

Matching the **Skills**  
**Knowledge** and  
**Capabilities**  
of Designers to the Expectations and  
Requirements of Employers

**DesignSmart Research Project  
Appendices [HONG KONG]  
2008**

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Focus Group Appendix.....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Focus Group Arrangement.....	2
1.2	Interview Guide for the Focus Group Sessions .....	5
1.3	Focus Group Transcripts.....	22
<b>2</b>	<b>Survey Statistical Appendix .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Forum Report.....</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1	Overview.....	51
3.2	Objectives .....	51
3.3	Key Discussions.....	52

## List of Figures

<b>Table 2.1</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Reasons for Design Manpower Mismatch.....	23
<b>Table 2.2</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Consequences of Manpower Mismatch.....	27
<b>Table 2.3</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Designers' Training Needs at Design School .....	41
<b>Table 2.4</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Staff Training Needs for Designers in the Workplace.....	43
<b>Table 2.5</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Suitability of Channels to Upgrade Designers' Competences.....	44
<b>Table 2.6</b>	Agreeableness of Designers and Employers on the Mentioned Reasons for the PRD region to be a Large Potential Market for Hong Kong Design Industry.....	46
<b>Table 2.7</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Needs, Expectations, and Wishes of Design Industry in Hong Kong.....	47
<b>Table 2.8</b>	Views from Designers and Employers on the Trend of the Design Industry and the Prediction on the Design Manpower.....	49

## 1 Focus Group Appendix

### 1.1 Focus Group Arrangement

Employer focus group sessions held on the PolyU campus:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
1	25-May-2006	Chinese	3
2	30-May-2006	Chinese	3
3	7-Jun-2006	Chinese	6
4	21-Jun-2006	Chinese	5
5	24-Jun-2006	English	2
6	29-Jun-2006	Chinese	3
7	30-Jun-2006	English	2
8	30-Jun-2006	Chinese	4
9	4-Jul-2006	Chinese	5
10	5-Jul-2006	Chinese	7
		<b>→ Total</b>	<b>40</b>

Designer focus group sessions held on the PolyU campus:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
11	22-May-2006	Chinese	10
12	29-May-2006	English	4
13	29-May-2006	Chinese	9
14	3-Jun-2006	Chinese	3
15	9-Jun-2006	Chinese	7
16	11-Jun-2006	Chinese	3
17	22-Jun-2006	Chinese	10
18	23-Jun-2006	Chinese	4
19	27-Jun-2006	Chinese	7
20	27-Jun-2006	Chinese	3
		<b>→ Total</b>	<b>60</b>

Employer focus group sessions held at the offices of the participants:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
21	23-Jun-2006	Chinese	2
22	29-Jun-2006	Chinese	1
23	7-Jul-2006	Chinese	2
		<b>➔ Total</b>	<b>5</b>

Designer focus group sessions held at the offices of the participants:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
24	23-Jun-2006	Chinese	2
25	26-Jun-2006	Chinese	13
26	29-Jun-2006	Chinese	3
27	7-Jul-2006	Chinese	2
		<b>➔ Total</b>	<b>20</b>

Supplementary focus group sessions held on the PolyU campus:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
1	15 April 2008	Chinese	6
2	16 April 2008	Chinese	4
		<b>➔ Total</b>	<b>10</b>

Major industry groups in which the focus group participants are involved:

No.	HSIC	Industries	No. of Participants Engaged
1	320	Wearing apparel (excl. footwear), manufacturing *	22
2	322	Wearing apparel (excl. footwear), manufacturing	1
3	323	Leather and leather products (excl. footwear and wearing apparel), manufacturing	1

4	332	Furniture and fixtures (excl. primarily of metal, i.e., major industry groups 380 and 381), manufacturing	1
5	342	Printing, publishing and allied industries	2
6	356	Plastic products, manufacturing	9
7	383	Radio, television and communications equipment and apparatus, manufacturing	1
8	385	Electrical appliances and houseware and electronic toys, manufacturing	21
9	386	Machinery, equipment, apparatus, parts and components n.e.c., manufacturing	2
10	389	Professional and scientific, measuring and controlling equipment n.e.c., and photographic and optical goods, manufacturing	3
11	390	Manufacturing industries n.e.c.**	5
12	391	Manufacturing industries n.e.c.	1
13	531	Decoration, repair and maintenance	16
14	833	Business services (excl. rental of machinery and equipment)	33
15	931	Education services	14
16	935	Business, professional and labour associations	8
17	940	Motion pictures and other entertainment services***	1
18	941	Motion pictures and other entertainment services	1
19	942	Libraries, museums, gardens and cultural services	3
20	959	Miscellaneous personal services	2
		<b>→ Total</b>	<b>148</b>

Notes:

- (1) A participant can be involved in more than one industry.
- (2) Two participants asked to keep their involved industry confidential.
- (3) n.e.c. = not elsewhere classified.
- (4) \* refer to Industry Code 320 – 322 “Wearing apparel (excl. footwear), manufacturing”
- (5) \*\* refer to Industry Code 390 – 391 “Manufacturing industries n.e.c.”
- (6) \*\*\* refer to Industry Code 940 – 941 “Motion pictures and other entertainment services”

## **1.2 Interview Guide for the Focus Group Sessions**

To ensure that each session was performed in a systematic and consistent manner, interview guides were prepared to govern and manage the flow of the discussion. The following four interview guides were written.

- Interview guide for the focus group sessions with design employers in English.
- Interview guide for the focus group sessions with design employers in Chinese.
- Interview guide for the focus group sessions with design professionals in English.
- Interview guide for the focus group sessions with design professionals in Chinese.

Details of each interview guide are given in the following.

### **1.2.1 Interview guide for the focus group sessions with design employers in English**

⇒ **Opening Remark (05:00 mins)**

*Chairperson:*

First of all, on behalf of the Department of Management and Marketing of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, we would like to welcome and thank all of you for joining this focus group session for our research study on “Matching the skills, knowledge and capabilities of designers to the expectations and requirements of employers”.

My name is [Name of Chairperson]. I shall be chairing this focus group session. Allow me to introduce the participants of this focus group. On the left is Mr/Ms [Name of Participant 1] from [Organisation of Participant 1], next is . . . next is . . . (*until all of the participants have been introduced*).

Sitting next to me is [Name of Moderator], [Name of Assistant Moderator, if any] from our department, who will be acting as moderator(s) during today’s discussion. Sitting a little further away is [Name of Recorder], who will help with the audio recording and will take notes of the discussion.

Allow me to restate the objectives of this study. As you know, there are four main objectives as follows.

- To study the discrepancy between the demand for and supply of design manpower.
- To understand the needs and wishes of design professional and employers.
- To identify the career development and training needs of the design profession.
- To assess the use of and need for design services in the PRD.

As members of the design industry, your views, experiences and comments are important to the success of this research.

May I remind you that the conversations in this discussion will be audio-recorded. However, please be assured that any information that you provide will be kept in the strictest confidence, and any comments that you make will appear in the written report on a no-name basis.

⇒ **Agenda (60:00 ~ 12:00 mins\*)**

*Moderator(s):*

Level	Questions	* Time Allotted	Priority
Essential	◇ Do you think, in general, that manpower mismatch is a	10 min.	H

	<p>problem that is currently faced by the design industry?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Probe: Can you give some examples to demonstrate the manpower mismatch problem in your organisation?</li> <li>➤ Probe: What causes of manpower mismatch in the design industry can you think of?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ What will the impact be on the design industry if the manpower mismatch problem is prolonged?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Economic implications? Managerial implications?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Why?</li> </ul>	10 min.	M
Important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ What skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes do you think are essential/important in a designer? (Let the participants discuss them one by one).</li> <li>➤ Probe: Why are these competencies essential/important to a designer? Can you give some examples?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Apart from these competencies, can you think of any other requirements that are important in a designer?</li> </ul>	15 min	H
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ In your organisation, are the required skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes that are required of employees clearly specified?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Do you think that your employees know your expectations of their skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes? How do your employees know whether they meet your requirements?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Does your organisation have clear job specifications that specify the required skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes for each level of designer?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Do you think that the practice of having clear job specifications is common in the design industry?</li> </ul>	15 min	H

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Probe: Why do you think that clear job specifications are essential/unimportant to the design industry?</li> <li>➤ Probe: What criteria do you use when you evaluate the job performance of a designer?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Does your organisation have a job performance appraisal policy and system in place to regularly evaluate the job performance of employees? Do you think that this kind of policy and system are essential to the design industry?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ Does your organisation conduct any business in the PRD? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Probe: <u>If YES</u>, then through what structure is business conducted, for example, solely owned venture, joint venture, partnership, outsourcing. Can you share with us your experience of starting up or running a business in the PRD?</li> <li>➤ Probe: <u>If NO</u>, then does your organisation have any plans to explore this market?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Do you think that the PRD is a large potential market for the Hong Kong design industry? Why?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Can you share with us your vision of the strategy that Hong Kong should develop to facilitate the export of its design services to the PRD?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Do you think that the manpower mismatch issue would improve or deteriorate if you were to extend your organisation's design services to the PRD?</li> <li>➤ Probe: Does your organisation prepare designers to work in the PRD? How?</li> <li>➤ Do you think that your employees are willing to work in the PRD? Why? Do you provide any special training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10 min	H

	before you arrange for them to work in the PRD?		
<p>✧ Do you think that your employees receive sufficient training at college/in the workplace to acquire the required skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Can your employees put what they have learned at college/in the workplace into practice? Why? Can you give some examples?</p> <p>☞ Probe: How do your employees upgrade their skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes? What kind of post-qualification training would you consider offering your employees?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that your organisation provides effective on the staff training to employees to help them to manage their jobs? How?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Through what channels does your organisation obtain updated information on the design industry?</p>	10 min	H	
<p>✧ As an employer, what do you think are the needs, wishes and expectations of designers and the design industry in Hong Kong?</p> <p><i>For design professionals:</i></p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that most design professionals have a clear career goal and career path? Why?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that your organisation gives sufficient opportunities to employees to develop their careers? Why?</p> <p>☞ Probe: How do you create a good working environment for designers in your organisation (for example, management style, reward schemes, promotion, motivation, on the staff training, mentorship, company</p>	10 min	H	

	<p>culture)?</p> <p><i>For the Hong Kong design industry:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ Probe: Does Hong Kong provide a good platform or environment for an organisation to grow? Why?</li> <li>☉ Probe: How can a balance be struck between profitability and creativity?</li> </ul>		
Supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ Can you think of any ways to improve the manpower match in the design industry?</li> <li>☉ Probe: What do you think the future trends in the design industry will be?</li> <li>☉ Probe: What do you anticipate the demand for and supply of designers to be in Hong Kong/the PRD in the next 2 to 3 years?</li> </ul>	5 min	M

\* Depending on group size.

⇒ **Closure (01:00 min)**

*Chairperson:*

That is the end of the focus group discussion. Once again, we thank all of you for participating in our research.

