2nd with an average score of 7.50 rated by 1,299 respondents, whereas HKUST ranked 3rd with a mean score of 7.16 rated by 1,217 respondents. When compared to the findings obtained from the last survey, no difference was observed in terms of their respective rankings regarding the overall performance of the eight universities, but the mean score of PolyU, taking the 4th rank over the past 4 years, has dropped from 6.82 to 6.71, which was tested to be statistically significant at $p=0.05$ level (Table 3).

Table 3 - Overall Performance

	2002 Survey		2003 Survey		2004 Survey		2005 Survey			
	Average	Standard error	Average	Standard error	Average	Standard error	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Recognition (No. of raters/total sample)
1. HKU	7.87	0.05	7.89	0.05	7.92	0.04	7.85	0.04	1,314	86.6%
2. CUHK	7.53	0.05	7.55	0.05	7.57	0.04	7.50	0.04	1,299	85.6%
3. HKUST	7.16	0.06	7.14	0.05	7.16	0.04	7.16	0.04	1,217	80.2%
4. PolyU	6.78	0.05	6.83	0.05	6.82	0.04	6.71*	0.04	1,281	84.4%
5. HKBU	6.21	0.05	6.31	0.05	6.16*	0.04	6.12	0.04	1,207	79.6%
6. CityU	6.10	0.06	6.04	0.05	6.13	0.04	6.06	0.04	1,185	78.1%
7. HKIEd	5.83	0.06	5.82	0.06	5.69	0.05	5.61	0.05	1,072	70.7%
8. Lingnan	5.44	0.06	5.57	0.06	5.51	0.05	5.43	0.05	1,130	74.5%

Our cross-tabulation analyses showed that, within each sub-group, the respective rankings of the universities were basically the same regardless of their education attainment and occupation. Only some insignificant differences were observed which were highlighted in square brackets. For actual ratings obtained by each university as rated by each sub-group, please refer to the tables below (Tables 4-5).

Table 4 – Cross-tabulation Analyses: University Performance by Education Attainment

	Primary or below			Secondary			Tertiary or above		
	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters
1. HKU [^]	7.78	0.14	155	7.87	0.05	659	7.83	0.05	488
2. CUHK	7.65	0.13	148	7.42	0.05	657	7.59	0.05	482
3. HKUST	7.10	0.17	137	7.04	0.06	607	7.33	0.05	464
4. PolyU	6.99	0.15	149	6.70	0.05	644	6.60	0.05	479
5. HKBU	6.56	0.14	137	6.10	0.05	598	6.01	0.05	462
6. CityU	6.54	0.16	120	5.97	0.06	590	6.02	0.06	465
7. HKIEd	6.17	0.20	97	5.81	0.07	540	5.23	0.07	429
8. Lingnan	6.05	0.20	121	5.44	0.06	558	5.23	0.06	439

[^] Differences among sub-groups tested to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

Table 5a – Cross-tabulation Analyses: University Performance by Occupation (I)

	Professionals and semi-professionals			Clerk and service workers			Production workers		
	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters
1. HKU	7.93	0.06	404	7.74	0.08	290	7.70	0.14	110
2. CUHK	7.61	0.05	404	7.39	0.07	290	7.23	0.15	109
3. HKUST	7.30	0.06	387	7.07	0.08	269	6.72	0.17	103
4. PolyU	6.63	0.06	399	6.66	0.08	286	6.45	0.16	104
5. HKBU [^]	6.00	0.06	384	6.11	0.08	267	6.06	0.14	96
6. CityU	5.97	0.06	379	5.96	0.08	262	5.74	0.16	97
7. HKIEd	5.24	0.07	347	5.73	0.10	247	5.67	0.20	85
8. Lingnan	5.19	0.07	357	5.45	0.10	252	5.47	0.17	90

[^] Differences among sub-groups tested to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

Table 5b – Cross-tabulation Analyses: University Performance by Occupation (II)

	Students			Housewives		
	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters
1. HKU	7.65	0.12	114	8.04	0.12	171
2. CUHK	7.69	0.10	114	7.53	0.12	161
3. HKUST	7.18	0.11	111	7.16	0.14	148
4. PolyU	6.63	0.09	112	6.80	0.12	158
5. HKBU [^]	6.07	0.10	112	6.28	0.12	146
6. CityU	6.03	0.10	111	6.11	0.12	146
7. HKIEd	5.42	0.14	107	5.82	0.16	129
8. Lingnan	5.42	0.13	110	5.56	0.16	140

[^] Differences among sub-groups tested to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

B. Overall Performance of Vice-Chancellor/President

With respect to the perceived overall performance of the Vice-Chancellor/President of each university, taking into consideration one's local and international reputation, approachability, leadership, vision, social credibility and public relations, it is worthy mentioning that only four out of eight current Vice-Chancellors/ Presidents rated in this year's survey had obtained recognition rates of over 50% (ranging from 54% to 59%). Results also revealed that Professor Lap-chee Tsui of HKU topped the list for the first year, with an average score of 7.39 rated by 898 respondents, while Professor Paul C.W. Chu of HKUST, who came 1st in the previous three years, lagged closely behind, attaining a mean score of 7.38 rated by 896 respondents. Meanwhile, Professor Lawrence J. Lau of CUHK came 3rd at 6.93 and rated by 718 respondents. The 4th to 8th ranks fell to the Vice-Chancellors/Presidents of PolyU, Lingnan, HKBU, CityU and HKIED correspondingly, with their average scores ranging from 6.61 to 5.87 (Table 6).

