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

DesignSmart Research Project
Appendices [CHINESE MAINLAND]
2008

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University 香港理工大學
創新科技署 Innovation and Technology Commission
Department of Management & Marketing
School of Design

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1 Focus Group Appendix

1.1 Focus Group Arrangement

Focus group sessions held at the Guangzhou shi Baoyun qu xin shi Baiye Labour Market:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
1	15-Jul-2006	Chinese	12
2	18-Jul-2006	Chinese	8
		➔ **Total**	**20**

Focus group sessions held at the Guangzhou shi Tianhe qu New Tianhe Hotel:

No.	Date	Medium of Instruction	No. of Participants
3	23-Sep-2006	Chinese	3
4	27-Sep-2006	Chinese	2
		➔ **Total**	**5**

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

No.	NSIC	Industries	No. of Participants Engaged
1	192	皮革制品制造 Manufacture of Leather Product	6
2	243	乐器制造 Manufacture of Musical Instrument	1
3	245	游艺器材及娱乐用品制造 Manufacture of Artistic and Entertainment Product	2
4	299	其他橡胶制品制造 Manufacture of Other Rubber Products	1
5	364	印刷、制药、日化生产专用设备制造 Manufacture of Printing, Pharmacy, Daily Chemical Commodity	1
6	395	家用电力器具制造 Manufacture of Domestic Electrical Appliance	1
7	403	广播电视设备制造 Manufacture of Broadcasting and Television Product	1
8	411	通用仪器仪表制造 Manufacture of General Measuring Equipment	1

9	412	专用仪器仪表制造 Manufacture of Specific Measuring Equipment	1
10	421	工艺美术品制造 Manufacture of Artistic Product and Craft	1
11	429	其他未列明的制造业 Other Manufacturing Industries	1
12	637	机械设备、五金交电及电子产品批发 Machinery Equipment, Metallic Electrical Appliance and Electronic Product Wholesale	1
13	741	企业管理服务 Corporate Management Service	2
14	746	职业中介服务 Career Agency	4
15	752	工程和技术研究与试验发展 Engineering and Technological Research & Experimental Development	1
		➔ **Total**	**25**

1.2 Interview Guide for the Focus Group Sessions

1.2.1. Interview Guide for Design Employers for Chinese FG Session

⇨ 开幕致辞 (05:00 分钟)

会议主席:

首先，谨代表香港理工大学管理与市场学系，欢迎各位来到此次 focus group 参与 “配置设计从业人员技能、知识和能力，适应雇主期望和要求”的讨论，感谢各位对我们研究的支持。

我叫 [会议主席名字]，将会主持今天 focus group 的讨论。我先介绍一下今天 focus group 的参与者。从我左边起，这位是 [参与者 1 公司名称] 的 [参与者 1 名字] 先生/小姐，接下来是 …… *(直至介绍完毕)*。

此外，这是我们系的 [主持人名字]、[如有，副主持人名字]，他们将会带领本次 focus group 的讨论。另外，现时坐在我较远的 [会议纪录员名字]，他们协助纪录是次会议讨论。

我大概介绍一下本次研究目的，是次研究项目主要有四个研究目标：

- 研究对设计人才的需求和供给之间的差异

- 了解专业设计师和雇主各自的需求和期望
- 把握对专业设计师的培训及其职业发展的需求
- 了解在 PRD 中对设计服务的应用及需求的现状

您们都是设计行业的重要成员，您们的意见和想法对于我们研究的成功相当关键。

另外，需要提醒一下，我们会录音记录是次 focus group 的谈话内容。不过请放心，我们将对这些信息完全保密，不会用于本次研究之外的任何用途。即使在我们的研究报告中有所提及，也不会出现您们的名字。

⇨ 议程 (60:00 ~ 120:00 分钟*)

主持人：

问题层次	问题	*所需时间	优先程度
本质性	✧ 一般说来，您认为人力资源上的不匹配是当前设计产业面临的一个问题吗？ ➲ 您能举例说明一下在您组织中这种人力资源不匹配的问题吗？ ➲ 您认为设计产业中这种人力资源不匹配现象出现的可能原因是什么？	10 分钟	高
	✧ 如果这种人力资源上的不匹配状况继续下去，会对设计产业有什么影响？ ➲ 经济方面的影响？管理方面的影响？等等 ➲ 为什么？	10 分钟	中
重要的	✧ 对于一个设计师来说，您认为哪些技能/知识/能力/态度是很关键/重要的？（我们可以逐一讨论） ➲ 为什么说这些能力对于一个设计师是关键的/重要的？您能举例说明吗？ ➲ 除了这些能力外，您认为对设计师还有其它要求吗？	15 分钟	高