**1.2.2 Interview guide for design employers for Chinese FG session**

⇒ **開幕致辭 (05:00 分鐘)**

*會議主席:*

首先，謹代表香港理工大學管理與市場學系，歡迎各位來到此次 focus group 參與“配置設計從業人員技能、知識和能力，適應僱主期望和要求”的討論，感謝各位對我們研究的支持。

我叫 [會議主席名字]，將會主持今天 focus group 的討論。我先介紹一下今天 focus group 的參與者。從我左邊起，這位是 [參與者 1 公司名稱] 的 [參與者 1 名字] 先生/小姐，接下來是 ..... (直至介紹完畢)。

此外，這是我們系的 [主持人名字]、[如有，副主持人名字]，他們將會帶領本次 focus group 的討論。另外，現時坐在我較遠的 [會議紀錄員名字]，他們協助紀錄是次會議討論。

我大概介紹一下本次研究目的，是次研究專案主要有四個研究目標：

- 研究對設計人才的需求和供給之間的差異
- 瞭解專業設計師和僱主各自的需求和期望
- 把握對專業設計師的培訓及其職業發展的需求
- 瞭解在 PRD 中對設計服務的應用及需求的現狀

您們都是設計行業的重要成員，您們的意見和想法對於我們研究的成功相當關鍵。

另外，需要提醒一下，我們會錄音記錄是次 focus group 的談話內容。不過請放心，我們將對這些資訊完全保密，不會用於本次研究之外的任何用途。即使在我們的研究報告中有所提及，也不會出現您們的名字。

⇒ 議程 (60:00 ~ 120:00 分鐘\*)

主持人：

問題層次	問題	*所需時間	優先程度
本質性	◇ 一般說來，您認為人力資源上的不匹配是當前設計產業面臨的一個問題嗎？	10 分鐘	高

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 您能舉例說明一下在您組織中這種人力資源不匹配的問題嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您認為設計產業中這種人力資源不匹配現象出現的可能原因是什麼？</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ 如果這種人力資源上的不匹配狀況繼續下去，會對設計產業有什麼影響？ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 經濟方面的影響？管理方面的影響？等等</li> <li>☉ 為什麼？</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10 分鐘	中
重要的	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ 對於一個設計師來說，您認為哪些技能/知識/能力/態度是很關鍵/重要的？（我們可以逐一討論） <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 為什麼說這些能力對於一個設計師是關鍵的/重要的？您能舉例說明嗎？</li> <li>☉ 除了這些能力外，您認為對設計師還有其他要求嗎？</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	15 分鐘	高
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✧ 在您的組織架構中，您是否清楚地對您的員工指出所需要的技能/知識/能力/態度？ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 您認為員工瞭解您對他們技能/知識/能力/態度的期望嗎？您的員工達到要求了嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您公司有沒有對不同層次的設計師就他們所需要的技能/知識/能力/態度擬定詳細的工作規範？</li> <li>☉ 您認為有一份詳細的工作規範說明書在設計行業是常見現象嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您認為這樣的工作規範說明書在設計行業中有必要嗎？為什麼？</li> <li>☉ 您評價設計師工作業績的標準是什麼？</li> <li>☉ 您公司是否已經建立起業績評價政策和體系，並用它來衡量員工的工作績效？您認為這樣的政策和體系對設計行業</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	15 分鐘	高

	裏的公司來說重要嗎？		
	<p>◇ 您公司在 PRD 有業務嗎？</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⊖ 如果回答“有”，在 PRD 是怎樣開展業務的？（獨資、合資、合夥、外包，等等），您能談談在 PRD 創業和經營的經歷嗎？</li> <li>⊖ 如果回答“沒有”，您公司有計劃開拓這個市場嗎？</li> <li>⊖ 您認為 PRD 是設計行業的一個大的潛在市場嗎？為什麼？</li> <li>⊖ 為了推動將設計服務產業對外向 PRD 的拓展，您認為香港應該制訂什麼願景及策略？</li> <li>⊖ 當您將設計業務拓展到 PRD 時，您認為人力資源不匹配的問題會有所改善還是更加嚴重？</li> <li>⊖ 您公司準備派設計師到 PRD 工作嗎？以什麼方式準備呢？</li> <li>⊖ 您覺得您的員工會願意到 PRD 工作嗎？為什麼？在您安排員工到 PRD 工作之前，您會對他們進行特別的培訓嗎？</li> </ul>	10 分鐘	高
	<p>◇ 要獲得上面提到的技能/知識/能力/態度，您認為您的員工從學校/公司接受的培訓是否足夠？</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⊖ 您的員工能否把從學校/公司學到的東西應用到實踐中？為什麼？能否舉例說明？</li> <li>⊖ 您的員工怎樣來更新關於設計行業的技能/知識/能力/態度？您考慮為員工提供哪些畢業後專業（post-qualification）培訓？</li> <li>⊖ 您認為您的公司是否對員工提供了有效的在崗培訓？是怎樣進行培訓的？</li> </ul>	10 分鐘	高

	<p>☉ 您公司通過什麼渠道來獲取設計行業的最新資訊？</p>		
	<p>◇ 作為一名僱主，您認為設計師有哪些需要、希望和期望？香港設計行業又有哪些需求、希望和期望？</p> <p><u>專業設計師方面:</u></p> <p>☉ 您認為大多數設計師有清楚的職業目標和職業路徑嗎？為什麼？</p> <p>☉ 您認為在您的公司裏中，員工是否有足夠的職業發展機會？為什麼？</p> <p>☉ 您在公司裏怎樣為設計師來創造一個良好的工作環境？（例如管理風格、報酬體系、職位升遷、激勵機制、在崗培訓、文化，等等）</p> <p><u>設計行業方面</u></p> <p>☉ 香港是否為持續成長的企業提供了良好的平臺和發展環境？為什麼？</p> <p>☉ 在創造性和盈利之間怎樣權衡？</p>	10 分鐘	高
輔助性的	<p>◇ 您對改善設計行業內人力資源的匹配情況有什麼好的建議嗎？</p> <p>☉ 您對設計產業未來的發展趨勢有什麼看法？</p> <p>☉ 您能對未來 2~3 年內香港和 PRD 設計師的供求狀況進行一下預測嗎？</p>	5 分鐘	中

\* 視乎參加人數

⇒ 結束 (01:00 分鐘)

**會議主席：**

今天的討論就到這裏，再次感謝你們參與我們的研究。

### 1.2.3 Interview guide for the focus group sessions with design professionals in English

#### ⇒ Opening Remark (05:00 mins)

##### *Chairperson:*

First of all, on behalf of the Department of Management and Marketing of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, we would like to welcome and thank all of you for joining this focus group session for our research study on “Matching the skills, knowledge and capabilities of designers to the expectations and requirements of employers”.

My name is [Name of Chairperson]. I shall be chairing this focus group session. Let me introduce the participants of this focus group. On my left is Mr/Ms [Name of Participant 1] from [Organisation of Participant 1], next is . . . next is . . . (*until all of the participants have been introduced*).

Sitting next to me we have [Name of Moderator], [Name of Assistant Moderator, if any] from our department, who will be acting as moderator(s) during today’s discussion. Sitting a little further away is [Name of Recorder], who will help with the audio recording and will take notes on the discussion.

Allow me to restate the objectives of this study. As you know, there are four main objectives as follows.

- To study the discrepancy between the demand for and supply of design manpower.
- To understand the needs and wishes of design professionals and employers.
- To identify the career development and training need of the design profession.

- To assess the use of and need for design services in the PRD.

As members of the design industry, your views, experiences and comments are important to the success of this research.

May I remind you that this discussion will be audio-recorded. However, please be assured that any information that you provide will be kept in the strictest confidence, and any comments that you make will be appear in our report on a no-name basis.

⇒ **Agenda (60:00 ~ 12:00 mins\*)**

*Moderator(s):*

Level	Questions	*Time Allotted	Priority
Essential	✧ Do you think, in general, that manpower mismatch is a problem that is currently faced by the design industry? ☞ Probe: Can you give some examples to demonstrate the manpower mismatch problem in your organisation? ☞ Probe: What causes of manpower mismatch in the design industry can you think of?	10 min.	H
	✧ What will the impact be on the design industry if the manpower mismatch problem is prolonged? ☞ Probe: Economic implications? Managerial implications? ☞ Probe: Why?	10 min.	M
Important	✧ What skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes do you think are essential/important in a designer? (Let the participants discuss them one by one). ☞ Probe: Why are these competencies essential/important in a designer? Can you give some examples?	15 min	H

	<p>☞ Probe: Apart from these competencies, can you think of any other requirements that are important in a designer?</p>		
	<p>⋄ Has your employer mentioned or reminded you of the required skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes that you need to acquire for your current job?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that you meet your employer's requirements?</p> <p>☞ Probe: What criteria do you think your employer uses to appraise your job performance? How do you know whether you meet the requirements?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Does your organisation have clear job specifications that specify the required skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes for different levels of designers for use in the recruitment process or internal performance appraisals?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think the practice of having clear job specifications is common in the design industry?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Why do you think that clear job specifications are essential/unimportant in the design industry?</p>	15 min	H
	<p>⋄ Do you think that you received sufficient training at college/in the workplace to acquire the required skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Can you put what you learned at college/in the workplace into practice? Why? Can you give some examples?</p> <p>☞ Probe: How can skills/knowledge/capabilities/attitudes be upgraded in the design industry?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Through what channels do you obtain updated information on the design industry?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that your organisation provides effective</p>	10 min	H

	<p>on the job training to help you to manage your job? Why?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that you have been given sufficient opportunities to develop your career in your organisation? Why?</p>		
	<p>◇ Do you need to work in the PRD for your organisation?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Are you willing to work in the PRD? Why?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that the PRD is a large potential market for the design industry? Why?</p>	5 min	H
	<p>◇ As a designer, what are your needs, wishes and expectation of the design industry?</p> <p>☞ Probe: Do you think that most designers have a clear career goal and career path? Why?</p> <p>☞ Probe: What criteria do you use to choose your employer?</p>	10 min	H
Supportive	<p>◇ Can you think of any ways to improve the manpower match in the design industry?</p> <p>☞ Probe: What are your views on future trends in the design industry?</p>	5 min	M

\* Depending on group size.

⇒ **Closure (01:00 min)**

*Chairperson:*

That is the end of the focus group discussion. Once again, we thank all of you for participating in our research.

#### 1.2.4 Interview guide for design professional for Chinese FG session

⇒ **開幕致辭 (05:00 分鐘)**

### 會議主席:

首先，謹代表香港理工大學管理與市場學系，歡迎各位來到此次 focus group 參與“配置設計從業人員技能、知識和能力，適應僱主期望和要求”的討論，感謝各位對我們研究的支持。

我叫 [會議主席名字]，將會主持今天 focus group 的討論。我先介紹一下今天 focus group 的參與者。從我左邊起，這位是 [參與者 1 公司名稱] 的 [參與者 1 名字] 先生/小姐，接下來是 ..... (直至介紹完畢)。

此外，這是我們系的 [主持人名字]、[如有，副主持人名字]，他們將會帶領本次 focus group 的討論。另外，現時坐在我較遠的 [會議紀錄員名字]，他們協助紀錄是次會議討論。

我大概介紹一下本次研究目的，是次研究專案主要有四個研究目標：

- 研究對設計人才的需求和供給之間的差異
- 瞭解專業設計師和僱主各自的需求和期望
- 把握對專業設計師的培訓及其職業發展的需求
- 瞭解在 PRD 中對設計服務的應用及需求的現狀

您們都是設計行業的重要成員，您們的意見和想法對於我們研究的成功相當關鍵。

另外，需要提醒一下，我們會錄音記錄是次 focus group 的談話內容。不過請放心，我們將對這些資訊完全保密，不會用於本次研究之外的任何用途。即使在我們的研究報告中有所提及，也不會出現您們的名字。

⇒ 議程 (60:00 ~ 120:00 分鐘\*)

主持人：

問題層次	問題	*所需時間	優先程度
本質性的	✧ 一般說來，您認為人力資源的不匹配是當前設計產業面臨的一個問題嗎？ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 您能舉例說明一下在您組織中這種人力資源不匹配的問題嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您認為設計產業中這種人力資源不匹配現象出現的可能原因是什麼？</li> </ul>	10分鐘	高
	✧ 如果這種人力資源上的不匹配狀況繼續下去，會對設計產業有什麼影響？ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 經濟方面的影響？管理方面的影響？為什麼？</li> </ul>	10分鐘	中
重要的	✧ 對於一個設計師來說，您認為哪些技能/知識/能力/態度是很關鍵/重要的？（我們可以逐一討論） <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 為什麼說這些能力對於一個設計師是關鍵的/重要的？您能舉例說明嗎？</li> <li>☉ 除了這些能力外，您認為對設計師還有其他要求嗎？</li> </ul>	15分鐘	高
	✧ 您老闆（僱主）提過您目前工作所需要的技能/知識/能力/態度嗎？ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 您認為您達到老闆（僱主）的要求了嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您認為老闆（僱主）評價您工作業績的標準是什麼？您怎麼知道您是否達到這個標準了呢？</li> <li>☉ 在您公司的招聘和內部業績評估過程中，有沒有對不同層次的設計師所需要的技能/知識/能力/態度擬定詳細的工作規範？</li> <li>☉ 您認為有一份詳細的工作規範說明書在設計行業是常見現象嗎？</li> </ul>	15分鐘	高

