

JOINT QUALITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tracking Survey of Graduates from Self-financed Associate Degree & Higher Diploma Programmes of 2005 and 2006 Cohorts

SURVEY REPORT

June 2009

Content

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 1. | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 1 |
| 2. | SURVEY BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY | 7 |
| 2.1 | Background..... | 7 |
| 2.2 | Survey Coverage and Response Rate..... | 8 |
| 2.3 | Data Collection Method | 9 |
| 2.4 | Fieldwork Operation..... | 9 |
| 2.5 | Pilot Test..... | 9 |
| 2.6 | Explanation Notes on Analysis and Presentation..... | 10 |
| 2.7 | Strength and Limitation of Focus Group Discussions..... | 12 |
| 3. | RESEARCH FINDINGS : FIRST DESTINATION..... | 13 |
| 3.1 | Overview of Profiles of Respondents..... | 13 |
| 3.2 | Choice of First Destination..... | 15 |
| 4. | FURTHER STUDIES AFTER COURSE COMPLETION... | 17 |
| 4.1 | Types of Programmes Articulated to | 17 |
| 4.2 | Observations of Participants in Focus Group Meetings..... | 18 |
| 4.3 | Local Institutions..... | 18 |
| 4.4 | Degree Programme co-organized by Local and non-Local institutions..... | 20 |
| 4.5 | Programme Offered Outside Hong Kong..... | 20 |
| 4.6 | Fields of Study Articulated to..... | 21 |
| 4.7 | Relevance of Programme for Further Studies..... | 23 |
| 4.8 | Usefulness of AD/HD Programme for Further Studies..... | 24 |
| 4.9 | Helpful Features of the Programme for Further Studies..... | 25 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| 5. | FULL-TIME / PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT AFTER COURSE COMPLETION | 27 |
| 5.1 | Industry..... | 27 |
| 5.2 | Occupation..... | 29 |
| 5.3 | Duration of Employment..... | 30 |
| 5.4 | Salary of the First Full-time Job since Graduation..... | 32 |
| 5.5 | First Job as Current Employment..... | 33 |
| 5.6 | Relevance to completed AD/HD Programmes..... | 34 |
| 5.7 | Helpfulness of Programmes for Full-time / Part-time Employment.. | 35 |
| 5.8 | Views from Participants of the Focus Group Meetings..... | 36 |
| | | |
| 6. | IMPACT OF THE AD/HD PROGRAMMES | 37 |
| 6.1 | Overview..... | 37 |
| 6.2 | Communication Skills..... | 39 |
| 6.3 | Language Skills..... | 40 |
| 6.4 | Problem-solving Skills..... | 41 |
| 6.5 | Self-confidence..... | 42 |
| 6.6 | Understanding of Industry-related Knowledge..... | 43 |
| 6.7 | Possession of Applicable Skills in Related Industry..... | 44 |
| 6.8 | Team work / Interpersonal Skills..... | 45 |
| 6.9 | Views of Participants from the Focus Group Meetings: Most Valuable Gain from Programmes..... | 46 |

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Background of the Study

The Joint Quality Review Committee (JQRC) is an independent corporate quality assurance body with a major function to provide for the peer review of the quality assurance processes of the self-financed sub-degree programmes of the eight University Grants Committee (UGC) funded institutions. With support from the Education Bureau (EDB), JQRC undertook to conduct tracking surveys of two cohorts of graduates (2005 and 2006) from self-financed Associate Degree (AD) and Higher Diploma (HD) programmes offered by its member institutions as well as the Vocational Training Council (VTC), on the courses they studied and their post-graduation experiences.

1.2 Objective of the Study

The study aims to track the views of two batches of graduates on the usefulness of the courses, their content, delivery and other concerns while they were students, and their post-qualification experiences and progression pathways. The results indicate the destination of recent AD and HD graduates from the self-financed sub-degree divisions of the UGC and government funded institutions, which may provide pointers for academic policies and planning.

1.3 Methodology

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect the required information. The questionnaires were mailed to graduates of the 2005 and 2006 cohorts in November 2007. This was followed up between February and April 2008 by telephone interviews using the same questionnaire.

Quantitative data from the survey were supplemented by qualitative views obtained through discussion with groups of graduates. An effort was made to make each focus group, as they are called, a representative sample to include respondents and non-respondents of the survey with questionnaires, graduates of both years, a balance in their previous fields of study and in employment or further studies. Eight meetings, one for each institution in the study, were held in May and June 2008.

1.4 Scope of the Study and Sample Frame

The survey covered two cohorts (2005 and 2006) of graduates from self-financed Associate Degree and Higher Diploma programmes of the seven member institutions of JQRC, and from the self-financed Higher Diploma programmes of VTC.

A total of 13,875 valid target graduates were contacted in the study. The questionnaires with valid answers reached 4,359, a response rate of 31.4%. (There were 2,757 returned questionnaires by mail and 1,602 telephone interviews conducted using the same questionnaire).

1.5 Profile of Respondents in the Survey

The total number of respondents in the survey was 4,359. There were 60.1% (2,620) females and 39.1% (1,705) males after exclusion of 0.8% of returned questionnaires which did not indicate the gender status. (Table 4)

64.1%(2,795) of the respondents were from AD programmes and the remaining 35.9% (1,564) were from the Higher Diploma programmes. (Table 5)

1.6 Choice of First Destination

Among the 4,359 respondents, 52.8% (2,301) went on to full-time studies and 8.5% (372) to part-time studies; 0.14% (6) did not specify their mode of study.

On the other hand, 43.1% (1,880) respondents went for full-time employment and another 17.3% (753) for part-time employment within 6 months of graduation. (Table 6--- the sum of % exceeds 100 due to multiple answers).

1.7 Further Studies after Course Completion

Of the 2,679 graduates who went into full-time, part-time and other mode of further studies, 68.5% (1,834) studied in the programmes offered solely by local institutions, 26.4%(709) registered for degree programmes co-offered by local and non-local institutions and another 4.7% (127) participated in programmes offered by overseas institutions. 0.3 % did not specify. (Table 7)

1.8 Degree Programmes organized by Local Institutions

Of the 1,834 respondents who articulated to degree programmes offered by local institutions, 87.9% (1,612) studied full-time and another 12.1% (221) studied part-time. There were 0.1% missing answers. (Table 8)

Among this group articulating into local degree programmes, 48.5% (890) went into UGC funded and 49.6% (910) into self-financed programmes. 1.9% did not specify. (Table 9)

29.6% (542) secured Year 1, 33.8% (620) Year 2 and 4.6% Year 3 places. The Year 3 places were offered at institutions offering 4-year Degree programmes. Another 23.6% (433) secured Year 1 places in top-up degree programmes and 7.9% (144) entered Year 2 of top up degree programmes. (Table 10: There were 0.6% unclassified responses)

1.9 Degree Programmes jointly organized by Local and non-Local Institutions

Of the 709 respondents who studied the degree programmes jointly offered by local and non-local institutions, 68.5% (486) of them went into top-up degree programmes and the remaining 31.3% (222) went into normal degree programmes. 0.1% did not specify. (Table 11)

1.10 Programmes offered Outside Hong Kong

There were 127 respondents who studied outside Hong Kong. 42.5% (54) of them went into top-up and the remaining 56.7% (72) into normal degree programmes. There was 1 missing answer. (Table 12)

1.11 Fields of Study Articulated to

Business and Management Studies was the most popular field, attracting 50.2% (1,346) of the 2,679 in further studies; 10.8% (290) went into Social Sciences and 8.3% (222) into languages and related studies. (Table 13)

1.12 Relevance and Usefulness of AD/HD Programmes for Further Studies

86.6% of the 2,679 respondents opting for further studies reported selecting programmes related to their AD/HD studies. 85% of the 1,970 AD respondents in further study and another 91% of the 709 HD respondents in further study reported the relatedness. (Table 14)

84.3% (2,259) of 2,679 respondents found their AD/HD studies helpful for their new programmes of study. (Table 15)

1.13 Full-time/ Part-time Employment after Course Completion

Of the 2,628 respondents who reported part-time or full-time employment within 6 months of graduation, a quarter (26.7%=702) worked in banking, finance, real estate and business services, 15.6% (410) were in wholesale, retail & import/ export trades and 14.8%(390) in education. (Table 17)

1.14 Full-time Employment

Among the 1,880 respondents who were in full-time employment, the average duration calculated on the longest job was 17.1 months. (Table 20)

For those working full-time for the first time, the average monthly salary was HK\$ 9,674 (Table 22) and the average monthly wage of those who in a full-time job for the second time, was significantly higher at HK\$10,153. (Table 23)

Of those who went into full-time employment, 51.7% of the 2006 cohort and 33.8% of the 2005 cohort were still working at their first job. This indicated that the employment of AD /HD respondents was rather stable. (Table 24)

1.15 Relevance and Helpfulness of AD/ HD Programmes for Employment

45.6% of the 2,628 respondents who were employed within 6 months of graduation reported that their first job was generally related to the programmes they had studied. HD respondents were more likely than AD respondents to find their studies relevant to their work (62.1%: 33.1%). (Table 25)

In terms of the perceived “helpfulness” of their studied programmes to their present employment, “fulfilling the employment requirements” was ranked first by respondents (1.76 out of 4). This was followed by “enriching knowledge and applicable skills in the related industry” (1.94). (Table 26 : the smaller the number, the higher the rank)

1.16 Impact of the Programmes on Students

All respondents (N=4,359) were asked to evaluate the helpfulness of the AD/ HD programmes based on a number of aspects, (A) Communication skills, (B) Language skills, (C) Problem-solving skills, (D) Self-confidence, (E) Understanding of

industry-related knowledge, (F) Possession of applicable skills in related industry, (G) Team work/ interpersonal skills.