Table 6 - Overall Performance of Vice-Chancellor/President

	2002 Survey		2003 Survey		2004 Survey		2005 Survey			
	Avg.	Std. error	Avg.	Std. error	Avg.	Std. error	Avg.	Std. error	No of raters	Recognition (No. of raters/total sample)
1. HKU - Lap-chee TSUI [#]	- N.A. -		7.16	0.06	7.22	0.05	7.39**	0.04	898	59.2%
2. HKUST - Paul C.W. CHU	7.26	0.07	7.22	0.06	7.30	0.05	7.38	0.05	896	59.1%
3. CUHK - Lawrence J. LAU [#]			- N.A. -				6.93	0.05	718	47.3%
4. PolyU - Chung-kwong POON	6.56	0.07	6.64	0.06	6.53	0.05	6.61	0.05	816	53.8%
5. Lingnan - Edward K.Y. CHEN	6.48	0.07	6.48	0.07	6.45	0.06	6.42	0.05	877	57.8%
6. HKBU - Ching-fai NG	6.31	0.07	6.33	0.06	6.26	0.05	6.33	0.06	725	47.8%
7. CityU - H.K. CHANG	6.31	0.07	6.18	0.07	6.17	0.06	6.27	0.06	609	40.1%
8. HKIED - Paul MORRIS [#]	- N.A. -		6.07	0.07	5.78*	0.06	5.87	0.07	523	34.5%

#No comparison made with the previous data as the relevant post was taken up by another person then.

When cross-tabulated by respondent's education attainment and occupation, it is found that slight variations were obtained in terms of the respective rankings of the VCs/Presidents within each sub-group, though most of them fluctuated within the standard error margins. They were highlighted in square brackets for easy identification. Actual ratings obtained by each VC/President as rated by each sub-group can be found from the tables below (Tables 7-8).

Table 7 – Cross-tabulation Analyses: V-C/President Performance by Education Attainment

	Primary or below			Secondary			Tertiary or above		
	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters
1.HKU-LC Tsui [^]	7.66	0.19	85	7.36	0.06	439	7.34	0.06	369
2.HKUST-Paul Chu	7.28	0.20	76	7.21	0.07	443	7.58	0.06	375
3.CUHK-Lawrence Lau [^]	7.12	0.23	59	6.92	0.07	345	6.90	0.07	310
4.PolyU-CK Poon	7.16	0.20	75	6.56	0.07	390	6.54	0.08	349
5.Lingnan-Edward Chen [^]	6.37	0.22	88	6.31	0.07	425	6.53	0.07	360
6.HKBU-CF Ng	6.74	0.24	64	6.35	0.08	364	6.21	0.08	295
7.CityU-HK Chang	6.77	0.26	55	6.23	0.09	285	6.17	0.08	268
8.HKIEd-Paul Morris	6.51	0.29	40	5.95	0.10	252	5.66	0.09	229

[^] Differences among sub-groups tested to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

Table 8a – Cross-tabulation Analyses: V-C/President Performance by Occupation (I)

	Professionals and semi-professionals			Clerk and service workers			Production workers		
	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters
1.HKU-LC Tsui	7.37	0.07	321	7.25	0.09	180	7.23	0.20	71
2.HKUST-Paul Chu	7.60	0.07	326	7.18	0.11	188	7.03	0.21	70
3.CUHK-Lawrence Lau	6.99	0.07	261	6.68	0.10	145	6.67	0.24	58
4.PolyU-CK Poon	6.55	0.08	295	6.50	0.11	164	6.56	0.22	62
5.Lingnan-Edward Chen	6.46	0.07	314	6.35	0.11	183	6.14	0.24	64
6.HKBU-CF Ng [^]	6.22	0.09	271	6.36	0.12	154	6.34	0.21	57
7.CityU-HK Chang	6.13	0.08	221	6.24	0.13	131	6.20	0.29	44
8.HKIEd-Paul Morris	5.62	0.11	190	5.79	0.14	105	5.91	0.24	42

[^] Differences among sub-groups tested to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

Table 8b – Cross-tabulation Analyses: V-C/President Performance by Occupation (II)

	Students			Housewives		
	Average	Standard error	No. of raters	Average	Standard error	No. of raters
1.HKU-LC Tsui	7.12	0.11	85	7.59	0.15	105
2.HKUST-Paul Chu	7.28	0.12	84	7.16	0.15	99
3.CUHK-Lawrence Lau	6.74	0.14	70	7.07	0.15	77
4.PolyU-CK Poon	6.50	0.13	75	6.58	0.16	92
5.Lingnan-Edward Chen	6.65	0.14	76	6.04	0.17	97
6.HKBU-CF Ng [^]	6.10	0.15	64	6.43	0.17	78
7.CityU-HK Chang	6.28	0.15	60	5.88	0.20	61
8.HKIEd-Paul Morris	6.15	0.15	57	6.00	0.26	58

[^] Differences among sub-groups tested to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

C. Perceived Deficiencies among the University Graduates in Hong Kong

In line with last year's survey design, a question was then asked to gauge respondents' opinion on the qualities which most Hong Kong university graduates lack of. Results showed that, without prompting, 28% of the respondents failed to provide a definite answer, which stayed practically the same as 2004. This year, "proficiency in Chinese, English and Putonghua" topped the list with 20% of respondents citing it. In the meantime, "social/work experience" and "work attitude" were also frequently mentioned, by 18% and 17% of the total sample respectively. Other commonly-cited qualities included "social/interpersonal skills", "academic and professional knowledge" and "conduct, honesty", each constituting around 10% of the total sample (Table 9).

Table 9 – Perceived Deficiencies among the University Graduates in Hong Kong

	2003 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey		
	% of total sample (Base = 1,025)	% of total sample (Base = 1,513)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base = 2,211 responses from 1,510 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 1,517)
Proficiency in Chinese, English and Putonghua	18.5%	17.6%	297	13.4%	19.7%
Social / Work experience	8.8%	21.2%**	269	12.1%	17.8%*
Work attitude (e.g. serious, enthusiastic, diligent, responsible, motivated)	16.7%	12.7%**	249	11.2%	16.5%**
Social / interpersonal skills	9.6%	8.8%	164	7.4%	10.8%
Academic and professional knowledge	10.0%	7.2%*	149	6.7%	9.9%**
Conduct, honesty	8.4%	5.6%**	134	6.0%	8.8%**
Critical thinking and problem-solving ability	9.6%	5.2%**	108	4.9%	7.2%*
Global prospect / foresight	2.2%	6.1%**	95	4.3%	6.3%
Self-confidence	3.5%	7.6%**	81	3.7%	5.4%*
Communication skills	3.7%	3.6%	68	3.1%	4.5%
Commitment to society	3.2%	6.9%**	63	2.9%	4.2%**
Creativity	1.4%	2.6%*	30	1.4%	2.0%
Emotion stability	1.7%	2.3%	18	0.8%	1.2%*
Computer proficiency	0.4%	0.2%	6	0.3%	0.4%
Others	9.0%	6.3%*	63	2.9%	4.2%**
Don't know/ hard to say	29.2%	27.7%	419	18.9%	27.7%
Total			2,211	100.0%	
Base	1,008	1,492	1,510		
Missing case(s)	17	21	7		