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☉ 您認為這樣的工作規範說明書在設計行業中有必要嗎？為什麼？</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ 要獲得上面提到的技能/知識/能力/態度，您認為您從學校/公司接受的培訓是否足夠？</li> <li>☉ 您從學校/公司學到的東西能應用到實踐中嗎？為什麼？能否舉例說明？</li> <li>☉ 在設計行業中怎樣來更新技能/知識/能力/態度？</li> <li>☉ 您通過什麼渠道來獲取設計行業的最新資訊？</li> <li>☉ 您為您的公司是否就您的工作提供了有效的在崗培訓？為什麼？</li> <li>☉ 您認為您在公司裏中的職業發展有足夠的機會嗎？為什麼？</li> </ul>	10 分鐘	高
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ 您需要為公司到 PRD 工作嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您願意在 PRD 工作嗎？為什麼？</li> <li>☉ 您認為 PRD 是設計行業的一個大的潛在市場嗎？為什麼？</li> </ul>	5 分鐘	高
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ 作為一個設計師，您對設計行業有哪些需要、希望和期望？</li> <li>☉ 您認為大多數設計師有清楚的職業目標和職業路徑嗎？為什麼？</li> <li>☉ 您選擇公司（僱主）的標準是什麼？</li> </ul>	10 分鐘	高
輔助性的	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ 您對改善設計行業內人力資源的匹配情況有什麼好的建議嗎？</li> <li>☉ 您對設計產業未來的發展趨勢有什麼看法？</li> </ul>	5 分鐘	中

\* 視乎參加人數

⇒ 結束 (01:00 分鐘)

會議主席：

今天的討論就到這裏，再次感謝你們參與我們的研究。

### **1.3 Focus Group Transcripts**

Full transcription of all focus group sessions were compiled and available upon request.

## 2 Survey Statistical Appendix

**Table 2.1** Views from Designers and Employers on Design Manpower Mismatch

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(R1) Manufacturing is moving out of HK</b>										
Designer	3 (1.4%)	28 (12.7%)	27 (12.3%)	16 (7.3%)	50 (22.7%)	77 (35.0%)	19 (8.6%)	220	4.77	1.606
Employer	3 (3.5%)	10 (11.6%)	2 (2.3%)	5 (5.8%)	24 (27.9%)	33 (38.4%)	9 (10.5%)	86	5.00	1.609
→ Total	6 (2.0%)	38 (12.4%)	29 (9.5%)	21 (6.9%)	74 (24.2%)	110 (35.9 %)	29 (9.2%)	306	4.83	1.608
<b>(R2) The competence of Mainland designers is rising</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	11 (5.0%)	21 (9.6%)	22 (10.0%)	79 (36.1%)	72 (32.9%)	12 (5.5%)	219	4.96	1.279
Employer	1 (1.1%)	9 (10.3%)	3 (3.4%)	6 (6.9%)	27 (31.0%)	34 (39.1%)	7 (8.0%)	87	5.06	1.433
→ Total	3 (1.0%)	20 (6.5%)	24 (7.8%)	28 (9.2%)	106 (34.6%)	106 (34.6%)	19 (6.2%)	306	4.99	1.323
<b>(R3) The supply of Mainland designers is rising</b>										
Designer	3 (1.4%)	6 (2.7%)	19 (8.7%)	27 (12.3%)	73 (33.3%)	78 (35.6%)	13 (5.9%)	219	5.04	1.239
Employer	1 (1.2%)	6 (7.0%)	3 (3.5%)	5 (5.8%)	29 (33.7%)	40 (46.5%)	2 (2.3%)	86	5.13	1.254
→ Total	4 (1.3%)	12 (3.9%)	22 (7.2%)	32 (10.5%)	102 (33.4%)	118 (38.7%)	15 (4.9%)	305	5.07	1.242
<b>(R4) More design services are being outsourced from Hong Kong</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	20 (9.1%)	16 (7.3%)	34 (15.5%)	51 (23.2%)	81 (36.8%)	16 (7.3%)	220	4.90	1.438
Employer	2 (2.3%)	7 (8.0%)	11 (12.6%)	11 (12.6%)	19 (21.8%)	31 (35.6%)	6 (6.9%)	87	4.78	1.528
→ Total	4 (1.3%)	27 (8.8%)	27 (8.8%)	45 (14.7%)	70 (22.8%)	112 (36.5%)	22 (7.2%)	307	4.87	1.463

<b>(R5) A shortage of experienced designers in the job market</b>										
Designer	6 (2.7%)	41 (18.6%)	31 (14.1%)	25 (11.4%)	47 (21.4%)	52 (23.6%)	18 (8.2%)	220	4.34	1.711
Employer	0 (0.0%)	10 (11.6%)	6 (7.0%)	3 (3.5%)	19 (22.1%)	35 (40.7%)	13 (15.1%)	86	5.19	1.538
→ Total	6 (2.0%)	51 (16.7%)	37 (12.1%)	28 (9.2%)	66 (21.6%)	87 (28.4%)	31 (10.1%)	306	4.58	1.705
<b>(R6) A shortage of competent designers in the job market</b>										
Designer	9 (4.1%)	35 (16.0%)	29 (13.2%)	26 (11.9%)	46 (21.0%)	58 (26.5%)	16 (7.3%)	219	4.38	1.713
Employer	1 (1.1%)	7 (8.0%)	8 (9.2%)	4 (4.6%)	13 (14.9%)	31 (35.6%)	23 (26.4%)	87	5.37	1.622
→ Total	10 (3.3%)	42 (13.7%)	37 (12.1%)	30 (9.8%)	59 (19.3%)	89 (29.1%)	39 (12.7%)	306	4.66	1.743
<b>(R7) Ineffective recruitment channels</b>										
Designer	6 (2.7%)	35 (16.0%)	28 (12.8%)	41 (18.7%)	55 (25.1%)	38 (17.8%)	16 (7.3%)	219	4.29	1.595
Employer	2 (2.3%)	14 (16.1%)	13 (14.9%)	10 (11.5%)	18 (20.7%)	25 (28.7 %)	5 (5.7%)	87	4.41	1.653
→ Total	8 (2.6%)	49 (16.0%)	41 (13.4%)	51 (16.7%)	73 (23.9%)	63 (20.6%)	21 (6.9%)	306	4.32	1.610
<b>(R8) Employers' misunderstanding of the values of design services</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	4 (1.8%)	6 (2.7%)	24 (11.0%)	37 (16.9%)	66 (30.1%)	81 (37.0%)	219	5.80	1.264
Employer	5 (5.7%)	18 (20.7%)	5 (5.7%)	7 (8.0%)	17 (19.5%)	24 (27.6%)	11 (12.6%)	87	4.48	1.910
→ Total	6 (2.0%)	22 (7.2%)	11 (3.6%)	31 (10.1%)	54 (17.6%)	90 (29.4%)	92 (30.1%)	306	5.43	1.590
<b>(R9) A lack of government subsidies and financial loan support</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	11 (5.0%)	7 (3.2%)	44 (20.1%)	31 (14.2%)	71 (32.4%)	53 (24.2%)	219	5.36	1.450
Employer	4 (4.6%)	12 (13.8%)	7 (8.0%)	12 (13.8%)	14 (16.1%)	23 (26.4%)	15 (17.2%)	87	4.71	1.829
→ Total	6 (2.0%)	23 (7.5%)	14 (4.6%)	56 (18.3%)	45 (14.7%)	94 (30.7%)	68 (22.2%)	306	5.17	1.591
<b>(R10) Designers fail to set a good career plan and goal</b>										

Designer	2 (0.9%)	19 (8.7%)	18 (8.2%)	45 (20.5%)	62 (28.3%)	55 (25.1%)	18 (8.2%)	219	4.75	1.410
Employer	1 (1.1%)	7 (8.0%)	6 (6.9%)	15 (17.2%)	17 (19.5%)	34 (39.1%)	7 (8.0%)	87	4.95	1.446
→ Total	3 (1.0%)	26 (8.5%)	24 (7.8%)	60 (19.6%)	79 (25.8%)	89 (29.1%)	25 (8.2%)	306	4.81	1.421
<b>(R11) Professional status of designers is of relatively low</b>										
Designer	3 (1.4%)	17 (7.7%)	19 (8.6%)	22 (10.0%)	39 (17.7%)	72 (32.2%)	48 (21.8%)	220	5.20	1.590
Employer	1 (1.1%)	14 (16.1%)	15 (17.2%)	7 (8.0%)	18 (20.7%)	23 (26.4%)	9 (10.3%)	87	4.52	1.697
→ Total	4 (1.3%)	31 (10.1%)	34 (11.1%)	29 (9.4%)	57 (18.6%)	95 (30.9%)	57 (18.6%)	307	5.01	1.648
<b>(R12) A limited promotion opportunities and career development in the design industry</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	12 (5.5%)	12 (5.5%)	15 (6.8%)	41 (18.6%)	82 (37.3%)	57 (25.9%)	220	5.53	1.409
Employer	1 (1.2%)	18 (20.9%)	5 (5.8%)	6 (7.0%)	18 (20.9%)	30 (34.9%)	8 (9.3%)	86	4.67	1.738
→ Total	2 (0.7%)	30 (9.8%)	17 (5.6%)	21 (6.9%)	59 (19.3%)	112 (36.6%)	65 (21.2%)	306	5.29	1.555
<b>(R13) A lack of encouragement of creativity in the workplace</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.8%)	8 (3.6%)	15 (6.8%)	32 (14.5%)	67 (30.5%)	94 (42.7%)	220	5.96	1.212
Employer	1 (1.2%)	15 (17.6%)	7 (8.2%)	8 (9.4%)	15 (17.6%)	25 (29.4%)	14 (16.5%)	85	4.79	1.773
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	19 (6.2%)	15 (4.9%)	23 (7.5%)	47 (15.4%)	92 (30.2%)	108 (35.4%)	305	5.64	1.485
<b>(R14) Courses taught in the design institutes are not pragmatic enough to match the market needs</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	28 (12.8%)	29 (13.2%)	27 (12.3%)	58 (26.5%)	52 (23.7%)	24 (11.4%)	219	4.67	1.566
Employer	0 (0.0%)	6 (6.7%)	11 (12.4%)	7 (7.9%)	27 (30.3%)	27 (30.3%)	11 (12.4%)	89	5.02	1.414
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	34 (11.0%)	40 (13.0%)	34 (11.0%)	85 (27.6%)	79 (25.6%)	35 (11.4%)	308	4.77	1.530
<b>(R15) Design institutes provide inadequate placement programmes to train up design graduates</b>										

Designer	2 (0.9%)	17 (7.7%)	15 (6.8%)	26 (11.8%)	56 (25.3%)	70 (31.7%)	35 (15.8%)	221	5.11	1.474
Employer	1 (1.1%)	6 (6.7%)	8 (9.0%)	10 (11.2%)	20 (22.5%)	29 (32.6%)	15 (16.9%)	89	5.12	1.506
→ Total	3 (1.0%)	23 (7.4%)	23 (7.4%)	36 (11.6%)	76 (24.5%)	99 (31.9%)	50 (16.1%)	310	5.12	1.481
<b>(R16) Admission requirements of design institutes are less restrictive than before</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	17 (7.8%)	15 (6.8%)	39 (17.8%)	52 (23.7%)	45 (20.5%)	49 (22.4%)	219	5.07	1.550
Employer	0 (0.0%)	9 (10.1%)	7 (7.9%)	20 (22.5%)	24 (27.0%)	12 (13.5%)	17 (19.1%)	89	4.83	1.532
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	26 (8.4%)	22 (7.1%)	59 (19.9%)	76 (24.7%)	57 (18.5%)	66 (21.4%)	308	5.00	1.546
<b>(R17) Insufficient staff training in the workplace</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.8%)	14 (6.4%)	36 (16.5%)	53 (24.3%)	68 (31.2%)	43 (19.7%)	218	5.36	1.252
Employer	0 (0.0%)	10 (11.2%)	12 (13.5%)	9 (10.1%)	18 (21.3%)	25 (28.1%)	14 (15.7%)	89	4.89	1.606
→ Total	0 (0.0%)	14 (4.6%)	26 (8.5%)	45 (14.7%)	72 (23.5%)	93 (30.3%)	57 (18.6%)	307	5.22	1.378
<b>(R18) Lack of qualified and experienced designers to give coaching and guidance to junior designers in workplace</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	14 (6.4%)	18 (8.2%)	31 (14.1%)	45 (20.5%)	57 (25.9%)	55 (25.0%)	220	5.26	1.497
Employer	0 (0.0%)	9 (10.1%)	8 (9.0%)	10 (11.2%)	17 (19.1%)	37 (41.6%)	8 (9.0%)	89	5.00	1.477
→ Total	0 (0.0%)	23 (7.4%)	26 (8.4%)	41 (13.3%)	62 (20.1%)	94 (30.4%)	63 (20.4%)	309	5.19	1.494

Note: These above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.774.