The most helpful skill was identified as “Team work/ interpersonal skills” with 66.9% mentioning this as “helpful” or “quite helpful”. “Communication skills” (66.6%) came next followed by “Understanding of industry-related knowledge” (62.1%). (Table 27)

1.17 General Comparison between AD and HD Respondents

A higher percentage of AD respondents went on to full-time studies than their HD counterparts after completing their respective programmes (61.9% : 36.5%). (Table 7)

However, both AD and HD respondents agreed that the AD and HD programmes were useful for their further studies. (Table 16) On the other hand, there were more HD than AD respondents who reported their employment as relevant to their previous fields of study (33.1% of AD respondents Vs. 62.1% of HD respondents). (Table 26)

71.3% of the AD respondents considered the programmes they studied helpful to improve communication skills, 58.2% considered them helpful to improve language skills and another 57.6% considered them helpful to improve problem-solving skills. On the other hand, HD respondents rated their programmes as being more helpful in terms of industry-related knowledge (72.0%) and possession of application skills (63.9%). (Table 27)

2. SURVEY BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Background

The Joint Quality Review Committee is an independent corporate quality assurance body established in 2005 by the Heads of Universities Committee of Hong Kong.

With a major function to provide for the peer review of the quality assurance processes of the self-financed sub-degree programmes of its member institutions, JQRC initiated a tracking survey of graduates from the self-financed Associate Degree (AD) and Higher Diploma (HD) programmes of its seven member institutions and also HD programmes of Vocational Training Council. The Consumer Search Hong Kong Limited was commissioned by the JQRC to conduct the survey with the following aims:

- (a) To study the progression pathways of graduates in study and / or career development; and
- (b) To collect views on the usefulness of the AD and HD programmes.

This report summarizes the survey findings obtained with the questionnaires and presents them in quantitative terms. Opinions collected from participants in the eight focus group meetings are also presented to supplement the survey findings.

2.2 Survey Coverage and Response Rate

The survey covered two cohorts of graduates from self-financed Associate Degree and Higher Diploma programmes of seven member institutions of JQRC, and from the self-financed Higher Diploma programmes of VTC.

A total of 13,875 valid target graduates were contacted in the study. The number of questionnaires with valid answers reached 4,359 and an average response rate of 31.4% was achieved. Of this total, 1,602 questionnaires (3/8 of the total) were compiled from telephone interviews.

Table 1 Survey coverage by institution

| | Institution | Number of completed questionnaires |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Hong Kong Baptist University | 386 |
| 2 | The Chinese University of Hong Kong | 211 |
| 3 | City University of Hong Kong | 526 |
| 4 | The Hong Kong Institute of Education | 46 |
| 5 | Lingnan University | 248 |
| 6 | The Hong Kong Polytechnic University | 878 |
| 7 | The University of Hong Kong | 1,060 |
| 8 | Vocational Training Council | 1,004 |
| | Total | 4,359 |

2.3 Data Collection Method

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect the required information. A telephone interviewing method was adopted at a later stage to boost the response rate.

There were 2,757 questionnaires returned by mail and 1,602 **telephone interviews** conducted with the same questionnaire.

Focus group meetings were also conducted, there were sixty five participants in eight different meetings, one for each participating institution.

2.4 Fieldwork Operation

- a) The main survey was conducted from 18 December 2007 to 30 April 2008.
- b) Eight focus group meetings were conducted from 26 May 2008 to 11 June 2008 in the conference room of the Consumer Search Hong Kong Limited. All meetings were audiovisual-recorded with the prior consent of the participants.

2.5 Pilot Test

A pilot test was conducted from 2 to 19 November 2007, to test the applicability of the questionnaire. A total number of 40 questionnaires were received:

The purpose of the pilot test was to evaluate the flow of the questionnaire and to fine-tune the wording with an aim to make the questionnaire easier for respondents to understand.

2.6 Explanation Notes on Analysis and Presentation

Sub-group Analysis

In addition to reporting the survey result of all respondents, statistical test at 95% level of confidence was used to identify any significant difference amongst findings across the different subgroups.

In the tables of findings, those sub-groups with significant differences were denoted by “▲” and “▼” where:

- (a) “▲” denoted a significantly higher percentage of response of the sub-group as compared with the corresponding total.
- (b) “▼” denoted a significantly lower percentage of response of the sub-group as compared with the corresponding total.

Small Sub-group Base

For all sub-groups with a sample size of 30 or less, no significant test was performed and the data presented is included for reference only.

Rating Scale

With regard to the data analysis on satisfaction level (Q14), agreement level (Q16), and degree of helpfulness (Q17), the “top 2 boxes” and “bottom 2 boxes” were employed where:

- (a) “Top 2” refers to respondents who found the item “satisfied”/ “quite satisfied”, “helpful”/ “quite helpful” or “agree”/ “quite agree”.
- (b) “Bottom 2” refers to the proportion of graduates who found the item “dissatisfied”/ “not quite satisfied”, “not helpful”/ “not quite helpful” or “disagree”/ “not quite agree”.

In some questions graduates were asked to rank satisfaction or agreement with certain statements on a scale of 1 - 5, where 1 referred to the highest satisfaction level/ agreement and 5 referred to the lowest satisfaction level/ agreement. The data should be interpreted thus: the smaller the number, the higher is the satisfaction/ agreement with the statement.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations were employed in the tables of findings in this report:

Table 2 Abbreviation

| Abbreviation | Descriptions |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| AD | Associate Degree |
| HD | Higher Diploma |
| HKBU | Hong Kong Baptist University |
| CUHK | The Chinese University of Hong Kong |
| CityU | City University of Hong Kong |
| HKIEd | The Hong Kong Institute of Education |
| LU | Lingnan University |
| PolyU | The Hong Kong Polytechnic University |
| HKU | The University of Hong Kong |
| VTC | Vocational Training Council |
| MA | Missing Answers/ Multiple Answers |

Questions with Multiple Responses

In this report, when multiple responses were allowed for some questions, the sum of percentages of multiple responses may exceed 100%.

Sum of Percentages

For single answer questions, the sum of percentages may not add up to exactly 100.0% due to rounding-up of figures.

Missing Answers

Since this was basically a self-administered questionnaire survey, there were some missing answers. The missing answers were excluded in the analysis.

2.7 Strength and Limitation of Focus Group Discussions

Participants can elaborate on their experience and perception of the programmes studied. Such elaboration can supplement quantitative findings obtained from the questionnaires. However, the limited number of participants in eight groups has restricted generalization of views obtained. Furthermore, for the purpose of this study, only views aligned to programme types .i.e. AD or HD programmes would be highlighted.

3. RESEARCH FINDINGS : FIRST DESTINATION

3.1 Overview of Profiles of Respondents

- (a) Of the graduates (N=4,359) who participated in the survey there were 2620 females (60.1%) and 1,705 males (39.1%). (Table 3)
- (b) 64.1% (=2,795) of all respondents were graduates of AD programmes, whereas the rest were graduates of HD programmes (35.9%= 1,564). (Table 4)

Table 3 Gender of respondents (by type of programme and cohort)

| Gender | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=1650) | 2006(%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Male | 39.1 | 40.1 | 38.5 | 37.6 | 39.7 | 36.5 | 41.8 | 40.7 | 42.6 |
| Female | 60.1 | 59.2 | 60.6 | 61.8 | 59.8 | 62.8 | 57.2 | 58.4 | 56.2 |
| MA | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 |

Table 4 Type of Programme studied by Respondents (by cohort)

| Type of programme | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2005 (n=1,650) | 2006 (n=2,709) |
| Associate Degree | 64.1 | 59.2 | 67.1 |
| Higher Diploma | 35.9 | 40.8 | 32.9 |

- (c) In terms of the fields of study, 44.7% were in business studies, 10.4% studied in arts/ translation, and 8.3% and 8.1% studied in social sciences and tourism & hospitality respectively. Computer studies and information technology accounted for 7.5%.
- (d) More AD than HD graduates studied in the fields of arts /translation (15.0%), social science (12.6%), science /applied science (7.5%), journalism /communication /media studies (5.0%) and fine arts /design (3.7%). (Table 5)