D. Preference for University Graduates

The survey went on to study employers' preference when selecting university graduates. To begin with, all respondents were asked if they were involved in any recruitment process of new staff in performing their office duties. Results showed that 17% of the total sample had such authority in one way or another (Table 10).

Table 10 - Involvement in Recruitment of New Staff (Teachers included)

	2002 Survey	2003 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey	
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	17.9%	18.9%	17.1%	264	17.4%
No	82.1%	81.1%	82.9%	1,249	82.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1,513	100.0%
Base	1,029	1,025	1,513	1,517	
Missing case(s)	3	8	3	4	

These respondents were further asked which university graduates they would prefer most when they looked for a new employee. Graduates of HKU topped the list once again this year, as chosen by one-quarter (25%) of these potential employers. Meanwhile, graduates from CUHK, PolyU and HKUST were preferred by 18%, 15% and 9% of this sub-sample respectively. Yet, 16% of these respondents said they had no particular preference and 13% failed to give a definite answer. When compared to the findings obtained in the 2004 survey, no significant differences were observed, except that CityU and HKBU have swapped their rankings, but it has to be noted that because of the small sub-sample, the standard error has increased accordingly to less than plus/minus 3.1 percentage points, i.e. less than plus/minus 6.2 percentage points at 95% confidence level (Table 11).

Table 11 - Most Preferred University Graduates

	2002 Survey	2003 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey		
	% of total sample (Base = 1,029)	% of total sample (Base = 1,025)	% of total sample (Base = 1,513)	Freq.	Percentage	% of total sample (Base = 1,517)
HKU	4.3%	4.3%	3.5%	64	24.5%	4.2%
CUHK	3.3%	2.6%	2.6%	48	18.4%	3.2%
PolyU	1.1%	2.2%	2.4%	38	14.6%	2.5%
HKUST	2.0%	2.0%	1.1%	23	8.9%	1.5%
HKBU	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%*	3	1.0%	0.2%
Lingnan	0.0%	0.4%*	0.1%	2 [#]	0.7%	0.1%
CityU	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	2 [#]	0.6%	0.1%
HKIEd	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	2	0.6%	0.1%
Other overseas universities	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	4	1.4%	0.3%
Others (please specify)	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	3	1.0%	0.2%
Don't know / hard to say	1.9%	2.1%	3.1%	34	12.8%	2.2%
No preference	3.5%	3.5%	3.3%	41	15.5%	2.7%
Total				261	100.0%	
Valid Base	184	192	258	264		
Missing case(s)	1	3	3	3		

Due to the statistical weighting applied, these two reported figures have been rounded up and their actual adjusted values should be "1.8" and "1.6" respectively, hence giving rise to two different percentages subsequently.

These respondents were then asked to provide some reasons for their specific choices. “Good knowledge in job-related areas” and “good performance of previous graduates” were most frequently cited, both by 19% of sub-sample (i.e. 3% of the total sample). Another 13% (i.e. 2% of the total sample) preferred certain graduates simply due to the reputation of their university. Other than these, reasons like “good work attitude”, “being diligent/motivated”, and “good language ability” were mentioned by relatively fewer respondents. These results were fairly similar to those obtained last year (Table 12).

Table 12 - Reasons for Preferring Graduates of a Particular University

	2002 Survey	2003 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey		
	% of total sample (Base = 1,029)	% of total sample (Base = 1,025)	% of total sample (Base = 1,513)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base = 259 responses from 187 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 1,517)
Good knowledge in job-related areas	2.5%	2.4%	2.0%	50	19.3%	3.3%*
Good performance of previous graduates	6.6%	5.0%	3.5%	49	18.9%	3.2%
Reputation	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	35	13.3%	2.3%
Good work attitude	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%	24	9.3%	1.6%
Diligent, motivated	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%	18 [#]	7.1%	1.2%
Good language ability	1.0%	1.4%	0.7%	18 [#]	6.9%	1.2%
Alumni	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	13	5.1%	0.9%
Good social relationship	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	11	4.4%	0.7%
Good leadership	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	5 [#]	1.9%	0.3%
Good connection with outside	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%	5 [#]	1.8%	0.3%
Salary matched with abilities	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	2	0.7%	0.1%
Others (please specify)	0.6%	1.4%	1.6%	22	8.4%	1.5%
Don't know / hard to say	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	7	2.7%	0.5%
Total				259	100.0%	
Valid Base	128	134	157	187		
Missing case(s)	1	6	0	0		

[#] Due to the statistical weighting applied, these reported figures have been rounded up and their actual adjusted values should be “18.4” and “17.9”; “4.9” and “4.7” respectively, hence giving rise to different percentages subsequently.

E. General Educational Policies

Five new questions were included in this year's survey to gauge respondents' opinion on various educational policies. When asked whether the HKSAR Government's overall funding to local universities was appropriate, 45% of the respondents thought so, while 34% said it was too little, and 7% held the contrary view. Another 15% failed to make a judgment on this aspect (Table 13).

Table 13 – Opinion to the HKSAR Government's Overall Funding to Local Universities

	Frequency	Percentage
Appropriate	676	44.7%
Too little	507	33.5%
Too much	107	7.1%
Don't know / hard to say	223	14.8%
Total	1,512	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	5	

Results also revealed that, 51% of the respondents believed having 8 universities was appropriate in Hong Kong at present. On the other hand, 28% regarded this to be too many, as contrast to 15% who considered it inadequate (Table 14).