**Table 2.2** Views from Designers and Employers on the Consequences of Manpower Mismatch

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(C1) An increase in an organization's training expenses</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	26 (12.0%)	19 (8.8%)	77 (35.5%)	41 (18.9%)	49 (22.6%)	4 (1.8%)	217	4.35	1.322
Employer	1 (1.1%)	11 (12.4%)	8 (9.0%)	11 (12.4%)	15 (16.9%)	38 (42.7%)	5 (5.6%)	89	4.82	1.556
→ Total	2 (0.7%)	37 (12.1%)	27 (8.8%)	88 (28.8%)	56 (18.3%)	87 (28.4%)	9 (2.9%)	306	4.49	1.408
<b>(C2) A decline in organization's reputation and market share of its products</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	11 (5.1%)	11 (5.1%)	41 (19.0%)	62 (28.7%)	72 (33.3%)	17 (7.9%)	216	5.01	1.287
Employer	0 (0.0%)	7 (7.9%)	5 (5.6%)	10 (11.2%)	24 (27.0%)	38 (42.7%)	5 (5.6%)	89	5.08	1.308
→ Total	2 (0.7%)	18 (5.9%)	16 (5.2%)	51 (16.7%)	86 (28.2%)	110 (36.1%)	22 (7.2%)	305	5.03	1.291
<b>(C3) A loss of sustainable support from stakeholders</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	12 (5.6%)	9 (4.2%)	64 (30.0%)	54 (25.4%)	62 (29.1%)	10 (4.7%)	213	4.79	1.253
Employer	0 (0.0%)	6 (6.8%)	8 (9.1%)	18 (20.5%)	17 (19.3%)	33 (37.5%)	6 (6.8%)	88	4.92	1.358
→ Total	2 (0.7%)	18 (6.0%)	17 (5.6%)	82 (27.2%)	71 (23.6%)	95 (31.6%)	16 (5.3%)	301	4.83	1.284
<b>(C4) Business keeping on with the OEM model and finding it hard to advance to ODM or OBM</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.8%)	9 (4.1%)	45 (20.7%)	40 (18.4%)	64 (29.5%)	55 (25.3%)	217	5.46	1.284
Employer	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.5%)	10 (11.2%)	14 (15.7%)	16 (18.0%)	31 (34.8%)	14 (15.7%)	89	5.15	1.411
→ Total	0 (0.0%)	8 (2.6%)	19 (6.2%)	59 (19.3%)	56 (18.3%)	95 (31.0%)	69 (22.5%)	306	5.37	1.327
<b>(C5) A reduction in the competitiveness of the design industry in Hong Kong</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	14 (6.4%)	13 (6.0%)	24 (11.0%)	45 (20.6%)	88 (40.4%)	32 (14.7%)	218	5.24	1.420

Employer	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)	6 (6.7%)	6 (6.7%)	22 (24.7%)	27 (30.3%)	25 (28.1%)	89	5.55	1.365
➔ Total	3 (1.0%)	16 (5.2%)	19 (6.2%)	30 (9.8%)	67 (21.8%)	115 (37.5%)	57 (18.6%)	307	5.33	1.409
<b>(C6) A lack of design originality</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	8 (3.7%)	16 (7.3%)	12 (5.5%)	40 (18.3%)	74 (33.9%)	68 (31.2%)	218	5.65	1.360
Employer	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.4%)	4 (4.5%)	8 (9.0%)	16 (18.0%)	38 (42.7%)	20 (22.5%)	89	5.60	1.250
➔ Total	0 (0.0%)	11 (3.6%)	20 (6.5%)	20 (6.5%)	56 (18.2%)	112 (36.5%)	88 (28.7%)	307	5.64	1.327
<b>(C7) A lack of design professionalism</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.2%)	11 (5.0%)	14 (6.4%)	42 (19.3%)	83 (38.1%)	61 (28.0%)	218	5.68	1.265
Employer	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.4%)	4 (4.5%)	7 (7.9%)	13 (14.6%)	31 (34.8%)	31 (34.8%)	89	5.78	1.312
➔ Total	0 (0.0%)	10 (3.3%)	15 (4.9%)	21 (6.8%)	55 (17.9%)	114 (37.1%)	92 (30.0%)	307	5.71	1.278
<b>(C8) Creation of more barriers to extend and export local design services to the Mainland or other foreign countries</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	6 (2.8%)	7 (3.3%)	58 (27.1%)	55 (25.1%)	65 (30.4%)	23 (10.7%)	214	5.10	1.177
Employer	1 (1.1%)	7 (7.9%)	7 (7.9%)	15 (16.9%)	17 (19.1%)	34 (38.2%)	8 (9.0%)	89	4.96	1.461
➔ Total	1 (0.3%)	13 (4.3%)	14 (4.6%)	73 (24.1%)	72 (23.8%)	99 (32.7%)	31 (10.2%)	303	5.06	1.266
<b>(C9) An increase in mutual dissatisfaction and conflicts among designers and their employers</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	7 (3.2%)	8 (3.7%)	32 (14.7%)	50 (23.0%)	75 (34.6%)	44 (20.3%)	217	5.41	1.285
Employer	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.5%)	9 (10.1%)	12 (13.5%)	18 (20.2%)	35 (39.2%)	11 (12.4%)	89	5.17	1.350
➔ Total	1 (0.3%)	11 (3.6%)	17 (5.6%)	44 (14.4%)	68 (22.2%)	110 (35.9%)	55 (18.0%)	306	5.34	1.307
<b>(C10) More designers leaving the design industry and opting to work for other non-design related industries</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	8 (3.7%)	11 (5.0%)	32 (14.7%)	54 (24.8%)	64 (29.4%)	48 (22.0%)	218	5.36	1.344

Employer	0 (0.0%)	5 (5.6%)	5 (5.6%)	22 (24.7%)	17 (19.1%)	32 (36%)	8 (9.0%)	89	5.01	1.310
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	13 (4.2%)	16 (5.2%)	54 (17.6%)	71 (23.1%)	96 (31.3%)	56 (18.2%)	307	5.26	1.341

Note: These above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.795.

**Table 2.3** Views from Designers and Employers on the Usefulness and Proficiency of the Skills, Knowledge, Capabilities and Attitudes of the designers

Skills Knowledge Capabilities Attitudes	Not Useful At All	Not Useful	Not Very Useful	Cannot Decide	Slightly Useful	Useful	Very Useful	N	Mean	SD
	Not Proficient At All	Not Proficient	Not Very Proficient		Slightly Proficient	Proficient	Very Proficient			
<b>(S1) Communication Skill</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (2.6%)	15 (6.5%)	93 (40.1%)	117 (50.4%)	232	6.37	0.78
	0 (0.0%)	5 (2.1%)	16 (6.9%)	25 (10.7%)	97 (41.6%)	76 (32.6%)	14 (6.0%)	233	5.14	1.06
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (7.8%)	32 (31.4%)	60 (58.8%)	102	6.45	0.80
	2 (2.0%)	7 (7.0%)	21(21.0%)	12 (12.0%)	23 (23.0%)	21 (21.0%)	14 (14.0%)	100	4.66	1.61
<b>(S2) Presentation Skill</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	6 (2.6%)	14 (6.0%)	69 (29.7%)	141 (60.8%)	232	6.47	0.79
	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	19 (8.2%)	24 (10.3%)	90 (38.8%)	80 (34.5%)	16 (6.9%)	232	5.17	1.08
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.9%)	1 (1.0%)	9 (8.8%)	36 (35.3%)	53 (52.0%)	102	6.32	0.90
	3 (3.0%)	3 (3.0%)	15 (14.9%)	15 (14.9%)	33 (32.7%)	20 (19.8%)	12 (11.9%)	101	4.78	1.46
<b>(S3) Hand Drawing Skill</b>										

Designer	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	6 (2.6%)	16 (6.9%)	54 (23.4%)	83 (35.9%)	68 (29.4%)	231	5.77	1.16
	2 (0.9%)	7 (3.0%)	24 (10.3%)	32 (13.7%)	86 (36.9%)	61 (26.2%)	21 (9.0%)	233	4.97	1.26
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (3.9%)	14 (13.7%)	43 (42.2%)	40 (39.2%)	102	6.15	0.87
	6 (6.0%)	5 (5.0%)	15 (15.0%)	10 (10.0%)	27 (27.0%)	29 (29.0%)	8 (8.0%)	100	4.66	1.62
<b>(S4) Computer/IT Skill</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.3%)	15 (6.5%)	27 (11.6%)	98 (42.2%)	89 (38.4%)	232	6.10	0.93
	0 (0.0%)	5 (2.1%)	10 (4.3%)	21 (9.0%)	72 (30.9%)	93 (39.9%)	32 (13.7%)	233	5.43	1.11
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	14 (13.7%)	52 (51.0%)	34 (33.3%)	102	6.15	0.76
	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	4 (4.0%)	9 (8.9%)	30 (29.7%)	39 (38.6%)	16 (15.8%)	101	5.44	1.20
<b>(S5) Interpersonal Skills</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	14 (6.1%)	42 (18.2%)	81 (35.1%)	92 (39.8%)	231	6.07	0.95
	0 (0.0%)	6 (2.6%)	13 (5.6%)	39 (16.7%)	90 (38.6%)	67 (28.8%)	18 (7.7%)	233	5.09	1.10
Employer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (3.0%)	3 (3.0%)	23 (22.8%)	38 (37.6%)	33 (32.7%)	101	5.91	1.05
	1 (1.0%)	9 (8.9%)	20 (19.8%)	13 (12.9%)	25 (24.8%)	27 (26.7%)	6 (5.9%)	101	4.55	1.49
<b>(S6) Language Skills</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	11 (4.7%)	43 (18.5%)	90 (38.8%)	86 (37.1%)	232	6.06	0.91
	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.3%)	25 (10.8%)	41 (17.7%)	88 (37.9%)	65 (28.0%)	10 (4.3%)	232	4.94	1.09
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (3.9%)	3 (2.9%)	18 (17.6%)	49 (48.0%)	28 (27.5%)	102	5.92	0.96
	2 (2.0%)	8 (7.9%)	24 (23.8%)	14 (13.9%)	25 (24.8%)	23 (22.8%)	5 (5.0%)	101	4.40	1.48
<b>(S7) Time Management</b>										

Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.7%)	9 (3.9%)	19 (8.2%)	78 (33.6%)	122 (52.6%)	232	6.31	0.91
	4 (1.7%)	6 (2.6%)	19 (8.2%)	36 (15.5%)	74 (31.8%)	70 (30.0%)	24 (10.3%)	233	5.04	1.31
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (8.8%)	42 (41.2%)	48 (47.1%)	102	6.29	0.86
	3 (3.0%)	12 (11.9%)	22 (21.8%)	11 (10.9%)	19 (18.8%)	26 (25.7%)	8 (7.9%)	101	4.40	1.66

Note: These above measurement items that measured usefulness exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.825; whereas those measured proficiency exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.866.