Table 5 Fields of Study (by type of programme and cohort)

| Field of study | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=1650) | 2006(%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006 (n=891) |
| Business | 44.7 | 47.3 ▲ | 43.2 ▼ | 38.6 ▼ | 40.1 | 37.8 | 55.7 ▲ | 57.7 | 54.2 |
| Arts/ Translation | 10.4 | 9.2 ▼ | 11.1 ▲ | 15.0 ▲ | 14.4 | 15.3 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| Social Sciences | 8.3 | 6.8 ▼ | 9.2 ▲ | 12.6 ▲ | 11.3 | 13.4 | 0.6 ▼ | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Tourism & Hospitality | 8.1 | 6.9 ▼ | 8.7 ▲ | 6.7 ▼ | 6.0 | 7.1 | 10.4 ▲ | 8.2 ▼ | 12.1 ▲ |
| Computer Studies & Information Technology | 7.5 | 10.3 ▲ | 5.8 ▼ | 4.9 ▼ | 5.9 | 4.3 | 12.1 ▲ | 16.6 ▲ | 8.8 ▼ |
| Sciences/ Applied Sciences | 4.9 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 7.5 ▲ | 9.2 ▲ | 6.6 ▼ | 0.2 ▼ | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Journalism / Communication / Media Studies | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 5.0 ▲ | 4.5 | 5.2 | 0.3 ▼ | 0 | 0.4 |
| Fine Arts/ Design | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.7 ▲ | 4.1 | 3.5 | 2.4 ▼ | 2.1 | 2.6 |
| Engineering | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 1.8 ▼ | 1.6 | 1.9 | 4.1 ▲ | 3.0 | 4.9 |
| Logistics & Transportation | 2.5 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 0.7 ▼ | 0.9 | 0.6 | 5.8 ▲ | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Banking & Finance | 1.2 | 0.6 ▼ | 1.5 ▲ | 1.0 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.9 |
| Property Management | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 1.2 |
| Education | 0.6 | 0.1 ▼ | 0.8 ▲ | 0.4 ▼ | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 ▲ | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Others | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 0.4 |

(e) Profile of Participants in the Focus Group Meetings

To achieve a representative profile, each group included respondents and non-respondents of the questionnaire survey and a balance in gender, year of graduation and fields of study.

3.2 Choice of First Destination

- (a) All respondents were asked to provide their first destination(s) within 6 months after course completion. More than half of the respondents (52.8%=2,301) were studying full-time; 43.1% (=1,880) were in full-time employment and a limited number (1.5%) did not study or work within the 6-month period.
- (b) Among those in full-time study, a higher proportion of them was from the AD than HD programmes (61.9% vs. 36.5%). (Table 6)
- (c) On the other hand, a higher percentage of HD than AD respondents went into full-time employment. (58.8% vs 34.1%). (Table 6)

Table 6 Choice of First Destination (by type of programme and cohort)

| Choice of first destination | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Further studies (Full-time) | 52.8 | 50.7▼ | 54.0▲ | 61.9▲ | 62.6 | 61.5 | 36.5▼ | 33.4▼ | 38.8▲ |
| Further studies (Part-time) | 8.5 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 9.5 | 8.1 |
| Further Studies (MA) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Did not take up further studies | 8.2 | 9.9▲ | 7.1▼ | 6.3▼ | 4.5▼ | 7.3▲ | 11.4▲ | 17.8▲ | 6.6▼ |
| Full-time employment (work for at least 35 hours/week) | 43.1* | 44.2 | 41.7 | 34.1▼ | 32.4 | 34.2 | 58.8▲ | 61.2 | 57.1 |
| Part-time employment | 17.3* | 16.2 | 17.9 | 19.7▲ | 18.4 | 20.4 | 13.0▼ | 13.1 | 12.9 |
| Unemployed | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 3.8 |
| Non-study/work | 1.5 | 2.0▲ | 1.2▼ | 1.4 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.5 |

Note: Sum of figures exceeds 100% due to multiple answers

Note: * 1,880 (43.1%) reported full-time; and 753 (17.3%) part-time employment within 6 months of graduation. 5 respondents stated that they held both full-time and part-time jobs at the same time and they were grouped both in 1,880 and 753. The actual number in employment : 1,880+753-5=2,628 in Table 18,19 & 20.

4. FURTHER STUDIES AFTER COURSE COMPLETION

4.1 Types of Programmes Articulated to

- (a) Among those who went on to full-time or part-time studies within 6 months after graduation (N=2,679), 68.5%(1,834) studied in programmes offered solely by local institutions (local degree programmes), 26.4% (709) studied in degree programmes co-offered by local and non-local institutions and 4.7%(127) took up studies overseas. (Table 7)
- (b) There was a higher proportion of AD than HD graduates (78.2% vs 41.3%) among those who furthered their studies in local degree programmes. (Table 7)
- (c) In contrast, a higher proportion of HD respondents studied in jointly offered degree programmes (52.3% of HD respondents compared with the 26.4% of the whole group who chose this route). (Table 7)

Table 7 Types of Programmes Articulated to – overview (by type of programme and cohort)

| Types of programmes articulated to (overview) | Total (%) (N=2679) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1970) | AD | | HD(%) (n=709) | HD | |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=981) | 2006(%) (n=1698) | | 2005(%) (n=692) | 2006(%) (n=1278) | | 2005(%) (n=289) | 2006(%) (n=420) |
| Programmes offered by local institutions | 68.5 | 66.9 | 69.6 | 78.2▲ | 78.5 | 78.1 | 41.3▼ | 38.1 | 43.6 |
| Degree programme co-organized by local and non-local institutions | 26.4 | 28.4 | 25.3 | 17.1▼ | 17.1 | 17.1 | 52.3▲ | 52.3 | 50.2 |
| Programme offered by overseas institution (overseas study) | 4.7 | 2.5 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.2 |
| Others | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.30 | 0.0 |

4.2 Observation of Participants in the Focus Group Meetings

About three quarters of the AD and half the HD participants articulated to degree programmes. They either enrolled immediately after graduation or worked for one to two years to save up money. The articulation rate varied from institution to institution. Some participants were of the impression that institutions preferred to admit graduates from their own AD / HD programmes. Most participants preferred UGC-funded degree programmes, but also valued the availability of self-financed top-up degree programmes, in spite of the high tuition fees. Participants were generally satisfied with the fact that their AD/HD credits were recognized for entry to degree programmes.

4.3 Local Institutions

(a) Mode of Study

The majority (87.9%=1,612) of respondents who articulated to local degree programmes (N=1,834), studied on full-time basis. (Table 8)

Table 8 Mode of Study at Local Institutions (by type of programme and cohort)

| Mode of study | Total (%) (N=1834) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1541) | AD | | HD(%) (n=293) | HD | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=653) | 2006(%) (n=1181) | | 2005(%) (n=543) | 2006(%) (n=998) | | 2005(%) (n=110) | 2006(%) (n=183) |
| Full-time | 87.9 | 89.3 | 87.1 | 88.4 | 90.1 | 87.5 | 85.3 | 85.5 | 85.2 |
| Part-time | 12.1 | 10.6 | 12.9 | 11.6 | 9.8 | 12.5 | 14.7 | 14.5 | 14.8 |
| MA | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

(b) Funding of the Programmes

48.5% (890) of respondents who articulated to local degree programmes were in UGC funded programmes and 49.6%(910) in self-financed programmes. (Table 9)

Table 9 Funding of Local Articulation Programmes (by type of programme and cohort)

| Funding of programme | Total (%) (N=1834) | Cohorts | | AD (n=1541) | AD | | HD (n=293) | HD | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=653) | 2006(%) (n=1181) | | 2005(%) (n=543) | 2006(%) (n=998) | | 2005(%) (n=110) | 2006(%) (n=183) |
| UGC Funded | 48.5 | 50.5 | 47.4 | 50.0 ▲ | 52.7 | 48.6 | 40.6 ▼ | 40.0 | 41.0 |
| Self-financed | 49.6 | 47.2 | 51.0 | 48.2 ▼ | 45.1 | 49.8 | 57.3 ▲ | 57.3 | 57.4 |
| MA | 1.9 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.6 |

(c) Year of Entry

Of the 1,834 respondents who studied in local degree programmes, 29.6%(542) entered year one, 33.8%(620) entered year two and 4.6% advanced to year three.