	✧ 在您的组织架构中，您是否清楚地对您的员工指出所需要的技能/知识/能力/态度？ ➲ 您认为员工了解您对他们技能/知识/能力/态度的期望吗？您的员工达到要求了吗？ ➲ 您公司有没有对不同层次的设计师就他们所需要的技能/知识/能力/态度拟定详细的工作规范？ ➲ 您认为有一份详细的工作规范说明书在设计行业是常见现象吗？ ➲ 您认为这样的工作规范说明书在设计行业中有必要吗？为什么？ ➲ 您评价设计师工作业绩的标准是什么？ ➲ 您公司是否已经建立起业绩评价政策和体系，并用它来衡量员工的工作绩效？您认为这样的政策和体系对设计行业里的公司来说重要吗？	15 分钟	高
	✧ 您公司在 PRD 有业务吗？ ➲ 如果回答“有”，在 PRD 是怎样开展业务的？（独资、合资、合伙、外包，等等），您能谈谈在 PRD 创业和经营的经历吗？ ➲ 如果回答“没有”，您公司有计划开拓这个市场吗？ ➲ 您认为 PRD 是设计行业的一个大的潜在市场吗？为什么？ ➲ 为了推动将设计服务产业对外向 PRD 的拓展，您认为香港应该制订什么愿景及策略？ ➲ 当您将设计业务拓展到 PRD 时，您认为人力资源不匹配的问题会有所改善还是更加严重？ ➲ 您公司准备派设计师到 PRD 工作吗？以什么方式准备呢？ ➲ 您觉得您的员工会愿意到 PRD 工作吗？为什么？在您安排员工到 PRD 工作之前，您会对他们进行特别的培训吗？	10 分钟	高
	✧ 要获得上面提到的技能/知识/能力/态度，您认为您的员工从学校/公司接受的培训是否足够？ ➲ 您的员工能否把从学校/公司学到的东西应用到实践中？为什么？能否举例说明？ ➲ 您的员工怎样来更新关于设计行业的技能/知识/能力/态度？您考虑为员工提供哪些毕业后专业（post-qualification）培训？ ➲ 您认为您的公司是否对员工提供了有效的在岗培训？是怎样进行培训的？ ➲ 您公司通过什么渠道来获取设计行业的最新信息？	10 分钟	高

	✧ 作为一名雇主，您认为设计师有哪些需要、希望和期望？香港设计行业又有哪些需求、希望和期望？ 专业设计师方面: ➲ 您认为大多数设计师有清楚的职业目标和职业路径吗？为什么？ ➲ 您认为在您的公司里中，员工是否有足够的职业发展机会？为什么？ ➲ 您在公司里怎样为设计师来创造一个良好的工作环境？（例如管理风格、报酬体系、职位升迁、激励机制、在岗培训、文化，等等） 设计行业方面 ➲ 香港是否为持续成长的企业提供了良好的平台和发展环境？为什么？ ➲ 在创造性和盈利之间怎样权衡？	10 分钟	高
辅助性的	✧ 您对改善设计行业内人力资源的匹配情况有什么好的建议吗？ ➲ 您对设计产业未来的发展趋势有什么看法？ ➲ 您能对未来 2～3 年内香港和 PRD 设计师的供求状况进行一下预测吗？	5 分钟	中

* 视乎参加人数

⇨ 结束 (01:00 分钟)

会议主席:

今天的讨论就到这里，再次感谢你们参与我们的研究。

1.3 Focus Group Transcripts

Full transcript of all focus group sessions was compiled and available upon request.