<b>(K1) Manufacturing Production Workflow/Processes</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	10 (4.3%)	40 (17.2%)	98 (42.2%)	82 (35.3%)	232	6.07	0.88
	2 (0.9%)	7 (3.0%)	26 (11.2%)	29 (12.5%)	79 (34.1%)	73 (31.5%)	16 (6.9%)	232	4.98	1.26
Employer	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.9%)	15 (14.7%)	44 (43.1%)	37 (36.3%)	102	6.04	1.05
	3 (3.0%)	16 (15.8%)	19 (18.8%)	11 (10.9%)	23 (22.8%)	18 (17.8%)	11 (10.9%)	101	4.32	1.71
<b>(K2) International View of Vision</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (3.4%)	24 (10.3%)	83 (35.8%)	116 (50.0%)	232	6.31	0.85
	4 (1.7%)	8 (3.5%)	29 (12.6%)	35 (15.2%)	82 (35.5%)	59 (25.5%)	14 (6.1%)	231	4.80	1.31
Employer	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	41 (40.2%)	49 (48.0%)	102	6.25	1.01
	1 (1.0%)	14 (13.9%)	20 (19.8%)	9 (8.9%)	29 (28.7%)	14 (13.9%)	14 (13.9%)	101	4.48	1.65
<b>(K3) Marketing</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	12 (5.2%)	52 (22.4%)	101 (43.5%)	65 (28.0%)	232	5.92	0.92
	5 (2.2%)	17 (7.3%)	31 (13.4%)	55 (23.7%)	78 (33.6%)	37 (15.9%)	9 (3.9%)	232	4.43	1.33
Employer	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	5 (5.0%)	6 (5.9%)	19 (18.8%)	42 (41.6%)	27 (26.7%)	101	5.72	1.22

	5 (5.0%)	14 (14.0%)	23 (23.0%)	15 (15.0%)	24 (24.0%)	12 (12.0%)	7 (7.0%)	100	4.03	1.62
<b>(K4) Mainland China</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	8 (3.5%)	35 (15.2%)	71 (30.7%)	72 (31.2%)	41 (17.7%)	231	5.78	6.13
	5 (2.2%)	20 (8.6%)	36 (15.5%)	68 (29.3%)	64 (27.6%)	35 (15.1%)	4 (1.7%)	232	4.24	1.30
Employer	1 (1.0%)	4 (3.9%)	5 (4.9%)	11 (10.8%)	38 (37.3%)	31 (30.4%)	12 (11.8%)	102	5.18	1.25
	7 (6.9%)	12 (11.9%)	19 (18.8%)	20 (19.8%)	23 (22.8%)	15 (14.9%)	5 (5.0%)	101	4.04	1.61
<b>(K5) Fine Art</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	12 (5.2%)	21 (9.1%)	52 (22.4%)	83 (35.8%)	62 (26.7%)	232	5.67	1.18
	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.7%)	25 (10.8%)	49 (21.1%)	92 (39.7%)	48 (20.7%)	14 (6.0%)	232	4.85	1.11
Employer	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (2.9%)	7 (6.9%)	28 (27.5%)	44 (43.1%)	18 (17.6%)	102	5.60	1.07
	2 (2.0%)	13 (12.9%)	17 (16.8%)	17 (16.8%)	27 (26.7%)	20 (19.8%)	5 (5.0%)	101	4.33	1.51
<b>(K6) Using Color</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	9 (3.9%)	29 (12.6%)	88 (38.1%)	101 (43.7%)	231	6.17	0.97
	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	17 (7.3%)	21 (9.0%)	100 (42.9%)	66 (28.3%)	24 (10.3%)	233	5.18	1.13
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.0%)	14 (13.9%)	44 (43.6%)	40 (39.6%)	101	6.20	0.79
	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	11 (10.9%)	13 (12.9%)	28 (27.7%)	28 (27.7%)	17 (16.8%)	101	5.13	1.42
<b>(K7) Management</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (2.6%)	25 (10.8%)	58 (25.0%)	78 (33.6%)	64 (27.6%)	232	5.71	1.10
	6 (2.6%)	11 (4.7%)	34 (14.6%)	54 (23.2%)	81 (34.8%)	36 (15.5%)	11 (4.7%)	233	4.48	1.32
Employer	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (3.0%)	9 (9.0%)	33 (33.0%)	36 (36.0%)	15 (15.0%)	100	5.37	1.24

	8 (8.1%)	13 (13.1%)	23 (23.2%)	18 (18.2%)	25 (25.3%)	8 (8.1%)	4 (4.0%)	99	3.80	1.55
--	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	----	------	------

Note: These above measurement items that measured usefulness exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.851; whereas those measured proficiency exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.902.

<b>(C1) Creativity</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	10 (4.3%)	20 (8.6%)	62 (26.7%)	138 (59.5%)	232	6.39	0.90
	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	4 (1.7%)	27 (11.6%)	105 (45.3%)	72 (31.0%)	21 (9.1%)	232	5.30	0.96
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (7.8%)	23 (22.5%)	70 (68.6%)	102	6.58	0.72
	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	10 (9.9%)	12 (11.9%)	29 (28.7%)	22 (21.8%)	20 (19.8%)	101	5.05	1.53
<b>(C2) Business Sense</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	10 (4.3%)	26 (11.3%)	97 (42.0%)	96 (41.6%)	231	6.19	0.88
	2 (0.9%)	4 (1.7%)	23 (10.0%)	40 (17.3%)	97 (42.0%)	51 (22.1%)	14 (6.1%)	231	4.88	1.15
Employer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (3.9%)	2 (2.0%)	13 (12.7%)	47 (46.1%)	35 (34.3%)	102	6.02	1.03
	1 (1.0%)	13 (12.9%)	25 (24.8%)	11 (10.9%)	29 (28.7%)	13 (12.9%)	9 (8.9%)	101	4.28	1.55
<b>(C3) Emotional Quotient</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	20 (8.7%)	37 (16.0%)	81 (35.1%)	88 (38.1%)	231	5.97	1.08
	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	13 (5.6%)	41 (17.7%)	80 (34.5%)	71 (30.6%)	22 (9.5%)	232	5.14	1.14
Employer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		
<b>(C4) Analytical Skill</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	8 (3.4%)	29 (12.5%)	84 (36.2%)	108 (46.6%)	232	6.23	0.91

	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	10 (4.3%)	30 (13.0%)	85 (36.8%)	78 (33.8%)	24 (10.4%)	231	5.27	1.08
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.9%)	2 (2.0%)	16 (15.7%)	33 (32.4%)	48 (47.1%)	102	6.19	0.97
	3 (3.0%)	7 (6.9%)	19 (18.8%)	11 (10.9%)	36 (35.6%)	12 (11.9%)	13 (12.9%)	101	4.56	1.56
<b>(C5) Independent Thinking</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	6 (2.6%)	27 (11.7%)	90 (39.0%)	105 (45.5%)	231	6.24	0.88
	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	12 (5.2%)	26 (11.2%)	78 (33.6%)	88 (37.9%)	24 (10.3%)	232	5.31	1.11
Employer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		
<b>(C6) Common Sense</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	14 (6.1%)	31 (13.4%)	88 (38.1%)	97 (42.0%)	231	6.15	0.90
	0 (0.0%)	1 (v0.4%)	9 (3.9%)	23 (10.0%)	84 (36.4%)	88 (38.1%)	26 (11.3%)	231	5.41	1.00
Employer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>(C7) Quick Thinking</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (2.2%)	5 (2.2%)	26 (11.3%)	88 (38.1%)	107 (46.3%)	231	6.24	0.90
	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	15 (6.5%)	29 (12.6%)	94 (40.7%)	74 (32.0%)	16 (6.9%)	231	5.16	1.05
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	16 (15.7%)	37 (36.3%)	45 (44.1%)	102	6.19	0.91
	0 (0.0%)	11 (11.0%)	11 (11.0%)	15 (15.0%)	36 (36.0%)	16 (16.0%)	11 (11.0%)	100	4.68	1.45
<b>(C8) Art Sense</b>										
Designer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Employer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (3.0%)	18 (17.8%)	43 (42.6%)	34 (33.7%)	101	6.00	0.99
	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	13 (12.9%)	16 (15.8%)	33 (32.7%)	23 (22.8%)	8 (7.9%)	101	4.72	1.39
<b>(C9) Imagination</b>										
Designer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	8 (7.9%)	39 (38.6%)	52 (51.5%)	101	6.38	0.80
	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.0%)	14 (13.9%)	14 (13.9%)	31 (30.7%)	25 (24.8%)	13 (12.9%)	101	4.97	1.35
<b>(C10) Adaptable to Change</b>										
Designer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Employer	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	15 (14.7%)	35 (34.3%)	47 (46.1%)	102	6.17	1.04
	3 (3.0%)	8 (7.9%)	19 (18.8%)	12 (11.9%)	32 (31.7%)	17 (16.8%)	10 (9.9%)	101	4.51	1.55
<p>Note: (1) These above measurement items that measured usefulness of designers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [<math>\alpha</math>] =0.852; whereas those that measured proficiency of designers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [<math>\alpha</math>] =0.898.</p> <p>(2) These above measurement items that measured usefulness of employers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [<math>\alpha</math>] =0.906; where those that measured proficiency of employers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [<math>\alpha</math>] =0.953.</p>										
<b>(A1) Willingness to Learn</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	8 (3.4%)	12 (5.2%)	83 (35.8%)	127 (54.7%)	232	6.39	0.86
	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	12 (5.2%)	43 (18.5%)	92 (39.7%)	80 (34.5%)	232	5.98	1.02

Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	6 (5.9%)	34 (33.3%)	60 (58.8%)	102	6.48	0.74
	2 (2.0%)	4 (4.0%)	13 (13.0%)	13 (13.0%)	23 (23.0%)	24 (24.0%)	21 (21.0%)	100	5.07	1.56
<b>(A2) Enthusiasm</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.3%)	12 (5.2%)	35 (15.1%)	65 (28.0%)	115 (49.6%)	232	6.16	1.08
	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	9 (3.9%)	26 (11.2%)	68 (29.3%)	75 (32.3%)	50 (21.6%)	232	5.50	1.19
Employer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (3.0%)	11 (10.9%)	38 (37.6%)	47 (46.5%)	101	6.23	0.95
	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	15 (14.9%)	15 (14.9%)	24 (23.8%)	24 (23.8%)	15 (14.9%)	101	4.84	1.53
<b>(A3) Open Mindedness</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	11 (4.8%)	25 (10.8%)	84 (36.4%)	110 (47.6%)	231	6.26	0.87
	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	8 (3.5%)	13 (5.6%)	67 (29.0%)	81 (35.1%)	60 (26.0%)	231	5.71	1.09
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	12 (11.8%)	34 (33.3%)	53 (52.0%)	102	6.33	0.84
	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	11 (10.9%)	12 (11.9%)	29 (28.7%)	25 (24.8%)	16 (15.8%)	101	4.98	1.50
<b>(A4) Diligence</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.3%)	9 (3.9%)	28 (12.1%)	85 (36.8%)	105 (45.5%)	231	6.19	0.96
	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	6 (2.6%)	24 (10.3%)	61 (26.3%)	92 (39.7%)	46 (19.8%)	232	5.59	1.09
Employer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (2.9%)	10 (9.8%)	42 (41.2%)	45 (44.1%)	102	6.22	0.93
	2 (2.0%)	4 (4.0%)	10 (10.0%)	11 (11.0%)	22 (22.0%)	33 (33.0%)	18 (18.0%)	100	5.18	1.49
<b>(A5) Humbleness</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	5 (2.2%)	24 (10.4%)	37 (16.1%)	81 (35.2%)	80 (34.8%)	230	6.25	6.11
	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	6 (2.6%)	21 (9.1%)	64 (27.6%)	96 (41.4%)	43 (18.5%)	232	5.61	1.04