The Year 3 places were offered at institutions offering 4-year Degree programmes. There were more HD than AD respondents among those admitted to Year III (12.6% of HD: 3.0% of AD). Of the respondents who entered top-up programmes, 23.6%(433) entered year one while 7.9%(144) were admitted to year two. Of those securing Year 2 admission to top-up degrees there were more HD (16.7%) than AD respondents (6.2%). Much depended on the institution admitting them; some specific courses may have been tailored to secure exemption. (Table 10)

Table 10 Year of Articulation in Local degree Programmes (by type of programme and cohort)

| Year of Entry In Articulation | Total (%) (N=1834) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1541) | AD | | HD(%) (n=293) | HD | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=653) | 2006(%) (n=1181) | | 2005(%) (n=543) | 2006(%) (n=998) | | 2005(%) (n=110) | 2006(%) (n=183) |
| Degree Programme | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 1 | 29.6 | 29.1 | 29.8 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 30.4 | 25.9 | 24.5 | 26.8 |
| Year 2 | 33.8 | 35.2 | 33.0 | 36.5 ▲ | 37.8 | 35.8 | 19.8 ▼ | 22.7 | 18.0 |
| Year 3 | 4.6 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 3.0 ▼ | 2.6 | 3.3 | 12.6 ▲ | 8.2 | 15.3 |
| Top-up Degree Programme | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 1 | 23.6 | 24.3 | 23.2 | 23.4 | 23.6 | 23.3 | 24.6 | 28.2 | 22.4 |
| Year 2 | 7.9 | 7.0 | 8.3 | 6.2 ▼ | 5.2 | 6.7 | 16.7 ▲ | 16.4 | 16.9 |
| MA | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

4.4 Degree Programme co-organized by Local and non-Local Institutions

- (a) Of those who studied in jointly offered degree programmes (N=709), 31.3% (222) went into degree programmes, and the rest went to top-up degree programmes. (68.5%=486)
- (b) A higher percentage of HD (72%) than AD respondents (64.8%) articulated to top-up degrees. (Table 11)

Table 11 Type of Programme – co-offered by Local and non-Local Institutions (by type of programme and cohort)

| Type of programme | Total (%) (N=709) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=338) | AD | | HD(%) (n=371) | HD | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (n=279) | 2006 (n=430) | | 2005(%) (n=119) | 2006(%) (n=219) | | 2005(%) (n=160) | 2006(%) (n=211) |
| Degree | 31.3 | 34.4 | 29.3 | 34.9▲ | 36.1 | 34.2 | 28.0▼ | 33.1 | 24.2 |
| Top-up Degree | 68.5 | 65.2 | 70.7 | 64.8▼ | 63.0 | 65.8 | 72.0▲ | 66.9 | 75.8 |
| MA | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

4.5 Programme Offered Outside Hong Kong

Among the 127 respondents who studied outside Hong Kong, 56.7%(72) were admitted to degree programmes and 42.5%(54) to top-up degree programmes. (Table 12)

Table 12 Type of Programme – Overseas Study (by type of programme and cohort)

| Type of programme | Total (%) (N=127) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=83) | AD | | HD(%) (n=44) | HD | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2005 (n=44) | 2006 (n=83) | | 2005(%) (n=26) | 2006(%) (n=57) | | 2005(%) (n=18) | 2006(%) (n=26) |
| Degree | 56.7 | 59.1 | 55.4 | 60.2 | 61.5 | 59.6 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 46.2 |
| Top-up Degree | 42.5 | 38.6 | 44.6 | 39.8 | 38.5 | 40.4 | 47.7 | 38.9 | 53.8 |
| MA | 0.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 0.0 |

4.6 Fields of Study Articulated to

- (a) Business & Management (50.2%) was the most popular field of study for all respondents to continue their education (N=2,679). This was followed by Social Sciences (10.8%). No other field of study enrolled 10% or more of the respondents, viz. Language & Related studies (8.3%), Mass Communication & Documentation (6.4%), Computer Science & IT (6.0%) and Architecture & Town Planning (0.9%). (Table 13)
- (b) Relatively a higher proportion of AD than HD respondents studied in programmes related to Social Sciences (14.5% of AD respondents as compared to 0.7% for HD respondents), Language & Related studies (10.5% vs 2.3%), Mass Communication and Documentation (8.0% vs 2.1%).
- (c) The reverse was true of Business & Management which enrolled 41.5% of AD respondents and 74.5% of HD respondents; and Computer Sciences & Information Technology enrolled 4.3% of AD vs 10.6% of HD respondents.

Table 13 Field of Study Articulated to (by type of programme and cohort)

| Type of programme | Total (%) (N=2679) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1970) | AD | | HD(%) (n=709) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=981) | 2006 (%) (n=1698) | | 2005(%) (n=692) | 2006(%) (n=1278) | | 2005(%) (n=289) | 2006(%) (n=420) |
| Business & Management Studies | 50.2 | 52.5 | 48.9 | 41.5▼ | 43.4 | 40.5 | 74.5▲ | 74.4 | 74.5 |
| Social Sciences | 10.8 | 9.8 | 11.4 | 14.5▲ | 13.7 | 14.9 | 0.7▼ | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| Language & Related Studies | 8.3 | 7.1 | 9.0 | 10.5▲ | 9.4 | 11.0 | 2.3▼ | 1.7 | 2.6 |
| Mass Communication & Documentation | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 8.0▲ | 8.2 | 7.8 | 2.1▼ | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Computer Science & Information Technology | 6.0 | 7.2▲ | 5.2▼ | 4.3▼ | 4.9 | 4.0 | 10.6▲ | 12.8 | 9.0 |
| Engineering & Technology | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| Arts, Design & Performing Arts | 2.7 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 3.1▲ | 2.7 | 3.4 | 1.4▼ | 0.3 | 2.1 |
| Humanities (including History, Philosophy and Religious Studies) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.7▲ | 2.9 | 2.7 | 0.8▼ | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| Education | 1.9 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.4▲ | 2.2 | 2.5 | 0.6▼ | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Studies allied to Medicine & Health | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 2.3▲ | 1.6 | 2.7 | 0.4▼ | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Biological Sciences | 1.7 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Physical Sciences | 1.6 | 2.7▲ | 1.1▼ | 2.2 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mathematical Sciences | 0.9 | 0.3▼ | 1.2▲ | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Architecture & Town Planning | 0.9 | 1.3 | .06 | 0.5▼ | 0.7 | 0.4 | 2.0▲ | 2.8 | 1.4 |
| Others | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| MA | 1.8 | 0.6▼ | 2.5▲ | 2.2▲ | 0.9▼ | 3.0▲ | 0.6▼ | 0.0 | 1.0 |

4.7 Relevance of AD/ HD Programme for Further Studies

- (a) The majority of respondents studied in programmes related to their AD / HD programmes (86.6%=2,316). In particular, 91.0% of HD respondents opted for further study in fields relevant to their HD programmes. (Table 14)

Table 14 Relevance to completed AD/HD Programme (by type of programme and cohort)

| Relevancy to completed AD/HD programme | Total (%) (N=2679) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1970) | AD | | HD(%) (n=709) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=981) | 2006 (%) (n=1698) | | 2005(%) (n=692) | 2006(%) (n=1278) | | 2005(%) (n=289) | 2006(%) (n=420) |
| | | Related | 86.6 | | 86.2 | 86.7 | | 85.0▼ | 84.7 |
| Not related | 13.3 | 13.6 | 13.1 | 14.9▲ | 15.2 | 14.7 | 8.7▼ | 9.7 | 8.1 |
| MA | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |

- (b) A similar trend was observed from the views of the participants in the Focus Group meetings. A large number of them articulated to degree programmes related to their previous AD/HD studies.

4.8 Usefulness of the AD/ HD Programme for Further Studies

- (a) Among all respondents who proceeded to further studies (N=2,679), more than four in five (84.3%=2,259) found their AD/HD programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” to the degree/ top-up degree programmes that they studied.
- (b) Respondents of HD programmes had a higher level of agreement on the usefulness of their completed programmes (87.9% compared with 84.3% of the whole group). (Table 15)

Table 15 Usefulness of the AD/HD Programme for Further Studies (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness of AD/HD programme | Total (%) (N=2679) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=1970) | AD | | HD (%) (n=709) | HD | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=981) | 2660(%) (n=1698) | | 2005 (%) (n=692) | 2006 (%) (n=1278) | | 2005 (%) (n=289) | 2006 (%) (n=420) |
| Top 2* | 84.3 | 84.1 | 84.5 | 83.0 ▼ | 83.8 | 82.6 | 87.9 ▲ | 84.8 ▼ | 90.0 ▲ |
| Helpful | 48.3 | 49.7 | 47.5 | 46.4 | 50.1 | 44.4 | 53.5 | 48.8 | 56.7 |
| Quite helpful | 36.0 | 34.4 | 37.0 | 36.6 | 33.7 | 38.2 | 34.4 | 36.0 | 33.3 |
| Neutral / No comment | 8.8 | 9.2 | 8.7 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 7.9 | 9.3 | 6.9 |
| Bottom 2 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 7.6 ▲ | 6.9 | 8.0 | 3.9 ▼ | 5.5 | 2.9 |
| Not quite helpful | 5.2 | 4.4 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 2.6 |
| Not helpful | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.2 |
| MA | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful” / “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Dissatisfied” / “Not quite satisfied”.

4.9 Helpful Features of the Programme for Further Studies

Respondents were asked to rank the helpfulness of their AD/ HD programmes in four areas using a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 representing the most helpful.