Table 14 – Opinion to the Number of Local Universities

	Frequency	Percentage
Appropriate	771	50.9%
Too many	424	28.0%
Too few	232	15.3%
Don't know / hard to say	87	5.7%
Total	1,514	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	3	

As for the admission of non-local students, including mainland and overseas ones, 46% of the respondents thought the local universities should enroll more, whereas 24% thought the opposite. It is also noteworthy that 17% preferred the status quo and 14% could not give a definite answer (Table 15).

Table 15 – Opinion to the Admission of Non-local Students

	Frequency	Percentage
More	683	45.5%
Fewer	359	23.9%
Status quo	251	16.7%
Don't know / hard to say	209	13.9%
Total	1,503	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	14	

Regarding the impact of admitting more non-local students on local ones, 53% said this would bring along more advantages, as opposed to 22% who held a negative view. Another 19% stayed neutral by choosing “half and half” (Table 16).

Table 16 – Perceived Effect of Admitting More Non-local Students on Local Ones

	Frequency	Percentage
More advantages	793	52.5%
Half and half	282	18.6%
More disadvantages	324	21.5%
Don't know / hard to say	112	7.4%
Total	1,511	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	6	

Finally, regarding the proposed “3+3+4” academic structure, a majority of 64% agreed to this proposal, whereas only 14% did not support it. Meanwhile, 10% opted for “half-half”, 9% were unable to provide a definite answer and 4% admitted they had no idea about the content of the reform (Table 17).

Table 17 – Opinion to the Proposed “3+3+4” Academic Structure

	Frequency	Percentage
Very much agree	402)	26.7%)
Quite agree	557) 959	37.0%) 63.7%
Half-half	145	9.6%
Quite disagree	139)	9.2%)
Very much disagree	64) 203	4.3%) 13.5%
Not sure about the content of the reform	67	4.4%
Don’t know / hard to say	131	8.7%
Total	1,505	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	12	

Appendix 1

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic Profile of Respondents

1. Gender

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Male	695	45.8%	732	48.3%
Female	822	54.2%	785	51.7%
Total	1,517	100.0%	1,517	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	0		0	

2. Age

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
18-20	134	9.3%	75	5.2%
21-29	227	15.8%	243	16.9%
30-39	281	19.6%	341	23.8%
40-49	371	25.9%	325	22.6%
50-59	253	17.6%	182	12.7%
60 or above	169	11.8%	269	18.8%
Total	1,435	100.0%	1,435	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	82		82	

3. Education Attainment

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Primary or below	210	13.9%	234	15.6%
Secondary	802	53.1%	759	50.4%
Tertiary or above	497	32.9%	512	34.0%
Total	1,509	100.0%	1,504	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	8		13	

4. Occupation Group

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Professionals and semi-professionals	412	27.8%	433	29.2%
Clerk and service workers	314	21.2%	313	21.1%
Production workers	148	10.0%	139	9.4%
Students	159	10.7%	117	7.9%
Housewives	237	16.0%	212	14.3%
Others	213	14.4%	268	18.1%
Total	1,483	100.0%	1,482	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	34		35	

5. Type of ownership of your house

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Self-purchased, or Rent?	898	61.0%	899	61.1%
	575	39.0%	573	38.9%
Total	1,473	100.0%	1,472	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	44		45	

6. House type

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Public housing estate	461	31.0%	448	30.2%
Housing Authority subsidized sale flats	226	15.2%	222	15.0%
Housing Society subsidized sale flats	25	1.7%	27	1.8%
Private housing	714	48.0%	723	48.6%
Village: villas / bungalows / modern village houses	22	1.5%	21	1.4%
Village: simple stone structures / traditional village houses	20	1.3%	24	1.6%
Staff quarters	17	1.1%	18	1.2%
Others	3	0.2%	3	0.2%
Total	1,488	100.0%	1,486	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	29		31	

7. Working in the academy

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes-Teaching staff of primary school (including teachers and principal)	17	7.3%	18	7.4%
Yes-Teaching staff of secondary school (including teachers and principal)	20	8.6%	21	8.5%
Yes-Teaching staff of university	10	4.3%	10	4.2%
Others	20	8.6%	21	8.7%
No	166	71.2%	175	71.2%
Total	233	100.0%	245	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	1,284		1,272	

8. Having children who are studying in schools

	<u>Raw sample</u>		<u>Weighted sample</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	572	38.0%	538	35.9%
No	932	62.0%	961	64.1%
Total	1,504	100.0%	1,499	100.0%
Base	1,517		1,517	
Missing	13		18	

Appendix 2

Frequency Tables

Frequency Tables

[Q1] Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of each university in Hong Kong while taking its local and international reputation, facilities and campus environment, qualification of its teaching staff, academic research performance, conduct and quality of students as well as its learning atmosphere, diversification and level of recognition of the courses into consideration, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. How would you rate **(eight universities in rotation)**?

	Average	Standard error	No of raters	Recognition
HKU	7.85	0.04	1,314	86.6%
CUHK	7.50	0.04	1,299	85.6%
HKUST	7.16	0.04	1,217	80.2%
PolyU	6.71	0.04	1,281	84.4%
HKBU	6.12	0.04	1,207	79.6%
CityU	6.06	0.04	1,185	78.1%
HKIEd	5.61	0.05	1,072	70.7%
Lingnan	5.43	0.05	1,130	74.5%

[Q2] Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of Vice-Chancellor/President of each university while taking his local and international reputation, approachability to the public, leadership, vision, social credibility and public relations into consideration, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. How would you rate the Vice-Chancellors/Presidents of **(eight universities in rotation)**? [96 = Don't know the Vice-Chancellor/President; 97 = Don't know the university; 98 = Don't know / hard to say; 99 = Refused to answer]