Employer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	5 (4.9%)	30 (29.4%)	38 (37.3%)	26 (25.5%)	102	5.76	1.02
	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	10 (9.9%)	22 (21.8%)	25 (24.8%)	26 (25.7%)	10 (9.9%)	101	4.79	1.42
<b>(A6) Attention to the Environment</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	7 (3.0%)	23 (9.9%)	84 (36.2%)	116 (50.0%)	232	6.31	0.84
	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	8 (3.5%)	24 (10.4%)	75 (32.5%)	82 (35.5%)	40 (17.3%)	231	5.50	1.08
Employer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>(A7) Professionalism</b>										
Designer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.0%)	14 (6.0%)	75 (32.3%)	136 (58.6%)	232	6.47	0.74
	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	11 (4.7%)	26 (11.2%)	84 (36.2%)	69 (29.7%)	40 (17.2%)	232	5.41	1.11
Employer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>(A8) Job Commitment</b>										
Designer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (3.9%)	37 (36.3%)	59 (57.8%)	102	6.48	0.77
	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	11 (10.9%)	11 (10.9%)	28 (27.7%)	24 (23.8%)	19 (18.8%)	101	5.04	1.53
<b>(A9) Eagerness to New Experience</b>										
Designer	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Employer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.9%)	9 (8.8%)	39 (38.2%)	51 (50.0%)	102	6.35	0.77
	5 (5.0%)	9 (8.9%)	9 (8.9%)	15 (14.9%)	32 (31.7%)	22 (21.8%)	18 (17.8%)	101	5.10	1.38

Note: (1) These above measurement items that measured usefulness of designers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.835; where those that measured proficiency of designers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.872.

(2) These above measurement items that measured usefulness of employers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.987; where those that measured proficiency of employers exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.941.

**Table 2.4** Significant Difference between the views of Designers and Employers on the Usefulness of designers' Skills, Knowledge, Capabilities and Attitude

Views from Designers & Employers on Usefulness of Designers' Skills, Knowledge, Capabilities & Attitudes					
	Designers		Employers		Any Significant Difference between Views from Designers & Employers (t-statistics) *
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<b>Skills</b>					
Communication Skill	6.37	0.779	6.45	0.804	No (t=0.859)
Presentation Skill	6.47	0.794	6.32	0.903	No (t=-1.486)
Hand Drawing Skill	5.77	1.160	6.15	0.872	Yes (t=2.966*)
Computer/IT Skill	6.10	0.932	6.15	0.763	No (t=0.456)
Interpersonal Skill	6.07	0.948	5.91	1.050	No (t=-1.354)
Language Skills	6.06	0.907	5.92	0.961	No (t=-1.304)
Time Management	6.31	0.907	6.29	0.863	No (t=-0.193)
<b>Knowledge</b>					
Knowledge of Manufacturing	6.07	0.880	6.04	1.052	No (t=-0.268)
International Field of Vision	6.31	0.847	6.25	1.012	No (t=-0.518)
Knowledge of Marketing	5.92	0.920	5.72	1.218	No (t=-1.608)

Knowledge about Mainland China	5.39	1.163	5.18	1.254	No (t=-1.505)
Knowledge of Fine Art	5.67	1.180	5.60	1.074	No (t=-0.513)
Knowledge of Using Color	6.17	0.974	6.20	0.788	No (t=0.265)
Knowledge of Management	5.71	1.104	5.37	1.244	Yes (t=-2.484*)
<b>Capability</b>					
Creativity	6.39	0.900	6.58	0.724	Yes (t=1.843*)
Business Sense	6.19	0.882	6.02	1.034	No (t=-1.505)
Analytical Skill	6.23	0.909	6.19	0.972	No (t=-0.382)
Quick Thinking	6.24	0.895	6.19	0.909	No (t=-0.525)
<b>Attitude</b>					
Willingness to Learn	6.39	0.856	6.48	0.741	No (t=0.902)
Enthusiasm	6.16	1.079	6.23	0.947	No (t=0.550)
Open Mindedness	6.26	0.866	6.33	0.836	No (t=0.722)
Diligence	6.19	0.961	6.22	0.929	No (t=0.187)
Humbleness	6.25	6.108	5.76	1.016	No (t=-0.689)

\* p < 0.05, two-tailed

**Table 2.5** Significant Difference between the views of Designers and Employers on the Proficiency of designers' Skills, Knowledge, Capabilities and Attitude

Views from Designers & Employers on Proficiency of Designers' Skills, Knowledge, Capabilities & Attitudes					
	Designers		Employers		Any Significant Difference between Views from Designers & Employers (t-statistics) *
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<b>Skills</b>					
Communication Skill	5.14	1.062	4.66	1.609	Yes (t=-3.192*)
Presentation Skill	5.17	1.083	4.78	1.460	Yes (t=-2.706*)

Hand Drawing Skill	4.97	1.259	4.66	1.622	No (t=-1.908)
Computer/IT Skill	5.43	1.105	5.43	1.105	No (t=0.016)
Interpersonal Skill	5.09	1.103	4.55	1.486	Yes (t=-3.623*)
Language Skills	4.94	1.085	4.97	1.259	Yes (t=-3.710*)
Time Management	5.04	1.306	4.40	1.662	Yes (t=-3.817*)
<b>Knowledge</b>					
Knowledge of Manufacturing	4.98	1.257	4.32	1.714	NA
International Field of Vision	4.80	1.307	4.48	1.653	No (t=-1.921)
Knowledge of Marketing	4.43	1.330	4.03	1.617	NA
Knowledge about Mainland China	4.24	1.296	4.04	1.606	NA
Knowledge of Fine Art	4.85	1.108	4.33	1.511	Yes (t=-3.524*)
Knowledge of Using Color	5.18	1.128	5.13	1.419	No (t=-0.383)
Knowledge of Management	4.48	1.317	3.80	1.552	NA
<b>Capability</b>					
Creativity	5.30	0.959	5.05	1.526	No (t=-1.793)
Business Sense	4.88	1.149	4.56	1.558	Yes (t=-3.955*)
Analytical Skill	5.27	1.083	4.28	1.550	Yes (t=-4.764*)
Quick Thinking	5.16	1.053	4.68	1.449	Yes (t=-3.382*)
<b>Attitude</b>					
Willingness to Learn	5.98	1.017	5.07	1.559	Yes (t=-6.301*)
Enthusiasm	5.50	1.192	4.84	1.534	Yes (t=-4.260*)
Open Mindedness	5.71	1.090	4.98	1.497	Yes (t=-5.014*)
Diligence	5.59	1.093	5.18	1.493	Yes (t=-2.826*)
Humbleness	5.61	1.043	4.79	1.423	Yes (t=-5.875*)

- $p < 0.05$ , two-tailed

- NA = Statistically, employers' ratings on their designers' proficiency in (1) Knowledge of Manufacturing, (2) Knowledge of Marketing, (3) Knowledge about Mainland China and (4) Knowledge of Management had no significance differences than 4 (i.e. cannot decide option), t-statistics comparison between the ratings from designers and employers was not performed for these 4 items.

**Table 2.3** Views from Designers and Employers on the Designers' Training Needs at Design School

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(T1) To provide more pragmatic courses</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	7 (3.0%)	14 (6.0%)	38 (16.3%)	113 (48.5%)	56 (24%)	233	5.78	1.12
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.0%)	3 (3%)	15 (14.9%)	47 (46.5%)	33 (32.7%)	101	6.03	0.93
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.2%)	10 (3%)	17 (5.1%)	53 (15.9%)	160 (47.9%)	89 (26.6%)	334	5.85	1.07
<b>(T2) Broadening general knowledge</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	19 (8.2%)	35 (15.2%)	52 (22.5%)	79 (34.2%)	42 (18.2%)	231	5.33	1.29
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (4.0%)	19 (18.8%)	48 (47.5%)	30 (29.7%)	101	6.03	0.81
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	2 (0.6%)	19 (5.7%)	39 (11.7%)	71 (21.4%)	127 (38.3%)	72 (21.7%)	332	5.54	1.21
<b>(T3) Training to strengthen capabilities</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	2 (0.9%)	3 (1.3%)	9 (3.9%)	33 (14.3%)	108 (46.8%)	76 (32.9%)	231	6.03	0.94
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	8 (7.9%)	51 (50.5%)	41 (40.6%)	101	6.31	0.66
→ Total	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	10 (3%)	41 (12.3%)	159 (47.9%)	117 (35.2%)	332	6.12	0.87
<b>(T4) More promotion for professionalism</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	5 (2.2%)	5 (2.2%)	6 (2.6%)	38 (16.4%)	98 (42.2%)	80 (34.5%)	232	5.98	1.07
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.9%)	12 (11.8%)	50 (49%)	37 (36.3%)	102	6.19	0.75
→ Total	0 (0%)	5 (1.5%)	5 (1.5%)	9 (2.7%)	50 (15.0%)	148 (44.3%)	117 (35.0%)	334	6.04	0.99

<b>(T5) More placement opportunities</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	4 (1.7%)	7 (3.0%)	28 (12.0%)	101 (43.3%)	89 (38.2%)	233	6.07	1.06
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (2.9%)	12 (11.8%)	61 (59.8%)	24 (23.5%)	102	6	0.81
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	2 (0.6%)	6 (1.8%)	10 (3.0%)	40 (11.9%)	162 (48.4%)	113 (33.7%)	335	6.05	0.99
<b>(T6) More diversified courses</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	10 (4.3%)	11 (4.7%)	30 (12.9%)	110 (47.2%)	67 (28.8%)	233	5.85	1.16
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	7 (6.9%)	4 (3.9%)	19 (18.6%)	46 (45.1%)	25 (24.5%)	102	5.74	1.14
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	5 (1.5%)	17 (5.1%)	15 (4.5%)	49 (14.6%)	156 (46.6%)	92 (27.5%)	335	5.81	1.16
<b>(T7) Up-to-date course content</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	8 (3.4%)	18 (7.8%)	98 (42.2%)	103 (44.4%)	232	6.22	0.94
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	5 (4.9%)	10 (9.8%)	46 (45.1%)	40 (39.2%)	102	6.17	0.87
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	5 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	13 (3.9%)	28 (8.4%)	144 (43.1%)	143 (42.8%)	334	6.21	0.91
<b>(T8) Courses that are comprehensive and focused</b>										
Designer	4 (1.7%)	7 (3.0%)	15 (6.5%)	6 (2.6%)	37 (15.9%)	89 (38.4%)	74 (31.9%)	232	5.71	1.41
Employer	1 (1%)	8 (7.9%)	5 (5.0%)	10 (9.9%)	21 (20.8%)	36 (35.6%)	20 (19.8%)	101	5.28	1.5
→ Total	5 (1.5%)	15 (4.5%)	20 (6.0%)	16 (4.8%)	58 (17.4%)	125 (37.5%)	94 (28.2%)	333	5.58	1.45
<b>(T9) Stringent entry requirements</b>										
Designer	4 (1.7%)	9 (3.9%)	9 (3.9%)	31 (13.3%)	42 (18.0%)	78 (33.5%)	60 (25.8%)	233	5.45	1.44
Employer	0 (0%)	7 (7.0%)	6 (6.0%)	16 (16.0%)	18 (18.0%)	33 (33.0%)	20 (20.0%)	100	5.24	1.46
→ Total	4 (1.2%)	16 (4.8%)	15 (4.5%)	47 (14.1%)	60 (18.0%)	111 (33.3%)	80 (24.0%)	333	5.39	1.45

Note: These above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.796.