Among the 2,259 respondents who answered this question, “Meeting admission requirement for further studies” (1.87 out of 4) was ranked highest. This was followed by “Enhancing interest in studying the degree/top-up degree programme” (2.02). “Provision of good foundation knowledge for degree / top-up degree programme” (3.00) and “Provision of good foundation in applicable skills for further studies” (3.03) were the areas yielding the third and fourth rank (Table 16). (The smaller the number, the higher the rank)

Table 16 Helpful Features of the Programme for Further Studies in ranking order (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpful features of the programmes | Total (N=2259) | Cohorts | | AD (n=1636) | AD | | HD (n=623) | HD | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=825) | 2006(%) (n=1434) | | 2005 (n=580) | 2006 (n=1056) | | 2005 (n=245) | 2006 (n=378) |
| Meeting admission requirements for further studies | 1.87 | 1.84 | 1.89 | 1.82 | 1.80 | 1.84 | 2.00 | 1.94 | 2.04 |
| Enhancing my interest in studying the degree/top-up degree programme | 2.02 | 2.99 | 3.04 | 2.02 | 2.14 | 1.95 | 2.04 | 2.11 | 1.99 |
| Providing a good foundation of knowledge for my degree/ top-up degree programme | 3.00 | 2.13 | 1.96 | 3.11 | 3.04 | 3.15 | 2.71 | 2.72 | 2.69 |
| Providing a good foundation in applicable skills for my degree/ top-up degree programme | 3.03 | 2.95 | 3.03 | 2.98 | 2.94 | 3.00 | 3.15 | 3.12 | 3.16 |

5. FULL-TIME / PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT AFTER COURSE COMPLETION

5.1 Industry

- (a) Among those who had part-time or full-time employment (N=2,628) within 6 months of graduation, jobs in banking, finance, real estate and business services (26.7%) were the most common. 15.6% were in wholesale, retail and import/export trades and 14.8% in education. (Table 17)
- (b) Analyzed by programme type and cohort, a higher proportion of HD of respondents was in banking, finance, real estate and business services (31.8% of HD participants against 26.7% of the whole group) A similar pattern is observed with “building or construction” (5.3% of HD respondents as compared with 3.2% of the whole group). The proportion of respondents from AD programmes on the other hand was higher in employment related to “education” (19.3% of AD respondents compared with 14.8% of all respondents in the group). (Table 17)

Table 17 Employment of Respondents by Industry (by type of programme and cohort)

| Industry | Total (%) (N=2628) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1500) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1128) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=1002) | 2006(%) (n=1626) | | 2005(%) (n=501) | 2006(%) (n=999) | | 2005(%) (n=501) | 2006(%) (n=627) |
| Banking, financing, insurance, real estate & business services | 26.7 | 27.0 | 26.5 | 22.9▼ | 21.2 | 23.7 | 31.8▲ | 32.9 | 30.9 |
| Wholesale, retail & import/export trades | 15.6 | 16.1 | 15.3 | 16.5 | 19.2▲ | 15.1▼ | 14.5 | 13.0 | 15.6 |
| Education | 14.8 | 14.3 | 15.2 | 19.3▲ | 19.4 | 19.3 | 8.9▼ | 9.2 | 8.6 |
| Community, social & personal services | 11.9 | 10.8 | 12.5 | 13.9▲ | 13.6 | 14.0 | 9.2▼ | 8.0 | 10.2 |
| Transport, storage & communications | 8.5 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 7.1▼ | 7.8 | 6.7 | 10.4▲ | 10.6 | 10.2 |
| Government or related organizations | 5.9 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 4.8 | 7.2 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 4.5 |
| Restaurants & hospitality management | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.1 |
| Building or construction | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 1.5▼ | 1.8 | 1.4 | 5.3▲ | 4.6 | 5.9 |
| Manufacturing | 3.0 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 2.6 |
| Arts, design or advertising | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 1.9▼ | 1.6 | 2.1 | 3.7▲ | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| Electricity, gas & water | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Others | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| MA | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 |

- (c) There was a correlation observed between the employment of respondents and their previous fields of study which may confirm the relevance of their studies to their jobs. A high percentage (37.5%) of those who studied in business were working in banking, financing, insurance, real estate and business services ; another 20.1% engaged in wholesale/ retail and import /export trades. (Table 18)
- (d) About one third of the Arts /Education respondents (31.7%) were employed by the education sector. The respondents from tourism and hospitality programmes had a higher tendency to work for restaurants and hospitality management (26.8%) and community, social and personal services (22.2%). (Table 18)

Table 18 Employment of Respondents by Industry (by areas of study of AD/HD programmes)

| Industry | Fields of study | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Total (%) (N=2628) | Business (%) (n=1221) | Art & Education (%) (n=271) | Soc. Sc. (%) (n=219) | Engineering & & IT (%) (n=374) | Tourism & Hospitality (%) (n=239) | Media & Design (%) (n=151) | Others (%) (n=153) |
| Banking, financing, insurance, real estate & business services | 26.7 | 37.5 ▲ | 15.9 | 15.5 | 24.3 | 14.2 ▼ | 10.6 ▼ | 17.0 |
| Wholesale, retail & import /export trades | 15.6 | 20.1 ▲ | 18.5 | 11.9 | 9.6 ▼ | 3.3 ▼ | 9.9 | 19.6 |
| Education | 14.8 | 8.9 ▼ | 31.7 ▲ | 28.8 ▲ | 19.0 | 6.7 ▼ | 17.2 | 12.4 |
| Community, social & personal services | 11.9 | 6.6 ▼ | 14.0 | 25.6 ▲ | 11.2 | 22.2 ▲ | 14.6 | 13.7 |
| Transport, storage & communications | 8.5 | 8.1 | 5.9 | 4.6 | 5.6 ▼ | 16.7 | 3.3 ▼ | 20.9 ▲ |
| Government or related organizations | 5.9 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 3.9 |
| Restaurants & hospitality management | 5.6 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 26.8 ▲ | 2.6 | 2.0 |
| Building or construction | 3.2 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 12.3 ▲ | 0.0 ▼ | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| Manufacturing | 3.0 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 7.2 ▲ |
| Fine art, design or advertising | 2.7 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 26.5 ▲ | 0.0 |
| Electricity, gas & water | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Others | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| MA | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.3 |

5.2 Occupation

- (a) 24% of respondents reported that they worked as professionals / teachers / accountants. 25.1% worked in para-professional positions such as assistant engineer, sports coach, translator, banking personnel, hospitality workers, technician, etc, while 19.6% worked in services and sales, and 31.3% in executive/ secretarial positions. (Table 19)
- (b) Analysed by type of programmes, a higher proportion of AD than HD respondents worked as teachers, while a higher proportion of HD than AD graduates worked as accountants. (Table 19)

Table 19 Occupation of Respondents (by type of programme and cohort)

| Occupation | Total (%) (N=2628) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=1500) | AD | | HD (%) (n=1128) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1002) | 2006 (%) (n=1626) | | 2005 (%) (n=501) | 2006 (%) (n=999) | | 2005 (%) (n=501) | 2006 (%) (n=627) |
| Professional | 8.9 | 9.9 | 8.3 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 8.0 | 10.2 | 6.2 |
| Accountant | 7.6 | 8.9 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 11.9 | 13.4 | 10.7 |
| Teacher/Teaching Assistant | 7.5 | 6.4 | 8.1 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 5.3 |
| Engineer/Assistant Engineer | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| Clerk/ Secretary | 22.9 | 25.1 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 22.2 | 21.1 | 24.7 | 28.1 | 22.0 |
| Executive/ Executive Assistant | 8.4 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 10.2 | 8.0 | 7.9 | 5.6 | 9.7 |
| Services worker/ Shop Sales worker | 19.6 | 18.5 | 20.2 | 21.0 | 20.6 | 21.2 | 17.6 | 16.4 | 18.7 |
| Transport worker | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Hospitality / Tourism Services Worker | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.3 |
| Computer / Telecommunications Technician | 2.5 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 3.3 |
| Event Organizer | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.9 |
| Banking Personnel | 4.5 | 2.9 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 5.9 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 4.9 |
| Craft and Related Workers | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Sports Coach | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Associate Professional | 5.5 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 6.3 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.9 |
| Arts Performer | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Insurance Agent | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Property Agent | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Personal Care Worker | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Translator | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Others | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 |

5.3 Duration of Employment

(a) Full-time Employment

Among those who engaged in full-time employment (N=1,880), the average duration of employment calculated on the longest job was 17 months.

The average employment duration of the 2005 cohort of respondents was 22 months while the average duration was 14 months for the 2006 cohort (Table 20).