	Average	Standard error	No of raters	Recognition
HKU - Prof Lap-chee TSUI	7.39	0.04	898	59.2%
HKUST - Prof Paul C.W. CHU	7.38	0.05	896	59.1%
CUHK – Prof Lawrence J. LAU	6.93	0.05	718	47.3%
PolyU - Prof Chung-kwong POON	6.61	0.05	816	53.8%
Lingnan - Prof Edward K.Y. CHEN	6.42	0.05	877	57.8%
HKBU - Prof Ching-fai NG	6.33	0.06	725	47.8%
CityU - Prof H.K. CHANG	6.27	0.06	609	40.1%
HKIEd - Prof Paul MORRIS	5.87	0.07	523	34.5%

[Q3] What do you think are the qualities which most Hong Kong university graduates lack of?
(Did not read out the answers, multiple responses allowed)

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base = 2,211 responses from 1,510 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 1,517)
Proficiency in Chinese, English and Putonghua	297	13.4%	19.7%
Social / Work experience	269	12.1%	17.8%
Work attitude (e.g. serious, enthusiastic, diligent, responsible, motivated)	249	11.2%	16.5%
Social / interpersonal skills	164	7.4%	10.8%
Academic and professional knowledge	149	6.7%	9.9%
Conduct, honesty	134	6.0%	8.8%
Critical thinking and problem-solving ability	108	4.9%	7.2%
Global prospect / foresight	95	4.3%	6.3%
Self-confidence	81	3.7%	5.4%
Communication skills	68	3.1%	4.5%
Commitment to society	63	2.9%	4.2%
Creativity	30	1.4%	2.0%
Emotion stability	18	0.8%	1.2%
Computer proficiency	6	0.3%	0.4%
Others	63	2.9%	4.2%
Don't know/ hard to say	419	18.9%	27.7%
Total	2,211	100.0%	
Base	1,510		
Missing case(s)	7		

[Q4] Under your job specifications, are you involved, in any way, in the recruitment process of new staff, including teachers?

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	264	17.4%
No	1,249	82.6%
Total	1,513	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	4	

[Q5] [Only for those who are involved in the recruitment process of new staff] If you looked for a new employee, which university's graduates would you prefer most? (Did not read out the answers, single response only)

	Frequency	Percentage	% of total sample (Base = 1,517)
HKU	64	24.5%	4.2%
CUHK	48	18.4%	3.2%
PolyU	38	14.6%	2.5%
HKUST	23	8.9%	1.5%
HKBU	3	1.0%	0.2%
Lingnan	2	0.7%	0.1%
CityU	2	0.6%	0.1%
HKIEd	2	0.6%	0.1%
Other overseas universities	4	1.4%	0.3%
Others (please specify)	3	1.0%	0.2%
Don't know / hard to say	34	12.8%	2.2%
No preference	41	15.5%	2.7%
Total	261	100.0%	
Valid base	264		
Missing case(s)	3		

[Q6] [Only for those who are involved in the recruitment process of new staff and have preference over a specific university's graduates] Why would you prefer the graduates of the chosen university? (Did not read out the answers, multiple responses allowed)

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base = 259 responses from 187 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 1,517)
Good knowledge in job-related areas	50	19.3%	3.3%
Good performance of previous graduates	49	18.9%	3.2%
Reputation	35	13.3%	2.3%
Good work attitude	24	9.3%	1.6%
Diligent, motivated	18	7.1%	1.2%
Good language ability	18	6.9%	1.2%
Alumni	13	5.1%	0.9%
Good social relationship	11	4.4%	0.7%
Good leadership	5	1.9%	0.3%
Good connection with outside (e.g., a university's extensive connection with enterprises, companies, or industrial firms; large number of graduates)	5	1.8%	0.3%
Salary matched with abilities	2	0.7%	0.1%
Others (please specify)	22	8.4%	1.5%
Don't know / hard to say	7	2.7%	0.5%
Total	259	100.0%	
Valid base	187		
Missing case(s)	0		

[Q7] As far as you know, do you consider the HKSAR Government's overall funding to local universities to be too much, too little, or appropriate?

	Frequency	Percentage
Appropriate	676	44.7%
Too little	507	33.5%
Too much	107	7.1%
Don't know / hard to say	223	14.8%
Total	1,512	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	5	

[Q8] There are a total of 8 local universities now, do you consider it to be too many, too few, or appropriate?

	Frequency	Percentage
Appropriate	771	50.9%
Too many	424	28.0%
Too few	232	15.3%
Don't know / hard to say	87	5.7%
Total	1,514	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	3	

[Q9] Do you think local universities should admit more or fewer non-local students, including mainland and overseas ones, to pursue undergraduate and postgraduate studies in Hong Kong?

	Frequency	Percentage
More	683	45.5%
Fewer	359	23.9%
Status quo	251	16.7%
Don't know / hard to say	209	13.9%
Total	1,503	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	14	

[Q10] Then, do you think admitting more non-local students, including mainland and overseas ones, into the universities would bring along more advantages or disadvantages to local students?

	Frequency	Percentage
More advantages	793	52.5%
Half and half	282	18.6%
More disadvantages	324	21.5%
Don't know / hard to say	112	7.4%
Total	1,511	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	6	

[Q11] The Education and Manpower Bureau are proposing to reform the academic structure to “3+3+4”, i.e. 3 years of junior secondary education, 3 years of senior secondary education, and 4 years of undergraduate studies. Do you agree or disagree to this new structure?

	Frequency	Percentage
Very much agree	402)	26.7%)
Quite agree	557) 959	37.0%) 63.7%
Half-half	145	9.6%
Quite disagree	139)	9.2%)
Very much disagree	64) 203	4.3%) 13.5%
Not sure about the content of the reform	67	4.4%
Don't know / hard to say	131	8.7%
Total	1,505	100.0%
Base	1,517	
Missing case(s)	12	

Appendix 3

Other Answers Submitted (Chinese)

Other answers submitted by respondents (in Chinese)

Table 1 What do you think are the qualities which most Hong Kong university graduates lack of?