2 Survey Statistical Appendix

Table 2.1 Views from Employers on the Reasons for Design Manpower Mismatch

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
(R1) Manufacturing is moving out of the PRD region									
10 (2.1%)	125 (26.8%)	57 (12.2%)	78 (16.7%)	108 (23.1%)	88 (18.8%)	1 (0.2%)	467	3.89	1.544
(R2) Competence of foreign designers (e.g. HK designers) is rising									
8 (1.7%)	62 (13.2%)	32 (6.8%)	52 (11.1%)	124 (26.5%)	178 (38%)	12 (2.6%)	468	4.72	1.503
(R3) Supply of foreign designers (e.g. HK designers) is rising									
10 (2.1%)	63 (13.5%)	38 (8.2%)	98 (21.0%)	127 (27.3%)	118 (25.3%)	12 (2.6%)	466	4.44	1.464
(R4) More design services are being outsourced from the PRD region (e.g. HK)									
13 (2.8%)	91 (19.6%)	39 (8.4%)	121 (26.0%)	113 (24.3%)	73 (15.7%)	15 (3.2%)	465	4.09	1.508
(R5) A shortage of experienced designers in the job market									
10 (2.1%)	49 (10.5%)	24 (5.1%)	31 (6.6%)	98 (20.9%)	214 (45.7%)	42 (9.0%)	468	5.07	1.540
(R6) A shortage of competent designers in the job market									
6 (1.3%)	43 (9.2%)	33 (7.1%)	44 (9.4%)	120 (25.6%)	191 (40.8%)	31 (6.6%)	468	4.98	1.444
(R7) Ineffective recruitment channels									
6 (1.3%)	62 (13.2%)	53 (11.3%)	56 (12.0%)	142 (30.3%)	126 (26.9%)	23 (4.9%)	468	4.57	1.503
(R8) Employers' misunderstanding of the values of design services									
19 (4.1%)	97 (20.7%)	60 (12.8%)	77 (16.5%)	102 (21.8%)	101 (21.6%)	12 (2.6%)	468	4.06	1.624
(R9) A lack of government subsidies and financial loan support									

18 (3.9%)	82 (17.7%)	35 (7.6%)	116 (25.1%)	94 (20.3%)	90 (19.4%)	28 (6%)	463	4.23	1.616
18 (3.9%)									
9 (1.9%)	82 (17.5%)	45 (9.6%)	89 (19.0%)	122 (26.0%)	106 (22.6%)	16 (3.4%)	469	4.31	9 (1.9%)
9 (1.9%)									
21 (4.5%)	142 (30.4%)	62 (13.3%)	54 (11.6%)	102 (21.8%)	76 (16.3%)	10 (2.1%)	467	3.73	1.658
(R12) A limited promotion opportunities and career development in the design industry									
13 (2.8%)	94 (20.1%)	59 (12.6%)	41 (8.8%)	104 (22.3%)	126 (27.0%)	30 (6.4%)	467	4.34	1.718
(R13) A lack of encouragement of creativity in the workplace									
24 (5.1%)	107 (22.9%)	56 (12%)	55 (11.8%)	81 (17.3%)	119 (25.4%)	26 (5.6%)	468	4.12	1.783
(R14) Courses taught in the design institutes are not pragmatic enough to match the market needs									
1 (0.2%)	25 (5.4%)	39 (8.4%)	51 (10.9%)	119 (25.5%)	179 (38.3%)	53 (11.3%)	467	5.16	1.332
(R15) Design institutes provide inadequate placement programmes to train up design graduates									
2 (0.4%)	19 (4.1%)	32 (6.9%)	38 (8.2%)	122 (26.2%)	210 (45.1%)	43 (9.2%)	466	5.28	1.240
(R16) Admission requirements of design institutes are less restrictive than before									
2 (0.4%)	61 (13.1%)	37 (8%)	62 (13.4%)	124 (26.7%)	126 (27.2%)	52 (11.2%)	464	4.79	1.545
(R17) Insufficient staff training in the workplace									
5 (1.1%)	37 (7.9%)	55 (11.8%)	55 (11.8%)	131 (28.1%)	156 (33.4%)	28 (6.0%)	467	4.82	1.421
(R18) Lack of qualified and experienced designers to give coaching and guidance to junior designers in workplace									
8 (1.7%)	39 (8.4%)	47 (10.1%)	52 (11.2%)	120 (25.8%)	165 (35.4%)	35 (7.5%)	466	4.87	1.478