Table 20 Duration of Employment (full-time employment) (by type of programme and cohort)

| Duration of employment | Total (%) (N=1880) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=952) | AD | | HD(%) (n=928) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=736) | 2006(%) (n=1144) | | 2005(%) (n=322) | 2006(%) (n=630) | | 2005(%) (n=414) | 2006(%) (n=514) |
| Less than 3 months | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.2▲ | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.0▼ | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| 3 months to 6 months | 6.2 | 2.7▼ | 8.4▲ | 7.7▲ | 4.0▼ | 9.5▲ | 4.6▼ | 1.7▼ | 7.0▲ |
| 7 months to 9 months | 7.3 | 2.4▼ | 10.4▲ | 7.8 | 2.2▼ | 10.6▲ | 6.8 | 2.7▼ | 10.1▲ |
| 10 months to 12 months | 13.3 | 8.0▼ | 16.7▲ | 13.0 | 6.8▼ | 16.2▲ | 13.6 | 8.9▼ | 17.3▲ |
| More than 1 year but less than 1.5 year | 32.0 | 19.6▼ | 39.9▲ | 33.5 | 22.4▼ | 39.2▲ | 30.4 | 17.4▼ | 40.9▲ |
| More than 1.5 year but less than 2 year(s) | 19.9 | 20.5 | 19.6 | 20.8 | 22.4 | 20.0 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 |
| More than 2 but less than 2.5 years | 8.7 | 22.1▲ | 0.1▼ | 6.7▼ | 19.6▲ | 0.2▼ | 10.8 | 24.2 | 0.0 |
| 2.5 years or more | 7.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 4.6▼ | 13.7 | 0.0 | 9.5▲ | 21.3 | 0.0 |
| MA | 2.2 | 3.5 | 1.4▼ | 2.3▲ | 4.3▲ | 1.3▼ | 2.2 | 2.9 | 1.6 |
| No job/missing answer in Q23 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| Average (months) | 17.12 | 22.20▲ | 13.94▼ | 16.28▼ | 21.16▲ | 13.91▼ | 17.97▲ | 22.97▲ | 13.98▼ |

b) Part-time Employment

Among all respondents that were in part-time jobs (N=753), the average longest duration was 16 months. (Table 21)

Table 21 Duration of Employment (part-time employment) (by type of programme and cohort)

| Duration of employment | Total (%) (N=753) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=550) | AD | | HD(%) (n=203) | HD | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=268) | 2006(%) (n=485) | | 2005(%) (n=180) | 2006(%) (n=370) | | 2005(%) (n=88) | 2006(%) (n=115) |
| Less than 3 months | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| 3 months to 6 months | 9.2 | 5.6▼ | 11.1▲ | 10.4 | 6.1▼ | 12.4▲ | 5.9 | 4.5 | 7.0 |
| 7 months to 9 months | 9.4 | 8.2 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 11.1 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 2.3 | 11.3 |
| 10 months to 12 months | 13.7 | 9.3▼ | 16.1▲ | 11.5▼ | 7.2▼ | 13.5▲ | 19.7▲ | 13.6 | 24.3 |
| More than 1 year but less than 1.5 year | 26.3 | 24.6 | 27.21 | 25.1 | 21.1 | 27.0 | 29.6 | 31.8 | 27.8 |
| More than 1.5 year but less than 2 year(s) | 28.2 | 26.5 | 29.1 | 29.6 | 27.8 | 30.5 | 24.1 | 23.9 | 24.3 |
| More than 2 but less than 2.5 years | 3.7 | 10.1▲ | 0.2▼ | 3.5 | 10.0▲ | 0.3▼ | 4.4 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
| 2.5 years or more | 5.0 | 13.1▲ | 0.6▼ | 4.7 | 13.9▲ | 0.3▼ | 5.9 | 11.4 | 1.7 |
| MA | 1.9 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.7 |
| No job/missing answer in Q23 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| Average (months) | 15.98 | 18.95▲ | 14.29▼ | 15.94 | 19.09▲ | 14.36▼ | 16.08 | 18.67▲ | 14.08▼ |

5.4 Salary of First full-time Job since Graduation*

- (a) Among all respondents with first full-time job (N=2,746**), 21% earned \$5,000 - \$7,999 per month, 39.4% earned \$8,000 - \$9,999, while those who earned \$10,000 - \$10,999 accounted for 16.5%. The average monthly salary was \$9,674. (Table 22)
- (b) Regarding the first job and analyzed by type of programmes, the average monthly income of AD respondents was higher than those of HD respondents. (\$9,935 vs. \$9,361 as shown in table 22).
- (c) In terms of cohorts, it is found that the 2005 respondents had a higher income than their 2006 counterparts. This is observed in the first job (\$9,815 vs. \$9,551 as shown in Table 22) as well as in the second job (\$10,411 vs. \$9,839 as shown in Table 23).

Table 22 Monthly Salary of the First full-time job* (by type of programme and cohort)

| Monthly salary of first full-time job | Total (%) (N=2746**) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1500) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1246) | HD | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=1284) | 2006(%) (n=1462) | | 2005(%) (n=697) | 2006(%) (n=803) | | 2005(%) (n=587) | 2006(%) (n=659) |
| | | 4,999 or less | 1.3 | | 1.4 | 1.3 | | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| 5,000-7,999 | 21.0 | 18.9▼ | 22.9▲ | 18.3▼ | 14.2▼ | 21.8▲ | 24.4▲ | 24.5 | 24.3 |
| 8,000-9,999 | 39.4 | 36.7▼ | 41.7▲ | 37.1▼ | 34.3▼ | 39.5▲ | 42.1▲ | 39.5 | 44.5 |
| 10,000-10,999 | 16.5 | 16.9 | 16.2 | 18.0▲ | 18.5 | 17.6 | 14.8▼ | 15.0 | 14.6 |
| 11,000-11,999 | 7.1 | 8.6▲ | 5.8▼ | 8.2▲ | 11.0▲ | 5.7▼ | 5.8▼ | 5.6 | 5.9 |
| 12,000-14,999 | 9.2 | 10.9▲ | 7.7▼ | 10.0 | 12.2▲ | 8.1▼ | 8.3 | 9.4 | 7.3 |
| 15,000-19,999 | 3.6 | 4.8▲ | 2.6▼ | 4.7▲ | 6.3▲ | 3.2▼ | 2.3▼ | 2.9 | 1.8 |
| 20,000 or more | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Average Salary (\$) | 9674.6 | 9815.1 | 9551.2 | 9935.0▲ | 10192.9 | 9711.1 | 9361.1▼ | 9366.5 | 9356.3 |

Notes: * A "full-time job" or 'stable employment or job' is defined as a job held for 3 months or more.

** Graduates in first stable job since graduation in Table 22(2,746) is higher than Table 17 (2,628) which records all first jobs **within 6 months of graduation**, because it includes first stable jobs started more than 6 months after graduation.

- (d) Among those who had second full-time job, their average monthly salary reached \$10,153 which was significantly higher than the income reported by those who still held their first full-time job. (Table 23)

Table 23 Monthly Salary of the Second full-time job (by type of programme and cohort)

| Monthly salary of second full-time job | Total (%) (N=908) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=465) | AD | | HD(%) (n=443) | HD | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=498) | 2006(%) (n=410) | | 2005(%) (n=242) | 2006(%) (n=223) | | 2005(%) (n=256) | 2006(%) (n=187) |
| | | 4,999 or less | 0.7 | | 0.0 | 1.5 | | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| 5,000-7,999 | 8.9 | 7.2▼ | 11.0▲ | 9.2 | 7.0 | 11.7 | 8.6 | 7.4 | 10.2 |
| 8,000-9,999 | 41.2 | 38.0▼ | 45.1▲ | 40.0 | 36.4 | 43.9 | 42.4 | 39.5 | 46.5 |
| 10,000-10,999 | 19.2 | 21.9▲ | 15.9▼ | 19.4 | 21.5 | 17.0 | 19.0 | 22.3▲ | 14.4▼ |
| 11,000-11,999 | 9.0 | 10.8▲ | 6.8▼ | 8.4 | 10.3 | 6.3 | 9.7 | 11.3 | 7.5 |
| 12,000-14,999 | 15.0 | 15.1 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 16.5 | 13.5 | 14.9 | 13.7 | 16.6 |
| 15,000-19,999 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 4.3 |
| 20,000 or more | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| Average Salary (\$) | 10153.6 | 10411.9 | 9839.8 | 10165.5 | 10531.1 | 9768.7 | 10141.0 | 10299.2 | 9924.5 |

5.5 First Job as Current Employment

- (a) 44.9% of all respondents in employment remained working at the same job after graduation, in particular, over half of the respondents of the 2006 cohort (51.7%) continued to work at their first jobs. (Table 24)
- (b) No significant difference was observed among respondents from different types of programmes. (Table 24)

Table 24 First Job as Current Employment (by type of programme and cohort)

| First job as current employment | Total (%) (N=2628) | Cohorts (%) | | AD (%) (n=1500) | AD | | HD (%) (n=1128) | HD | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | 2005(%) (n=1002) | 2006(%) (n=1626) | | 2005 (%) (n=501) | 2006 (%) (n=999) | | 2005 (%) (n=501) | 2006 (%) (n=627) |
| | | Yes | 44.9 | | 33.8▼ | 51.7▲ | | 43.7 | 30.1 |
| No | 54.8 | 65.8▲ | 48.0▼ | 55.7 | 69.3 | 48.9 | 53.5 | 62.3 | 46.4 |
| MA | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |

5.6 Relevance to completed AD/ HD Programmes

- (a) In general, 45.6% of all respondents having employment within 6 months of graduation (N=2,628) reported that their job was related to their studied AD/ HD programmes.
- (b) A higher proportion of HD than AD respondents (62.1%: 33.1%) reported the relevance of their studies to their jobs. (Table 25)

Table 25 Relevance to completed AD/HD Programme (by type of programme and cohort)

| Relevancy to completed AD/HD programme | Total (%) (N=2628) | Cohorts | | AD(%) (n=1500) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1128) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1002) | 2006 (%) (n=1626) | | 2005(%) (n=501) | 2006(%) (n=999) | | 2005(%) (n=501) | 2006(%) (n=627) |
| Related | 45.6 | 48.2 | 44.0 | 33.1 ▼ | 35.1 | 32.1 | 62.1 ▲ | 61.3 | 62.8 |
| Not related | 53.8 | 51.2 | 55.5 | 66.1 ▲ | 64.3 | 67.1 | 37.5 ▼ | 38.1 | 37.0 |
| MA | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 |