	Frequency
沒有	7
就業機會	5
理財能力	4
過份自信	3
文化水平	2
欠缺一些老師人才	2
只顧錢	2
政府經費	2
歷史知識	1
欠缺應變能力	1
體能	1
人工高的工作才選擇	1
不面對現實	1
比外國學術比較不好	1
欠缺目標	1
危機感	1
自主性	1
自我推動能力	1
自制力	1
技術	1
受不了苦	1
受唔到挫折	1
冒險能力	1
思想不成熟	1
政治、社會知識	1
政治立場	1
家庭教育	1
挫敗感	1

Table 1 What do you think are the qualities which most Hong Kong university graduates lack of? (Cont'd)

	Frequency
氣質	1
缺乏自學能力	1
理想	1
處事經驗	1
無環保意識	1
無耐性及急進	1
愛國思想	1
資助	1
對外面環境敏感度	1
對讀書沒有上進心	1
毅力、主動	1
學位	1
學校同經濟幫助	1
整體不及以前大學生	1
獨立的工作能力	1
應變能力, 求生	1

Table 2 If you looked for a new employee, which university's graduates would you prefer most?

	Frequency
各有千秋	1
個別人士	1
除中文大學外, 其他大學均可取	1

Table 3 Why would you prefer the graduates of the chosen university?

	Frequency
畢業生質素好	2
感覺	2
較有自信	1
聰明，有潛質	1
有理想	1
不取錄中大畢業生，因太激進	1
比較適合受訪者的工作	1
多元化	1
有文化	1
有國際視野	1
思考靈活	1
不需要英文	1
無	1
較有創意	1
電視有介紹呢間大學	1
學習氣氛好	1
樸實	1
歷史	1
應變力好	1

Appendix 4

Questionnaire (English)

**Opinion Survey on the Public Ranking of
Universities in Hong Kong 2005**
Survey Questionnaire

Section I Self Introduction

Good afternoon/evening, this is Mr/Miss X, an interviewer from the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong. We would like to ask for your opinion regarding the local universities in Hong Kong. It would take you a couple of minutes and the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential.

- District of residence
- Household size

Section II Selection of Respondent

How many members are there in your household aged 18 or above at this moment? (Interviewers can directly ask if there is only one qualified respondent at home. If so, interviewer can interview him / her at once.) Since we need to conduct random sampling, if there is more than one available, I would like to speak to the one who will have his / her birthday next. (Interviewer can illustrate with examples: “that means is there anyone who will have his / her birthday in March or the coming three months?”) [If there is no household member aged 18 or above, terminate the interviewd.]

Yes

No (terminate)

Section III The Questionnaire

Before the survey starts, interviewers must read out, “We are an independent research team. You should simply report honestly what you feel regardless of the fact that we belong to the University of Hong Kong, otherwise, the information will be of no reference value.”

[Q1] Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of each university in Hong Kong while taking its local and international reputation, facilities and campus environment, qualification of its teaching staff, academic research performance, conduct and quality of students as well as its learning atmosphere, diversification and level of recognition of the courses into consideration, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. How would you rate **(eight universities in rotation)**? [97 = Don't know the university; 98 = Don't know / hard to say; 99 = Refused to answer]

[Q2] Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of Vice-Chancellor/President of each university while taking his local and international reputation, approachability to the public, leadership, vision, social credibility and public relations into consideration, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. How would you rate the Vice-Chancellors/Presidents of **(eight universities in rotation)**? [96 = Don't know the Vice-Chancellor/President; 97 = Don't know the university; 98 = Don't know / hard to say; 99 = Refused to answer]

The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) – Prof Lawrence J. LAU

The City University of Hong Kong (CityU) – Prof H.K. CHANG

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) – Prof Paul C.W. CHU

The University of Hong Kong (HKU) – Prof Lap-chee TSUI

The Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) – Prof Ching-fai NG

The Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIEd) – Prof Paul MORRIS

The Polytechnic University of Hong Kong (PolyU) – Prof Chung-kwong POON

The Lingnan University (Lingnan) – Prof Edward K.Y. CHEN

[Q3] What do you think are the qualities which most Hong Kong university graduates lack of? (Do not read out the answers, multiple responses allowed)

Conduct, honesty

Proficiency in Chinese, English and Putonghua

Critical thinking and problem-solving ability

Work attitude (e.g. serious, enthusiastic, diligent, responsible, motivated)

Social skills / interpersonal skills

Social / Work experience

Emotion stability

Communication skills

Academic and professional knowledge

Computer proficiency

Self-confidence

Commitment to society

Global prospect / foresight

Creativity

Others (please specify)

Don't know/ hard to say

Refused to answer

[Q4] Under your job specifications, are you involved, in any way, in the recruitment process of new staff, including teachers?

Yes

No (Skip to Q7)

Refused to answer (Skip to Q7)

[Q5] [Only for those who are involved in the recruitment process of new staff] If you looked for a new employee, which university's graduates would you prefer most? (Do not read out the answers, single response only)

- The Chinese University of Hong Kong
- The City University of Hong Kong
- The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
- The University of Hong Kong
- The Hong Kong Baptist University
- The Hong Kong Institute of Education
- The Polytechnic University of Hong Kong
- The Lingnan University
- Other overseas universities
- Others (please specify)
- Don't know / hard to say (Skip to Section Q7)
- No preference (Skip to Section Q7)
- Refused to answer (Skip to Section Q7)

[Q6] [Only for those who are involved in the recruitment process and have preference over a specific university's graduates] Why would you prefer the graduates of the chosen university? (Do not read out the answers, multiple responses allowed)

- Good performance of previous graduates
- Good social relationship
- Good work attitude
- Good leadership
- Diligent, motivated
- Good language ability
- Good knowledge in job-related areas
- Good connection with outside (e.g., a university's extensive connection with enterprises, companies, or industrial firms; large number of graduates)
- Salary matches ability
- Alumni
- Reputation
- Others (please specify)
- Don't know / hard to say
- Refused to answer

[Q7] As far as you know, do you consider the HKSAR Government's overall funding to local universities to be too much, too little, or appropriate?

Too much

Too little

Appropriate

Don't know / hard to say

Refused to answer

[Q8] There are a total of 8 local universities now, do you consider it to be too many, too few, or appropriate?