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.797

Table 2.2 Views from Employers on the Consequences of Manpower Mismatch

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
(C1) An increase in an organization's training expenses									
2 (0.4%)	51 (10.9%)	21 (4.5%)	57 (12.2%)	112 (23.9%)	213 (45.5%)	12 (2.6%)	468	4.95	1.382
(C2) A decline in organization's reputation and market share of its products									
7 (1.5%)	64 (13.7%)	40 (8.6%)	74 (15.9%)	107 (23%)	163 (35%)	11 (2.4%)	466	4.59	1.504
(C3) A loss of sustainable support from stakeholders									
11 (2.4%)	92 (19.9%)	52 (11.2%)	99 (21.4%)	105 (22.7%)	93 (20.1%)	11 (2.4%)	463	4.12	1.535
(C4) Business keeping on with the OEM model and finding it hard to advance to ODM or OBM									
3 (0.6%)	35 (7.5%)	24 (5.2%)	114 (24.6%)	102 (22%)	162 (34.9%)	24 (5.2%)	464	4.85	1.331
(C5) A reduction in the competitiveness of the design industry in Hong Kong									
11 (2.4%)	71 (15.2%)	50 (10.7%)	37 (7.9%)	99 (21.2%)	168 (36.1%)	30 (6.4%)	466	4.64	1.660
(C6) A lack of design originality									
3 (0.6%)	34 (7.3%)	35 (7.5%)	43 (9.2%)	87 (18.6%)	215 (46%)	50 (10.7%)	467	5.19	1.417
(C7) A lack of design professionalism									
4 (0.9%)	35 (7.5%)	37 (7.9%)	33 (7.1%)	124 (26.6%)	205 (43.9%)	29 (6.2%)	467	5.07	1.373
(C8) Creation of more barriers to extend and export local design services to the Mainland or other foreign countries									
6 (1.3%)	34 (7.3%)	23 (4.9%)	96 (20.6%)	101 (21.7%)	178 (38.2%)	28 (6.0%)	466	4.93	1.374
(C9) An increase in mutual dissatisfaction and conflicts among designers and their employers									

11 (2.4%)	63 (13.5%)	51 (11.0%)	108 (23.2%)	118 (25.4%)	93 (20.0%)	21 (4.5%)	465	4.34	1.488
(C10) More designers leaving the design industry and opting to work for other non-design related industries									
6 (1.3%)	50 (10.7%)	40 (8.6%)	114 (24.5%)	119 (25.5%)	119 (25.5%)	18 (3.9%)	466	4.54	1.402

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.808

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

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	Cannot Decide	Slightly Proficient	Proficient	Very Proficient			
(S1) Communication Skill									
6 (1.2%)	3 (0.6%)	12 (2.3%)	30 (5.8%)	63 (12.2%)	232 (44.9%)	171 (33.1%)	517	5.94	1.129
2 (0.4%)	23 (4.5%)	35 (6.8%)	38 (7.4%)	178 (34.8%)	184 (35.9%)	51 (10.0%)	512	5.20	1.246
(S2) Time Management									
2 (0.4%)	15 (2.9%)	21 (4.1%)	48 (9.3%)	88 (17.0%)	240 (46.4%)	103 (19.9%)	517	5.59	1.224
7 (1.4%)	22 (4.3%)	37 (7.2%)	70 (13.7%)	168 (32.9%)	166 (32.5%)	40 (7.8%)	511	5.02	1.301
(S3) Language Skills									
3 (0.6%)	9 (1.7%)	27 (5.2%)	35 (6.8%)	109 (21.2%)	225 (43.7%)	107 (20.8%)	515	5.60	1.198
0 (0.0%)	23 (4.5%)	46 (9.0%)	63 (12.4%)	188 (36.9%)	139 (27.3%)	49 (9.6%)	509	5.03	1.253
(S4) Computer/IT Skill									