5.7 Helpfulness of Programmes for Full-time/Part-time Employment

Respondents were asked to rank the helpfulness of the programmes on a scale from 1 to 4. Respondents found programmes most useful in “fulfilling the employment requirements” (1.76* out of 4). This was followed by “enriching knowledge and applicable skills in the related industry” (1.94) and “improving language and communication skills” (2.03). (Table 26)

Table 26 Helpfulness of the Programmes for Full-time / Part-time Employment (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpful features of completed AD/HD programme | Total (N=2628) | Cohorts | | AD (n=1500) | AD | | HD (n=1128) | HD | |
|---|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1002) | 2006 (%) (n=1626) | | 2005 (n=501) | 2006 (n=999) | | 2005 (n=501) | 2006 (n=627) |
| This programme fulfilled the employment requirements. | 1.76 | 1.78 | 1.74 | 1.78 | 1.77 | 1.78 | 1.73 | 1.78 | 1.69 |
| This programme enriched my knowledge and applicable skills in the related industry. | 1.94 | 1.9 | 1.96 | 2.04 | 2.07 | 2.02 | 1.88 | 1.83 | 1.92 |
| This programme improved my language and communication skills. | 2.03 | 2.02 | 2.04 | 1.97 | 1.94 | 1.98 | 2.19 | 2.17 | 2.20 |
| This programme enhanced my interest and understanding of the related industry. | 2.03 | 2.04 | 2.03 | 2.03 | 2.02 | 2.03 | 2.03 | 2.05 | 2.02 |
| This programme improved my confidence and performance in job interviews. | 2.12 | 2.15 | 2.1 | 2.06 | 2.09 | 2.05 | 2.22 | 2.23 | 2.21 |
| This programme was recognized by my employers. | 2.25 | 2.23 | 2.27 | 2.30 | 2.26 | 2.32 | 2.21 | 2.20 | 2.22 |

Note* The smaller the number, the higher the favour for helpfulness

5.8 Views from Participants of the Focus Group Meetings

Participants in the focus group meetings found that the practicality of skills acquired from their studies varied with different fields of study. For technical subjects such as accounting, design and engineering, the skill sets were tangible and applicable at work. However, graduates from Social Sciences or Language Studies found that they had gained useful foundation knowledge of the subjects rather than usable practical knowledge.

6. Impact of the AD/ HD Programmes

6.1 Overview

- (a) Respondents (N=4,359) were asked to evaluate the helpfulness of the completed AD/ HD programmes based on a number of aspects, i.e.(A) Communication skills, (B) Language skills, (C) Problem-solving skills, (D) Self-confidence, (E) Understanding of industry-related knowledge, (F) Possession of applicable skills in related industry, (G) Team work/ interpersonal skills. (Table 27)

Table 27 Helpfulness of Programmes on Selective Aspects (Top two boxes)

| Skills | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| A) Communication skills | 66.6 | 66.0 | 66.9 | 71.3 ▲ | 73.0 | 70.4 | 58.1 ▼ | 55.9 | 59.8 |
| B) Language skills | 54.3 | 52.5 | 55.3 | 58.2 ▲ | 57.8 | 58.4 | 47.3 ▼ | 44.9 | 49.2 |
| C) Problem-solving skills | 54.3 | 50.5 | 56.6 | 57.6 ▲ | 56.1 | 58.4 | 48.4 ▼ | 42.5 | 52.9 |
| D) Self-confidence | 57.5 | 55.9 | 58.5 | 58.2 | 59.2 | 57.8 | 56.1 | 51.1 ▼ | 59.9 ▲ |
| E) Understanding of industry-related knowledge | 62.1 | 61.2 | 62.7 | 56.6 ▼ | 54.1 | 58.0 | 72.0 ▲ | 71.5 | 72.4 |
| F) Possession of applicable skills in related industry | 51.2 | 50.4 | 51.8 | 44.1 ▼ | 42.6 | 44.9 | 63.9 ▲ | 61.7 | 65.7 |
| G) Team work/ interpersonal skills | 66.9 | 64.1 | 68.7 | 69.9 | 68.6 | 70.7 | 61.5 | 57.5 | 64.5 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “ Helpful”/ “ Quite helpful”;** Bottom 2 refer to “ Not helpful”/“Not quite helpful”

- (b) The top two choices were “Team work/ interpersonal skills” which were found by 66.9% of respondents to be “helpful” or “quite helpful”, and “Communication skills” which came next with 66.6% of respondents scoring this. This was followed by “Understanding of industry-related knowledge” which got 62.1%. (Table 27)

Table 28 Helpfulness of Programmes on Selective Aspects

| Skills | Top 2* (%) | Bottom 2** (%) | Helpfulness (%) | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----|
| | | | Helpful | Quite helpful | Neutral/ No comment | Not quite helpful | Not helpful | MA |
| A) Communication skills | 66.6 | 9.2 | 18.7 | 47.9 | 23.3 | 7.4 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| B) Language skills | 54.2 | 15.0 | 13.9 | 40.3 | 29.8 | 12.5 | 2.4 | 0.9 |
| C) Problem-solving skills | 54.3 | 10.9 | 12.5 | 41.8 | 33.8 | 8.9 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| D) Self-confidence | 57.5 | 9.7 | 14.8 | 42.7 | 31.8 | 7.1 | 2.6 | 1.0 |
| E) Understanding of industry-related knowledge | 62.1 | 13.0 | 19.9 | 42.2 | 23.9 | 9.5 | 3.5 | 1.0 |
| F) Possession of applicable skills in related industry | 51.3 | 16.4 | 13.7 | 37.6 | 31.2 | 12.8 | 3.6 | 1.1 |
| G) Team work/ interpersonal skills | 66.9 | 7.6 | 18.7 | 48.2 | 24.5 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “ Helpful” / “ Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “ Not helpful”/“Not quite helpful”

6.2 Communication Skills

Two-thirds of all respondents (N=4,359) considered the programme “helpful” or “quite helpful” in improving their communication skills (66.6%). The score was higher among AD respondents (71.3%). (Table 29)

Table 29 Helpfulness of the Programmes in improving Communication Skills (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on improving communication skills | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Top 2* | 66.6 | 66.0 | 66.9 | 71.3 ▲ | 73.0 | 70.4 | 58.1 ▼ | 55.9 | 59.8 |
| Helpful | 18.7 | 16.9 ▼ | 19.8 ▲ | 20.6 ▲ | 20.5 | 20.6 | 15.4 ▼ | 11.7 | 18.2 |
| Quite Helpful | 47.9 | 49.1 | 47.1 | 50.7 ▲ | 52.5 | 49.8 | 42.7 ▼ | 44.1 | 41.6 |
| Neutral/ No Comment | 23.3 | 23.9 | 23.0 | 20.1 ▼ | 19.1 | 20.6 | 29.1 ▲ | 30.9 | 27.7 |
| Bottom 2** | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 7.8 ▼ | 7.2 | 8.1 | 11.7 ▲ | 12.2 | 11.3 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 7.4 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 6.6 ▼ | 5.9 | 6.9 | 8.9 ▲ | 8.6 | 9.1 |
| Not Helpful | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.2 ▼ | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.8 ▲ | 3.6 | 2.2 |
| MA | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful” / “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful” / “Not quite helpful”

6.3 Language Skills

More than half the respondents (54.3%) agreed that the programme was “helpful” or “quite helpful” in improving their language skills. (Table 30)

Only 15% found the programme “not helpful” or “not quite helpful” in this aspect.

AD respondents had higher percentage than HD respondents. (58.2% of AD as compared with 47.3% of HD respondents) (Table 30)

Table 30 Helpfulness of Programmes in improving Language Skills (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on improving language skills | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Top 2* | 54.3 | 52.5 | 55.3 | 58.2 ▲ | 57.8 | 58.4 | 47.3 ▼ | 44.9 | 49.2 |
| Helpful | 13.9 | 12.5 ▼ | 14.8 ▲ | 16.1 ▲ | 16.3 | 16.1 | 10.0 ▼ | 7.1 | 12.2 |
| Quite Helpful | 40.3 | 40.0 | 40.5 | 42.0 ▲ | 41.6 | 42.3 | 37.3 ▼ | 37.7 | 36.9 |
| Neutral/ No Comment | 29.8 | 32.6 ▲ | 28.1 ▼ | 26.7 ▼ | 29.3 | 25.2 | 35.5 ▲ | 37.4 | 34.0 |
| Bottom 2** | 15.0 | 14.0 | 15.5 | 14.3 | 12.2 | 15.5 | 16.1 | 16.6 | 15.7 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 12.5 | 11.8 | 13.0 | 12.1 | 10.3 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 14.0 | 12.8 |
| Not Helpful | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| MA | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful”/ “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful”/ “Not quite helpful”

6.4 Problem-solving Skills

54.3% of the respondents considered the programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” in improving their problem-solving skills. There was a higher percentage of AD than HD respondents who reported their helpfulness, (57.6% Vs. 48.4%). Only 10.9% of all respondents found the programmes “not helpful” or “not quite helpful” in this aspect. (Table 32).