Too many

Too few

Appropriate

Don't know / hard to say

Refused to answer

[Q9] Do you think local universities should admit more or fewer non-local students, including mainland and overseas ones, to pursue undergraduate and postgraduate studies in Hong Kong?

More

Fewer

Status quo

Don't know / hard to say

Refused to answer

[Q10] Then, do you think admitting more non-local students, including mainland and overseas ones, into the universities would bring along more advantages or disadvantages to local students?

More advantages

Half and half

More disadvantages

Don't know / hard to say

Refused to answer

[Q11] The Education and Manpower Bureau are proposing to reform the academic structure to "3+3+4", i.e. 3 years of junior secondary education, 3 years of senior secondary education, and 4 years of undergraduate studies. Do you agree or disagree to this new structure?

Very much agree

Quite agree

Neutral/Half-half

Quite disagree

Very much disagree

Not sure about the content of the reform

Don't know / hard to say

Refused to answer

Section IV Personal Particulars

Interviewer: I'd like to know some of your personal particulars in order to facilitate our analysis.

[D1] Gender

Male

Female

[D2] Age (exact number)

【 99 = Refused to answer 】

[D3] Education Attainment

Primary or below

Secondary

Matriculated

Tertiary, non-degree course

Tertiary, degree course

Postgraduate or above

Refused to answer

[D4] The type of ownership of your house is:

Self-purchased, or

Rent?

Refused to answer

[D5] House type

Public housing estate

Housing Authority subsidized sale flats

Housing Society subsidized sale flats

Private housing

Village: villas / bungalows / modern village houses

Village: simple stone structures / traditional village houses

Staff quarters

Others

Refused to answer

[D6] Occupation

Managers and administrators

Professionals

Associate professionals

Clerks

Service workers and shop sales workers

Skilled agricultural and fishery workers

Craft and related workers

Plant and machine operators and assemblers

Non-skilled workers

Students

Housewives

Unclassified

Others (unemployed, retired, etc.)

Refused to answer

[D7] [Only for those who are professionals or associate professionals] Are you working in the academy?

Yes-Teaching staff of primary school (including teachers and principal)

Yes-Teaching staff of secondary school (including teachers and principal)

Yes-Teaching staff of university

Others

No

Refused to answer

[D8] Lastly, do you have any children who are still studying in schools?

Yes

No

Refused to answer

The survey is completed. Thank you for your participation. Should you have any doubts, you may contact our supervisor at the hotline 3471 7310, or call 2859 2988 during office hours to confirm the authenticity of this survey and verify my identity. I am Mr/Miss X, byebye.

Appendix 5

Questionnaire (Chinese)

第一部分 自我介紹

喂，你好，我姓 X，我地係香港大學民意研究計劃打電話黎既，想訪問你對一 d 大專院校既意見，我地只會阻你幾分鐘時間。請你放心，你既電話號碼係經由我地既電腦隨機抽樣抽中既，而你提供既資料係會絕對保密既。

- 居住地區
- 住戶人數

第二部分 選出被訪者

請問你屋企而家有幾多位 18 歲或以上既人係度？(訪問員可直接問是否只有一位符合資格既人係屋企，如果是，可立即訪問那位人士。)因為我地要隨機抽樣，如果多過一位，請你叫即將生日果位黎聽電話。(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇 3 月或未來三個月內生日既人係度？』)【如果戶中有成年人，訪問告終；多謝合作，收線。】

有
冇 (訪問告終)

第三部分 問卷部分

調查開始前，訪問員必須讀出：『我地係一個立場絕對中立既研究小組，你回答問題時唔好因為我地屬於香港大學而影響你原本既意見，請你務須如實作答，否則就有參考價值。』

[Q1] 首先，請你用 0-10 分形容你對香港每間大專院校的整體評價，0 分代表極差，10 分代表極佳，5 分代表一半半。請你綜合有關學校既本地與國際聲譽及名氣、設備及校園環境、教職員資歷、學術研究表現、學生成績及品行質素、學習氣氛與課程多元化及認可度等等，然後作出評分。請問你會俾（八間大專院校輪流轉換次序）幾多分呢？

〔97 = 不認識該院校；98 = 唔知道 / 難講；99 = 拒答〕

[Q2] 請你再用 0-10 分評價各院校校長既整體表現，0 分代表極差，10 分代表極佳，5 分代表一半半。請你綜合有關校長既本地及國際知名度、親民度、領導能力、洞察力、社會公信力及對外公共關係等等，然後作出評分。請問你會俾（八間大專院校校長輪流轉換次序）幾多分呢？

〔96 = 不認識該校長；97 = 不認識該院校；98 = 唔知道 / 難講；99 = 拒答〕

中文大學 劉遵義教授	浸會大學 吳清輝教授
城市大學 張信剛教授	教育學院 莫禮時教授
科技大學 朱經武教授	理工大學 潘宗光教授
香港大學 徐立之教授	嶺南大學 陳坤耀教授

[Q3] 請問你認為宜家香港既大學畢業生最欠缺 d 乜野？【不讀答案，可選多項】

品德、誠實

中、英文及普通話能力

思考及解決問題能力

工作態度（例如：認真、熱誠、勤奮、有責任感、上進）

待人接物態度

社會 / 工作經驗

情緒控制

溝通技巧

學術能力、專業知識

電腦應用能力

自信
對社會的承擔
國際視野 / 遠見
創意
其他 (請註明)
唔知道 / 難講
拒答

[Q4] 請問係你既工作範圍內，你有冇權聘請或者參與聘請僱員呢？包括聘請教師在內。

有
冇 (跳至 Q7)
拒答 (跳至 Q7)

[Q5] [只問有權聘請或者參與聘請僱員之被訪者] 如果要你選擇，你會比較喜歡邊間大學既畢業生呢？【不讀答案，只選一項】

中文大學
城市大學
科技大學
香港大學
浸會大學
教育學院
理工大學
嶺南大學
其他海外大學
其他 (請註明)
唔知道 / 難講 (跳至 Q7)
冇所謂 (跳至 Q7)
拒答 (跳至 Q7)