1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	11 (2.1%)	24 (4.7%)	39 (7.6%)	207 (40.2%)	229 (44.5%)	515	6.17	1.022
2 (0.4%)	13 (2.5%)	10 (1.9%)	44 (8.6%)	96 (18.7%)	214 (41.6%)	134 (26.1%)	514	5.73	1.185
(S5) Hand Drawing Skill									
1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	9 (1.7%)	17 (3.3%)	42 (8.1%)	210 (40.7%)	233 (45.2%)	516	6.21	0.975
0 (0.0%)	8 (1.6%)	17 (3.3%)	27 (5.3%)	99 (19.3%)	215 (41.8%)	147 (28.6%)	514	5.83	1.103
(S6) Presentation Skill									
1 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	23 (4.4%)	22 (4.3%)	83 (16.1%)	241 (46.6%)	145 (28%)	517	5.88	1.053
2 (0.4%)	12 (2.3%)	42 (8.2%)	42 (8.2%)	174 (33.9%)	174 (33.9%)	66 (12.9%)	513	5.27	1.218
(S7) Interpersonal Skill									
2 (0.4%)	5 (1.0%)	22 (4.3%)	53 (10.3%)	124 (24.1%)	209 (40.6%)	100 (19.4%)	515	5.56	1.137
1 (0.2%)	21 (4.1%)	38 (7.4%)	87 (17.0%)	173 (33.7%)	139 (27.1%)	53 (10.3%)	513	5.04	1.253

Note: The above measurement items that measured usefulness exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.943; whereas those items that measured proficiency exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.924.

(K1) International View of Vision									
0 (0.0%)	8 (1.6%)	23 (4.5%)	42 (8.2%)	92 (17.9%)	222 (43.1%)	128 (24.9%)	515	5.71	1.150
1 (0.2%)	34 (6.6%)	47 (9.1%)	72 (14%)	163 (31.6%)	139 (26.9%)	59 (11.4%)	516	4.98	1.369
(K2) Manufacturing Production Workflow/Processes									
1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	11 (2.1%)	28 (5.4%)	85 (16.5%)	241 (46.9%)	145 (28.2%)	514	5.91	0.997
2 (0.4%)	12 (2.3%)	39 (7.6%)	44 (8.5%)	151 (29.3%)	197 (38.2%)	70 (13.6%)	516	5.34	1.221

(K3) Fine Art									
0 (0.0%)	9 (1.7%)	18 (3.5%)	35 (6.8%)	102 (19.8%)	222 (43.0%)	130 (25.2%)	516	5.74	1.118
2 (0.4%)	16 (3.1%)	33 (6.4%)	63 (12.2%)	149 (28.8%)	184 (35.6%)	69 (13.3%)	517	5.27	1.247
(K4) Marketing									
1 (0.2%)	8 (1.6%)	13 (2.5%)	37 (7.2%)	132 (25.6%)	223 (43.3%)	101 (19.6%)	515	5.65	1.069
1 (0.2%)	27 (5.2%)	45 (8.7%)	72 (14.0%)	183 (35.5%)	149 (28.9%)	37 (7.2%)	515	4.96	1.260
(K5) Mainland China									
1 (0.2%)	7 (1.4%)	21 (4.1%)	41 (8.0%)	106 (20.6%)	240 (46.6%)	99 (19.2%)	515	5.64	1.106
4 (0.8%)	16 (3.1%)	31 (6%)	62 (12.0%)	173 (33.5%)	178 (34.5%)	51 (9.9%)	516	5.18	1.221
(K6) Using Color									
1 (0.2%)	13 (2.5%)	12 (2.3%)	38 (7.4%)	87 (16.9%)	217 (42.2%)	146 (28.4%)	514	5.79	1.170
1 (0.2%)	14 (2.7%)	24 (4.7%)	58 (11.3%)	126 (24.6%)	210 (40.9%)	79 (15.4%)	513	5.43	1.203
(K7) Management									
1 (0.2%)	21 (4.1%)	32 (6.2%)	64 (12.4%)	143 (27.8%)	189 (36.7%)	65 (12.6%)	515	5.24	1.260
7 (1.4%)	27 (5.2%)	59 (11.4%)	81 (15.7%)	172 (33.3%)	131 (25.4%)	38 (7.4%)	516	4.81	1.355

Note: The above measurement items that measured usefulness exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.877; whereas those items that measured proficiency exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.870

(C1) Creativity									
0 (0.0%)	3 (0.6%)	8 (1.6%)	8 (1.6%)	56 (10.9%)	171 (33.1%)	270 (52.3%)	516	6.31	0.911