**Table 2.4** Views from Designers and Employers on the Staff Training Needs for Designers in the Workplace

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(W1) Providing more on-the-job training</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	5 (2.2%)	13 (5.8%)	40 (17.9%)	113 (50.7%)	49 (22%)	223	5.80	1.03
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	6 (6.1%)	15 (15.2%)	66 (66.7%)	9 (9.1%)	99	5.72	0.87
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.9%)	7 (2.2%)	19 (5.9%)	55 (17.1%)	179 (55.6%)	58 (18.0%)	322	5.77	0.98
<b>(W2) Providing more support for off-the-job training</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.8%)	8 (3.6%)	19 (8.5%)	43 (19.3%)	96 (43%)	52 (23.3%)	223	5.67	1.18
Employer	0 (0%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	13 (13.1%)	23 (23.2%)	57 (57.6%)	2 (2.0%)	99	5.38	0.96
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.9%)	10 (3.1%)	32 (9.9%)	66 (20.5%)	153 (47.5%)	54 (16.8%)	322	5.58	1.12
<b>(W3) Providing more site visits</b>										
Designer	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	8 (3.6%)	25 (11.3%)	98 (44.1%)	89 (40.1%)	222	5.76	1.03
Employer	0 (0%)	2 (2.0%)	4 (4.0%)	6 (6.1%)	18 (18.2%)	59 (59.6%)	10 (10.1%)	99	5.53	1.03
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.9%)	4 (1.2%)	14 (4.4%)	43 (13.4%)	157 (48.9%)	99 (30.8%)	321	5.69	1.03
<b>(W4) Providing favourable work environment that encourages continuing education</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	5 (2.2%)	17 (7.6%)	49 (22.0%)	91 (40.8%)	58 (26.0%)	223	6.18	0.90
Employer	0 (0%)	4 (4.0%)	1 (1.0%)	8 (8.1%)	13 (13.1%)	61 (61.6%)	12 (12.1%)	99	5.60	1.03
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	5 (1.6%)	6 (1.9%)	25 (7.8%)	62 (19.3%)	152 (47.2%)	70 (21.7%)	322	6.00	0.98
<b>(W5) Providing visits to manufacturing/production lines</b>										

Designer	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.4%)	25 (11.3%)	47 (21.2%)	90 (40.5%)	56 (25.2%)	222	5.76	1.11
Employer	0 (0%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	10 (10.1%)	25 (25.3%)	48 (48.5%)	12 (12.1%)	99	5.64	1.09
→ Total	0 (0%)	3 (0.9%)	5 (1.6%)	35 (10.9%)	72 (22.4%)	138 (43.0%)	68 (21.2%)	321	5.72	1.10

Note: These above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.800.

**Table 2.5** Views from Designers and Employers on the Suitability of Channels to Upgrade Designers' Competences

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(H1) Formal taught courses</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	11 (4.7%)	8 (3.4%)	23 (9.9%)	62 (26.6%)	100 (42.9%)	29 (12.4%)	233	5.37	1.21
Employer	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	5 (4.9%)	8 (7.8%)	24 (23.5%)	53 (52.0%)	9 (8.8%)	102	5.42	1.15
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	13 (3.9%)	13 (3.9%)	31 (9.3%)	86 (25.7%)	153 (45.7%)	38 (11.3%)	335	5.39	1.19
<b>(H2) Paper media (e.g. magazines, newspaper, etc)</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	13 (5.6%)	25 (10.8%)	67 (28.9%)	97 (41.8%)	27 (11.6%)	232	5.39	1.10
Employer	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (4.0%)	6 (5.9%)	20 (19.8%)	57 (56.4%)	12 (11.9%)	101	5.59	1.08
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	17 (5.1%)	31 (9.3%)	87 (26.1%)	154 (46.2%)	39 (11.7%)	333	5.45	1.10
<b>(H3) Internet</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	7 (3.0%)	13 (5.6%)	59 (25.3%)	116 (49.8%)	34 (14.6%)	233	5.62	1.03
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (4.0%)	8 (8.0%)	17 (17.0%)	51 (51.0%)	19 (19.0%)	100	5.70	1.06
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.2%)	11 (3.3%)	21 (6.3%)	76 (22.8%)	167 (50.2%)	53 (15.9%)	333	5.64	1.04
<b>(H4) Seminars</b>										

Designer	2 (0.9%)	3 (1.3%)	10 (4.3%)	27 (11.7%)	74 (32.2%)	92 (40.0%)	22 (9.6%)	230	5.31	1.11
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	5 (5.0%)	17 (17.0%)	63 (63.0%)	13 (13.0%)	100	5.79	0.84
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	4 (1.2%)	11 (3.3%)	32 (9.7%)	91 (27.6%)	155 (47.0%)	35 (10.6%)	330	5.46	1.06
<b>(H5) Site visits</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	5 (2.2%)	21 (9.1%)	49 (21.2%)	120 (51.9%)	33 (14.3%)	231	5.63	1.01
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (3.0%)	23 (22.8%)	52 (51.5%)	21 (20.8%)	101	5.86	0.85
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	7 (2.1%)	24 (7.2%)	72 (21.7%)	172 (51.8%)	54 (16.3%)	332	5.70	0.97
<b>(H6) Social networks</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	4 (1.7%)	14 (6.0%)	52 (22.4%)	62 (26.7%)	83 (35.8%)	17 (7.3%)	232	5.11	1.12
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (8.0%)	24 (24.0%)	26 (26.0%)	38 (38.0%)	4 (4.0%)	100	5.06	1.05
→ Total	0 (0%)	4 (1.2%)	22 (6.6%)	76 (22.9%)	88 (26.5%)	121 (36.4%)	21 (6.3%)	332	5.09	1.10
<b>(H7) Competition participation</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	9 (3.9%)	19 (8.3%)	64 (27.8%)	90 (39.1%)	44 (19.1%)	230	5.56	1.13
Employer	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	5 (5.0%)	11 (11.0%)	20 (20.0%)	49 (49.0%)	12 (12.0%)	100	5.42	1.21
→ Total	2 (0.6%)	5 (1.5%)	14 (4.2%)	30 (9.1%)	84 (25.5%)	139 (42.1%)	56 (17.0%)	330	5.52	1.15

Note: These above measurement items exhibited moderate reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.673.

**Table 2.6** Agreeableness of Designers and Employers on the Mentioned Reasons for the PRD region to be a Large Potential Market for Hong Kong Design Industry

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(P1) Trading environment improved</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	2 (3.4%)	2 (3.4%)	3 (5.1%)	13 (22.0%)	30 (50.8%)	9 (15.3%)	59	5.59	1.13
Employer	1 (1.2%)	4 (4.8%)	3 (3.6%)	5 (6.0%)	20 (23.8%)	44 (52.4%)	7 (8.3%)	84	5.37	1.25
→ Total	1 (0.7%)	6 (4.2%)	5 (3.5%)	8 (5.6%)	33 (23.1%)	74 (51.7%)	16 (11.2%)	143	5.46	1.20
<b>(P2) Bureaucratic procedures simplified</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (10.2%)	20 (33.9%)	21 (35.6%)	10 (16.9%)	2 (3.4%)	59	4.69	0.99
Employer	0 (0%)	5 (6.0%)	6 (7.1%)	12 (14.3%)	31 (36.9%)	27 (32.1%)	3 (3.6%)	84	4.93	1.20
→ Total	0 (0%)	5 (3.5%)	12 (8.4%)	32 (22.4%)	52 (36.4%)	37 (25.9%)	5 (3.5%)	143	4.83	1.12
<b>(P3) Clients favour more branded products</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (6.8%)	7 (11.9%)	19 (32.2%)	20 (33.9%)	9 (15.3%)	59	5.39	1.10
Employer	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	3 (3.6%)	7 (8.3%)	20 (23.8%)	43 (51.2%)	9 (10.7%)	84	5.49	1.11
→ Total	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	7 (4.9%)	14 (9.8%)	39 (27.3%)	63 (44.1%)	18 (12.6%)	143	5.45	1.10
<b>(P4) Rich resources in the mainland</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.7%)	10 (16.9%)	6 (10.2%)	25 (42.4%)	17 (28.8%)	59	5.80	1.10
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (3.6%)	23 (27.7%)	43 (51.8%)	11 (13.3%)	83	5.66	0.93
→ Total	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	13 (9.2%)	29 (20.4%)	68 (47.9%)	28 (19.7%)	142	5.72	1.00
<b>(P5) Demand for high quality design work</b>										

Designer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (10.2%)	12 (20.3%)	27 (45.8%)	14 (23.7%)	59	5.83	0.91
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	4 (4.8%)	14 (16.7%)	51 (60.7%)	13 (15.5%)	84	5.81	0.88
→ Total	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	10 (7.0%)	26 (18.2%)	78 (54.5%)	27 (18.9%)	143	5.82	0.89

Note: These above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.705.

**Table 2.7** Views from Designers and Employers on the Needs, Expectations, and Wishes of Design Industry in Hong Kong

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(N1) Educating the general public to understand and appreciate design starting from childhood</b>										
Designer	1(0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	2 (0.9%)	8 (3.4%)	44 (19.0%)	108 (46.6%)	66 (28.4%)	232	5.93	1.002
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (3.9%)	3 (2.9%)	17 (16.7%)	49 (48.0%)	28 (27.5%)	102	5.89	1.033
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.2%)	6 (1.8%)	11 (3.3%)	61 (18.3%)	157 (47.0%)	94 (28.1%)	234	5.92	1.010
<b>(N2) Providing more placement opportunities for design students before graduation</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	5 (2.2%)	10 (4.3%)	34 (14.7%)	105 (45.5%)	74 (32.0%)	231	5.97	1.042
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (3.9%)	3 (2.9%)	17 (16.7%)	54 (52.9%)	24 (23.5%)	102	5.89	0.932
→ Total	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	9 (2.7%)	13 (3.9%)	51 (15.3%)	159 (47.7%)	98 (29.4%)	333	5.94	1.009
<b>(N3) Providing more favorable work environments for designers (e.g. providing more staff training and room for creativity)</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	12 (5.2%)	22 (9.6%)	105 (45.7%)	89 (38.7%)	230	6.16	0.883
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (2.9%)	14 (13.7%)	63 (61.8%)	19 (18.6%)	102	5.89	0.878
→ Total	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	15 (4.5%)	36 (10.8%)	168 (50.6%)	108 (32.5%)	332	6.08	0.888
<b>(N4) Putting more efforts into uniting designers, design associations and design industries to create more synergic and cooperative relationships</b>										

Designer	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)	13 (5.6%)	44 (19.0%)	104 (45.0%)	66 (28.6%)	231	5.93	0.941
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.9%)	4 (3.9%)	20 (19.6%)	50 (49.0%)	25 (24.5%)	102	5.88	0.926
➔ Total	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.8%)	17 (5.1%)	64 (19.2%)	154 (46.2%)	91 (27.3%)	333	5.91	0.935
<b>(N5) Introducing a professional chartered system for designers to promote their professionalism</b>										
Designer	6 (2.6%)	6 (2.6%)	8 (3.5%)	23 (10.0%)	47 (20.3%)	74 (32.0%)	67 (29.0%)	231	5.55	1.440
Employer	0 (0%)	5 (5.0%)	1 (1.0%)	10 (9.9%)	22 (21.8%)	35 (34.7%)	28 (27.7%)	101	5.63	1.286
➔ Total	6 (1.8%)	11 (3.3%)	9 (2.7%)	33 (9.9%)	69 (20.8%)	109 (32.8%)	95 (28.6%)	332	5.58	1.394
<b>(N6) Enhancing Hong Kong designers' image through organizing more international competitions and exhibitions</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	14 (6.0%)	40 (17.2%)	101 (43.5%)	73 (31.5%)	232	5.96	0.993
Employer	2 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	16 (15.7%)	54 (52.9%)	27 (26.5%)	102	5.94	1.042
➔ Total	3 (0.9%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.9%)	16 (4.8%)	56 (16.8%)	155 (46.4%)	100 (29.9%)	334	5.95	1.006
<b>(N7) Providing more financial and loan supports for design entrepreneurs to improve their product diversification and brand establishment</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)	18 (7.8%)	29 (12.5%)	110 (47.4%)	72 (31.0%)	232	5.99	0.947
Employer	0 (0%)	3 (2.9%)	1 (1.0%)	5 (4.9%)	17 (16.7%)	46 (45.1%)	30 (29.4%)	102	5.88	1.102
➔ Total	0 (0%)	4 (1.2%)	3 (0.9%)	23 (6.9%)	46 (13.8%)	156 (46.7%)	102 (30.5%)	334	5.96	0.996
<b>(N8) Introducing stricter legislation for the protection of intellectual property</b>										
Designer	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	25 (10.8%)	29 (12.5%)	31 (13.4%)	142 (61.2%)	232	6.42	1.451
Employer	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (2.9%)	5 (4.9%)	16 (15.7%)	39 (38.2%)	37 (36.3%)	102	5.93	1.180
➔ Total	3 (0.9%)	3 (0.9%)	4 (1.2%)	30 (9.0%)	45 (13.5%)	70 (21.0%)	179 (53.6%)	334	6.27	1.390

Note: These above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.782.