[Q6] [只問有權聘請或者參與聘請僱員及較喜歡某大學畢業生之被訪者] 點解你比較喜歡呢間大學既畢業生呢？【不讀答案，可選多項】

以往該院校的畢業生表現良好
人際關係良好
工作態度認真
有領導才能

勤奮、上進
語文能力佳
具有與工作相關的知識
對外聯繫廣 (例如: 大學與企業、公司或廠商連系多、畢業生多)
薪酬與能力相稱
舊生 / 校友
有名氣
其他(請註明)
唔知道 / 難講
拒答

[Q7] 就你所知，你認為香港特區政府對本地大學既整體撥款係太多、太少、定係適中呢？

太多
太少
適中
唔知道 / 難講
拒答

[Q8] 咁你認為香港現時有八間大學係太多、太少、定係適中呢？

太多
太少
適中
唔知道 / 難講
拒答

[Q9] 你認為本港既大學應該增加定係減少取錄非本地生，包括內地及海外學生，來港修讀學士、碩士或者博士課程？

增加
減少
不變
唔知道 / 難講
拒答

[Q10] 咁你認為取錄更多非本地生，包括內地及海外學生，來港升學，對本地既學生係好處多定壞處多？

- 好處多
- 好壞參半
- 壞處多
- 唔知道 / 難講
- 拒答

[Q11] 教統局建議緊將來既學制應改為「三三四」，即係三年初中、三年高中、四年大學。請問你贊成定反對呢個新學制？【訪員追問程度】

- 非常贊成
- 幾贊成
- 中立 / 一半半
- 幾反對
- 非常反對
- 唔清楚新學制內容
- 唔知道 / 難講
- 拒答

第四部分 個人資料

我想問你些少個人資料，方便分析。

[D1] 性別

男

女

[D2] 年齡（準確數字）

【99=唔肯講】

[D3] 教育程度

小學或以下

中學

預科

專上非學位

專上學位

研究院或以上

拒答

[D4] 請問你住緊既單位係：

自置，定係

租住既呢？

拒答

[D5] 咁係咩類型既房屋呢？

公營租住房屋
房屋委員會補助出售單位
房屋協會補助出售單位
私人住宅單位
村屋：別墅／平房／新型村屋
村屋：簡單磚石蓋搭建築物／傳統村屋
員工宿舍
其他
拒答

[D6] 職業

經理及行政人員
專業人員
輔助專業人員
文員
服務工作及商店銷售人員
漁農業熟練工人
手工藝及有關人員
機台及機器操作員及裝配員
非技術工人
學生
家庭主婦
不能辨別
其他（包括失業、已退休、及其他非在職者）
拒答

[D7] [只問職業為專業人員及輔助專業人員者]請問你係唔係教育界人士？

係 - 小學教職員（包括老師及校長）
係 - 中學教職員（包括老師及校長）
係 - 大專院校教職員
其他
唔係
拒答

[D8] 最後，請問你有冇子女仲讀緊書？

有

冇

拒答

問卷已經完成，多謝您接受我地既訪問。如果你對今次既訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 3471-7310 同我地既督導員聯絡，或者係辦公時間打去熱線電話 2859-2988 查詢今次訪問既真確性同埋核對我既身分，我姓 x 既。拜拜。

Appendix 6

Note of Caution (English)

FOR DISTRIBUTION TO THE PRESS**Points to Note Regarding the Opinion Survey on the
Public Ranking of Universities in Hong Kong 2005**

1. The full report of this survey can be browsed at the HKU POP SITE, address being <http://hkupop.hku.hk>
2. As an opinion survey, the findings of this survey are meant to reflect the perception of the general public of various tertiary institutions in Hong Kong. They are neither results of objective appraisals nor professional assessments.
3. This survey has mainly adopted the method of absolute rating according to individual attributes, rather than relative ranking. It is more conducive to profile analysis of relative strength and weaknesses for individual institutions. Readers should not over-emphasize the relative ranking of different institutions.
4. The researcher is aware POP itself is part of The University of Hong Kong, which is one of the institutions rated by respondents. In order to eliminate any possible bias due to social desirability effect, all respondents were specifically told at the beginning of the interview that POP was an independent research body, and that they should simply report what they honestly felt, otherwise the result would not be meaningful.
5. In order to eliminate any possible bias due to the ordering of answers, the sequence of prompting the respondents with the name of the eight institutions was randomly rotated across all rating questions.
6. The researcher believes that this survey has been conducted fairly, objectively, and scientifically. The research instrument and survey findings are fully open for public scrutiny. We welcome open comments and validation study by other research bodies.

Appendix 7

Note of Caution (Chinese)

新聞通告

有關「港人眼中的大專院校排名調查 2005」的注意事項

1. 是次調查的詳細報告可在香港大學民意網站查閱，網址為：
<http://hkupop.hku.hk>
2. 作為一項意見調查，是次調查的結果只能反映一般香港市民對本地各大專院校的主觀評價，並非對該等院校的客觀評審，或專業推介。
3. 是次調查主要採用分類分項評分法，而非相對排名法，有利分析個別院校的長處和缺點。讀者不宜過份集中比較院校之間的排名。
4. 研究機構——即民意研究計劃——明白到本身乃香港大學的一部份，屬於被評價的院校之一。為了確保被訪者不受此因素影響評分，訪員在訪問的引言中便強調民意研究計劃是中立的研究組織，被訪者切勿因為民意研究計劃屬於香港大學而影響其本意，並務須如實作答，否則調查結果便沒有參考價值。
5. 此外，為了避免因提問次序而引起的偏差，每條評分問題中八間院校的提問次序皆以隨機方法輪流轉換。
6. 研究機構認為是次調查已做到客觀、科學、和非常公正。研究機構已將調查的方法和數據全面公開，歡迎賜教，亦歡迎任何機構以同樣方法重覆驗正。

Appendix 8

Press Release (Chinese & English)

Appendix 9

Newspaper Clippings