1 (0.2%)	13 (2.5%)	20 (3.9%)	45 (8.8%)	176 (34.2%)	180 (35%)	78 (15.2%)	514	5.41	1.145
(C2) Analytical Skill									
0 (0.0%)	4 (0.8%)	6 (1.2%)	11 (2.1%)	76 (14.8%)	249 (48.3%)	169 (32.8%)	515	6.07	0.887
2 (0.4%)	25 (4.9%)	40 (7.8%)	86 (16.7%)	161 (31.3%)	137 (26.6%)	63 (12.2%)	515	5.03	1.324
(C3) Business Sense									
0 (0.0%)	9 (1.7%)	12 (2.3%)	42 (8.1%)	117 (22.7%)	194 (37.6%)	142 (27.5%)	516	5.75	1.120
3 (0.6%)	16 (3.1%)	35 (6.8%)	68 (13.2%)	156 (30.2%)	174 (33.7%)	63 (12.2%)	516	5.20	1.257
(C4) Adaptable to Change									
0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	12 (2.3%)	24 (4.7%)	89 (17.2%)	246 (47.7%)	143 (27.7%)	516	5.93	0.950
3 (0.6%)	20 (3.9%)	31 (6.0%)	68 (13.2%)	144 (28.0%)	158 (30.7%)	90 (17.5%)	515	5.27	1.330
(C5) Art Sense									
1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	9 (1.7%)	43 (8.3%)	97 (18.8%)	203 (39.3%)	159 (30.8%)	516	5.86	1.068
3 (0.6%)	11 (2.1%)	22 (4.3%)	50 (9.7%)	128 (24.8%)	192 (37.2%)	109 (21.1%)	516	5.53	1.228
(C6) Imagination									
1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	5 (1.0%)	21 (4.1%)	65 (12.6%)	199 (38.6%)	224 (43.4%)	516	6.18	0.927
1 (0.2%)	11 (2.1%)	28 (5.4%)	46 (8.9%)	130 (25.1%)	190 (36.8%)	110 (21.3%)	517	5.53	1.219
(C7) Quick Thinking									
0 (0.0%)	3 (0.6%)	4 (0.8%)	24 (4.7%)	59 (11.4%)	206 (39.9%)	220 (42.6%)	516	6.17	0.928
0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	3 (9.1%)	14 (42.4%)	4 (12.1%)	8 (24.2%)	3 (9.1%)	33	4.73	1.281

Note: The above measurement items that measured usefulness exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.912; whereas those items that measured proficiency exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.899.									
(A1) Willingness to Learn									
1 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	6 (1.2%)	12 (2.3%)	48 (9.3%)	239 (46.2%)	209 (40.4%)	517	6.21	0.874
3 (0.6%)	5 (.01%)	20 (3.9%)	35 (6.8%)	131 (25.3%)	228 (44.1%)	94 (18.2%)	517	5.61	1.102
(A2) Enthusiasm									
0 (0.0%)	5 (1.0%)	6 (1.2%)	17 (3.3%)	78 (15.1%)	235 (45.5%)	176 (34%)	517	6.05	0.939
0 (0.0%)	13 (2.5%)	13 (2.5%)	54 (10.5%)	143 (27.7%)	207 (40.1%)	85 (16.5%)	516	5.51	1.121
(A3) Open Mindedness									
1 (0.2%)	8 (1.6%)	7 (1.4%)	41 (7.9%)	98 (19.0%)	229 (44.4%)	132 (25.6%)	516	5.79	1.069
1 (0.2%)	12 (2.3%)	25 (4.9%)	82 (15.9%)	146 (28.3%)	185 (35.9%)	63 (12.2%)	515	5.28	1.178
(A4) Humbleness									
3 (0.6%)	11 (2.1%)	14 (2.7%)	52 (10.1%)	120 (23.3%)	216 (41.9%)	100 (19.4%)	516	5.56	1.172
3 (0.6%)	16 (3.1%)	34 (6.6%)	74 (14.4%)	156 (30.4%)	181 (35.3%)	48 (9.4%)	513	5.15	1.228
(A5) Diligence									
1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	12 (2.3%)	17 (3.3%)	44 (8.5%)	243 (47.1%)	198 (38.4%)	516	6.15	0.933
1 (0.2%)	9 (1.7%)	19 (3.7%)	39 (7.6%)	132 (25.6%)	215 (41.7%)	99 (19.2%)	515	5.60	1.123
(A6) Job Commitment									
1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	7 (1.4%)	20 (3.9%)	56 (10.8%)	223 (43.1%)	207 (40.0%)	517	6.14	0.953

1 (0.2%)	11 (2.1%)	19 (3.7%)	50 (9.7%)	113 (21.9%)	216 (41.8%)	106 (20.5%)	517	5.59	1.172
(A7) Eagerness to New Experience									
1 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	5 (1.0%)	41 (7.9%)	87 (16.9%)	223 (43.2%)	157 (30.4%)	516	5.92	0.992
3 (0.6%)	8 (1.6%)	27 (5.2%)	59 (11.4%)	134 (26%)	180 (34.9%)	104 (20.2%)	516	5.47	1.229

Note: The above measurement items that measured usefulness exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.879; where as those items that measured proficiency exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0913.