Table 31 Helpfulness of Programmes in improving Problem -solving Skills (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on improving Problem solving skills | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| | | Top 2* | 54.3 | | 50.5 ▼ | 56.6 ▲ | | 57.6 ▲ | 56.1 |
| Helpful | 12.5 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 14.0 ▲ | 15.4 | 13.3 | 9.8 ▼ | 7.9 | 11.2 |
| Quite Helpful | 41.8 | 38.2 ▼ | 43.9 ▲ | 43.5 ▲ | 40.7 | 45.0 | 38.6 ▼ | 34.6 | 41.6 |
| Neutral / No Comment | 33.8 | 36.2 ▼ | 43.9 ▲ | 30.9 ▼ | 31.5 | 30.6 | 38.9 ▲ | 42.9 | 35.8 |
| Bottom 2** | 10.9 | 12.4 ▲ | 10.0 ▼ | 10.5 | 11.7 | 9.9 | 11.6 | 13.5 | 10.2 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 8.9 | 10.2 ▲ | 8.1 ▼ | 8.6 | 9.7 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 10.8 | 8.3 |
| Not Helpful | 2.0 | 2.2 ▲ | 1.9 ▼ | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.9 |
| MA | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful”/ “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful”/ “Not quite helpful”

6.5 Self-confidence

57.5% of respondents found the programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” in improving the self-confidence. There was a higher percentage scoring top 2 boxes in the responses of the 2006 cohort (59.9%). (Table 34)

Table 32 Helpfulness of Programmes in improving Self-confidence (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on improving self-confidence | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Top 2* | 57.5 | 55.9 | 58.5 | 58.2 | 59.2 | 57.8 | 56.1 | 51.1 ▼ | 59.9 ▲ |
| Helpful | 14.8 | 13.9 | 15.4 | 16.1 | 17.4 | 15.5 | 12.5 | 8.9 | 15.2 |
| Quite Helpful | 42.7 | 41.9 | 43.1 | 42.1 | 41.8 | 42.3 | 43.7 | 42.2 | 44.8 |
| Neutral/ No Comment | 31.8 | 33.1 | 31.0 | 29.9 ▼ | 29.6 | 30.0 | 35.2 ▲ | 38.2 | 32.9 |
| Bottom 2** | 9.7 | 10.2 | 9.4 | 10.9 ▲ | 10.5 | 11.1 | 7.6 ▼ | 9.8 ▼ | 5.9 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 7.1 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.3 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 4.3 |
| Not Helpful | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.7 |
| MA | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful”/ “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful”/ “Not quite helpful”

6.6 Understanding of Industry-related Knowledge

62.1% of respondents considered the programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” in enhancing their industry-related knowledge. Only 13% found the programmes “not helpful” or “not quite helpful” in this aspect.

Among all subgroups, there was a higher proportion of HD respondents (72% as compared with 62.1% of all respondents in the group) who found the programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” in the provision of industry-related knowledge. (Table 35)

Table 33 Helpfulness of Programmes in improving Understanding of Industry-related Knowledge (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on understanding of industry-related knowledge | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Top 2* | 62.1 | 61.2 | 62.7 | 56.6 ▼ | 54.1 | 58.0 | 72.0 ▲ | 71.5 | 72.4 |
| Helpful | 19.9 | 17.9 ▼ | 21.1 ▲ | 17.0 ▼ | 15.4 | 17.9 | 25.1 ▲ | 21.7 | 27.6 |
| Quite Helpful | 42.3 | 43.3 | 41.6 | 39.6 ▼ | 38.8 | 40.1 | 46.9 ▲ | 49.8 | 44.8 |
| Neutral/ No Comment | 23.9 | 24.2 | 23.6 | 25.9 ▲ | 27.2 | 25.2 | 20.2 ▼ | 19.9 | 20.4 |
| Bottom 2** | 13.0 | 13.7 | 12.6 | 16.5 ▲ | 17.8 | 15.8 | 6.7 ▼ | 7.7 | 5.9 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 9.5 | 10.1 | 9.2 | 11.9 ▲ | 12.6 | 11.6 | 5.2 ▼ | 6.4 | 4.3 |
| Not Helpful | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 4.6 ▲ | 5.2 | 4.2 | 1.5 ▼ | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| MA | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful”/ “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful”/ “Not quite helpful”

6.7 Possession of Applicable Skills in Related Industry

51.2% of all respondents found the programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” in preparing them to possess applicable skills in related industries. Only 16.4 % found the programmes “not helpful” or “not quite helpful” in this aspect.

Relatively a greater percentage of HD respondents than AD respondents (63.9% vs 44.1%) identified the programmes as “helpful”/ or “quite helpful” in this respect. (Table 36)

Table 34 Helpfulness of the Programmes in improving Applicable Skills in Related Industries (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on possessing of applicable skills in related industries | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD (%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005 (%) (n=977) | 2006 (%) (n=1818) | | 2005 (%) (n=673) | 2006 (%) (n=891) |
| Top 2* | 51.2 | 20.4 | 51.8 | 44.1 ▼ | 42.6 | 44.9 | 63.9 ▲ | 61.7 | 65.7 |
| Helpful | 13.7 | 12.0 | 14.7 | 10.8 | 8.8 | 11.8 | 18.9 | 16.6 | 20.5 |
| Quite Helpful | 37.6 | 38.4 | 37.1 | 33.3 | 33.8 | 33.1 | 45.1 | 45.0 | 45.1 |
| Neutral/ No Comment | 31.2 | 32.4 | 30.4 | 34.6 ▲ | 35.9 | 33.8 | 25.1 ▼ | 27.3 | 23.5 |
| Bottom 2** | 16.4 | 16.2 | 16.6 | 20.2 ▲ | 20.6 | 20.0 | 9.7 ▼ | 10.0 | 9.5 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 12.8 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 15.4 | 15.3 | 15.5 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 8.0 |
| Not Helpful | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| MA | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.3 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful”/ “Quite helpful”; ** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful”/ “Not quite helpful”

6.8 Team work/ Interpersonal Skills

66.9% of respondents found the programmes “helpful” or “quite helpful” in improving their interpersonal skills / teamwork spirit.

AD respondents were more positive about the usefulness of this skill, with 69.9% of AD as compared with 61.5% of HD. (Table 37)

Table 35 Helpfulness of Programmes in improving Teamwork /Interpersonal Skills (by type of programme and cohort)

| Helpfulness on improving teamwork / interpersonal skills | Total (%) (N=4359) | Cohorts | | AD (%) (n=2795) | AD | | HD(%) (n=1564) | HD | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | 2005 (%) (n=1650) | 2006 (%) (n=2709) | | 2005(%) (n=977) | 2006(%) (n=1818) | | 2005(%) (n=673) | 2006(%) (n=891) |
| Top 2* | 66.9 | 64.1 ▼ | 68.7 ▲ | 69.9 ▲ | 68.6 | 70.7 | 61.5 ▼ | 57.5 | 64.5 |
| Helpful | 18.7 | 17.9 | 19.1 | 20.3 ▲ | 20.4 | 20.2 | 15.7 ▼ | 14.3 | 16.8 |
| Quite Helpful | 48.3 | 46.2 ▼ | 49.5 ▲ | 49.7 ▲ | 48.2 | 50.4 | 45.8 ▼ | 43.2 | 47.7 |
| Neutral/ No Comment | 24.5 | 25.8 | 23.6 | 21.9 ▼ | 21.8 | 21.9 | 29.1 ▲ | 31.6 | 27.2 |
| Bottom 2** | 7.6 | 9.2 ▲ | 6.7 ▼ | 7.3 | 8.7 ▲ | 6.5 ▼ | 8.3 | 9.8 | 7.2 |
| Not Quite Helpful | 5.8 | 6.9 ▲ | 5.2 ▼ | 5.6 | 6.7 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 5.4 |
| Not Helpful | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 1.8 |
| MA | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 |

Note: * Top 2 refer to “Helpful”/“Quite helpful”;** Bottom 2 refer to “Not helpful”/ “Not quite helpful”

6.9 Views of Participants from the Focus Group Meetings: Most Valuable Gain from Programmes

(a) The 65 respondents were also asked what they had gained from the AD/HD programmes. Most found that learning through presentations in class had improved their communication skills and could build up their self-confidence to speak in front of an audience. The frequent usage of English in lectures and coursework improved their English writing, listening and speaking skills in general.

And most participants agreed that they had significantly improved their IT application skills from their studies.

(b) Participants said that they built up their sense of responsibility from group projects and from their study experience in post-secondary institutions.

(c) They found their learning experience in AD/HD programmes had enhanced their teamwork/interpersonal skills/ problem-solving & analyzing skills.

(d) Some participants found that they could easily apply skills learnt from specialized fields of study. Others found the general foundation they learnt from subjects taught and from General Education courses prepared them well for further study.