**Table 2.8** Views from Designers and Employers on the Trend of the Design Industry and the Prediction on the Design Manpower

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
<b>(T1) Hong Kong should continue to serve as a bridge for foreign enterprises to enter the PRD market.</b>										
Designer	3 (1.3%)	7 (3.0%)	8 (3.5%)	33 (14.3%)	56 (24.2%)	99 (42.9%)	25 (10.8%)	231	5.29	1.243
Employer	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	4 (3.9%)	8 (7.8%)	15 (14.7%)	51 (50.0%)	20 (19.6%)	102	5.60	1.292
➔ Total	5 (1.5%)	9 (2.7%)	12 (3.6%)	41 (12.3%)	71 (21.3%)	150 (45.0%)	45 (13.5%)	333	5.38	1.264
<b>(T2) There is an increasing demand for professionals who have a good mastery of design management.</b>										
Designer	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	7 (3.0%)	16 (6.9%)	40 (17.2%)	120 (51.7%)	48 (20.7%)	232	5.78	0.996
Employer	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)	6 (5.9%)	14 (13.7%)	53 (52.0%)	26 (25.5%)	102	5.90	0.980
➔ Total	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	9 (2.7%)	22 (6.6%)	54 (16.2%)	173 (51.8%)	74 (22.2%)	333	5.82	0.991
<b>(T3) There is more cooperation between Hong Kong and Mainland designers, i.e. Hong Kong designers are involved in design concept creation while Mainland designers are involved in design implementation.</b>										
Designer	4 (1.7%)	8 (3.5%)	9 (3.9%)	26 (11.3%)	50 (21.7%)	97 (42.2%)	36 (15.7%)	230	5.37	1.334
Employer	1 (1.0%)	3 (2.9%)	4 (3.9%)	10 (9.8%)	24 (23.5%)	43 (42.2%)	17 (16.7%)	102	5.45	1.256
➔ Total	5 (1.5%)	11 (3.3%)	13 (3.9%)	36 (10.8%)	74 (22.3%)	140 (42.2%)	53 (16.0%)	332	5.39	1.309
<b>(T4) More attempts are being made for organizations to move from OEM to ODM or OBM.</b>										
Designer	0 (0%)	3 (1.3%)	7 (3.0%)	30 (12.9%)	42 (18.1%)	97 (41.8%)	53 (22.8%)	232	5.65	1.134
Employer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.9%)	11 (10.8%)	13 (12.7%)	52 (51.0%)	23 (22.5%)	102	5.79	1.008
➔ Total	0 (0%)	3 (0.9%)	10 (3.0%)	41 (12.3%)	55 (16.5%)	149 (44.6%)	76 (22.8%)	334	5.69	1.098
<b>(T5) There is an increasing amount of design service outsourcing.</b>										

Designer	4 (1.7%)	13 (5.6%)	14 (6.1%)	61 (26.4%)	44 (19.0%)	77 (33.3%)	18 (7.8%)	231	4.87	1.388
Employer	3 (2.9%)	2 (2%)	4 (3.9%)	15 (14.7%)	30 (29.4%)	41 (40.2%)	7 (6.9%)	102	5.14	1.275
➔ Total	7 (2.1%)	15 (4.5%)	18 (5.4%)	76 (22.8%)	74 (22.2%)	118 (35.4%)	25 (7.5%)	333	4.95	1.358
<b>(T6) More design services are being exported to the Mainland.</b>										
Designer	3 (1.3%)	6 (2.6%)	11 (4.8%)	48 (20.8%)	46 (19.9%)	99 (42.9%)	18 (7.8%)	231	5.15	1.251
Employer	3 (2.9%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	18 (17.6%)	30 (29.4%)	42 (41.2%)	6 (5.9%)	102	5.16	1.225
➔ Total	6 (1.8%)	8 (2.4%)	12 (3.6%)	66 (19.8%)	76 (22.8%)	141 (42.3%)	24 (7.2%)	333	5.15	1.241

Note: These above measurement items exhibited moderate reliability, Cronbach's alpha [ $\alpha$ ] =0.672.

### **3 Forum Report**

#### **3.1 Overview**

Fifty participants, including designers and employers, attended the forum titled “Designers’ Competence and Employers’ Expectations – Is there a Mismatch?” on 27 May 2008 in Courtyard (A122) at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University from 6:30 pm to 8:00 pm, presented by Prof Lorraine Justice (Director, Swire Professor of School of Design), Prof Edward Snape (Professor and Head of Management and Marketing Department) and Dr Eric Ngai (Chief Investigator and Associate Professor of Management and Marketing Department).

The forum included presentations of Prof Justice, Prof Snape and Dr Ngai on the findings of the DesignSmart Project ‘Matching the Skills, Knowledge and Capabilities of Designers to the Expectations and Requirements of Employers’ and followed by an opening discussion. During the opening discussions, participants expressed their views on findings and the topics of “Designers’ Competence and Employers’ Expectations”. This report provides a general summary without attribution to specific participants in the forum.

#### **3.2 Objectives**

The key objectives of this forum were as follows:

- To report the findings from DesignSmart Project to the design practitioners in the Hong Kong design industry;
- To gather suggestions and comments from the design practitioners before disseminating the findings from the final project to the public; and
- To have experienced design practitioners and prominent figures review the project results.

### **3.3 Key Discussions**

The following points were noticed during opening discussions.

#### **3.3.1 Designers**

##### *3.3.1.1 Education of Design Students*

- Hong Kong design students should be educated about the real situation in the market and about how to be competitive. Hong Kong designers are reluctant to have an (emotional) risk takers' mindset.
- Design students in Hong Kong are more creative than those in the Mainland. Employers may have different demands between Hong Kong designers and Mainland designers. Labour costs are another concern. Hong Kong designers may charge triple what Mainland designers do. Hong Kong designers should know why they are more valued than Mainland designers.
- Design students should also have a better attitude and awareness of design. Nowadays, Mainland designers have greater awareness of design than Hong Kong designers do. Mainland designers have talent, and the English language is not a problem for them.
- Language proficiency, especially English, is the major concern of design students, especially to go on internationally.

#### **3.3.2 Employers**

*3.3.2.1 Educate employers about expectations and the design value of the market to solve the mismatch problem, and gain respect*

- The findings and details of the project indicate clearly that both designers and employers agreed on the mismatch, particularly the qualitative aspects of the industry, contributing to the problem of, for example, originality.
- Employers argued that the problem of mismatch lies with the pre-career training/preparation for the designers. Upgrading the existing programme seems to be the solution. Attaining graduate or even postgraduate levels as the basic entry level for the profession is becoming the trend for designers.
- The views of the designers and employers differ. It is important for employers to understand the designers' needs.
- Another problem in the industry is caused by the mismatch between the employers' thoughts as well as offers and the designer's expectations. The industry is unable to provide the job types, opportunities and work place environment that designers expect.
- Dissatisfaction with employers' offers is the reason why the designers quit their jobs. From a human resources management perspective, all kinds of tactics may work, for instance, staff development. However, understanding the expectations of the designers is the initial critical step.
- OEM employers merely need designers to draw and copy things. There should be a policy to promote and educate the public and employers about design value. In the Mainland, design schools in Shanghai are actually competitive in the industry.

- Design students get jobs directly from companies. Large firms, such as Cartier and Montblanc, recruit design students, even junior students, for jobs, which is the current trend in the industry.

### **3.3.3 Educational Institutions**

#### *3.3.3.1 Directions for and insights into the development of future courses*

- It is noted that forecasting is not the main objective of the research, nor is it the intention of the project. However, the number of company vacancies across different levels of designers at the date of the survey and in the coming 12 months has been included in the full report to provide a general picture of the design industry.
- The study mainly focused on the qualitative analysis of investigating the manpower mismatch in Hong Kong.
- If this manpower data were to be put into the situation for consideration, we should distinguish between the roles of IVE and PolyU. We could tell you that IVE focuses more on technical training in terms of providing workshops, whereas PolyU concentrates on developing and training design professionals, such as graduate program for designers and design managers.

#### *3.3.3.2 Placement and development schemes for students*

- It is common to recruit design students from Hong Kong and in the Mainland. But it is interesting, from the findings of the study, that more placement schemes and opportunities are required and needed for the pre-career training curriculum.
- For placement schemes and the nature of what should be provided, it is suggested that placement schemes and its nature should be focused more on the advanced

development of the design, product, and the whole industry. For example, the development of designs for the next 5-10 years is also a concern, not just carrying out the immediate design work.

#### *3.3.3.3 Difficulties in finding the second generation for design management*

- It is noted that it is difficult to have a second generation in the market.
- PolyU has organized a joint MBA programme between the business school and the design school for training and developing design managers to meet the huge demand in the industry. This is an MBA in design and innovation, and is jointly conducted. It focuses on the cultivation of design management skills, such as formulating design strategies at a higher level of work through production and decision making to the market. Applications have tripled, and the programme is on its way.

### **3.3.4 Policy Makers**

#### *3.3.4.1 Chartered system for designers*

- It is recommended to have a chartered system for designers that can be similar to that for engineers and architects. In India, designers can be chartered after taking a test and having several years of experience.
- Benefits of the chartered system include ensuring that designers are accredited at a certain level and have the specific tools and skills for design.
- It may also serve as a stamp of approval by the industry and community. In addition, the charge of the designers can also be linked to the chartered system.

### **3.3.5 Design Industry**

#### *3.3.5.1 Supporting data to support enhancing Hong Kong design internationally*

- In order to cope with the international business that employers engage in, designers in Hong Kong must have an international background.
- Although plenty of local designs have won in local and overseas international competitions, many of the creative pieces are put down by judges from the industry (manufacturing) as the works are not manufacturable for the mass market. The winning designs are easy pieces that can sell.
- When we promote Hong Kong designs, it should be more open. Taking the Hong Kong Design Association Awards as an example, the same people have won the same awards for five years.

#### *3.3.5.2 Market Regulation*

- The market and trade should be regulated. Not being regulated makes the market too competitive. Policy makers should leverage Hong Kong designers to mainland designers. The local community should support the design industry in Hong Kong.
- It is suggested that a pricing system should be developed, such as setting a standard hourly rate. SMEs complain that designers charge too much that they prefer to hire design students for cost saving.

### **3.3.6 Other matters**

#### *3.3.6.1 Clarification of the terms and objectives of the study*

- During the discussion, presenters defined and clarified the definition of the terms used throughout the research study.