Table 2.4 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
(T1) To provide more pragmatic courses									
1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	8 (1.5%)	19 (3.7%)	47 (9.1%)	314 (60.7%)	124 (24%)	517	5.99	0.889
(T2) Broadening general knowledge									
1 (0.2%)	11 (2.1%)	11 (2.1%)	23 (4.4%)	101 (19.5%)	283 (54.7%)	87 (16.8%)	517	5.73	1.024
(T3) Training to strengthen capabilities									
1 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	2 (0.4%)	22 (4.3%)	53 (10.3%)	307 (59.7%)	127 (24.7%)	514	6.02	0.817
(T4) More promotion for professionism									
1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	2 (0.4%)	15 (2.9%)	78 (15.1%)	285 (55.1%)	133 (25.7%)	517	6.00	0.838
(T5) More placement opportunities									

1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	16 (3.1%)	74 (14.3%)	273 (52.8%)	149 (28.8%)	517	6.05	0.828
(T6) More diversified courses									
1 (0.2%)	11 (2.1%)	21 (4.1%)	38 (7.4%)	94 (18.3%)	242 (47%)	108 (21%)	515	5.66	1.155
(T7) Up-to-date course content									
2 (0.4%)	2 (0.4%)	2 (0.4%)	21 (4.1%)	46 (8.9%)	276 (53.4%)	168 (32.5%)	517	6.11	0.872
(T8) Courses that are comprehensive and focused									
1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	4 (0.8%)	30 (5.8%)	103 (19.9%)	249 (48.2%)	126 (24.4%)	517	5.86	0.949
(T9) Stringent entry requirements									
4 (0.8%)	10 (1.9%)	17 (3.3%)	66 (12.8%)	107 (20.8%)	234 (45.5%)	76 (14.8%)	514	5.47	1.180

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.830.

Table 2.5 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
(W1) Providing more on-the-job training									
1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	13 (2.5%)	19 (3.7%)	88 (17.1%)	327 (63.4%)	64 (12.4%)	516	5.76	0.887
(W2) Providing more support for off-the-job training									
1 (0.2%)	12 (2.3%)	11 (2.1%)	33 (6.4%)	138 (26.7%)	266 (51.6%)	55 (10.7%)	516	5.54	1.018
(W3) Providing more site visits									

1 (0.2%)	10 (1.9%)	18 (3.5%)	44 (8.5%)	156 (30.3%)	220 (42.7%)	66 (12.8%)	515	5.46	1.077
(W4) Providing favourable work environment that encourages continuing education									
1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	6 (1.2%)	19 (3.7%)	78 (15.2%)	320 (62.3%)	89 (17.3%)	514	5.89	0.805
(W5) Providing visits to manufacturing/production lines									
3 (0.6%)	7 (1.4%)	11 (2.1%)	41 (8.0%)	109 (21.2%)	271 (52.7%)	72 (14.0%)	514	5.62	1.042

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.760.

Table 2.6 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
(H1) Formal taught courses									
1 (0.2%)	10 (1.9%)	27 (5.2%)	28 (5.4%)	142 (27.6%)	259 (50.3%)	48 (9.3%)	515	5.46	1.064
(H2) Paper media (e.g. magazines, newspaper, etc)									
0 (0.0%)	11 (2.2%)	24 (4.7%)	42 (8.3%)	166 (32.8%)	226 (44.7%)	37 (7.3%)	506	5.35	1.043
(H3) Internet									
0 (0.0%)	4 (0.8%)	9 (1.7%)	23 (4.5%)	114 (22.1%)	299 (58.1%)	66 (12.8%)	515	5.73	0.860
(H4) Seminars									
0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	11 (2.1%)	37 (7.2%)	121 (23.6%)	290 (56.5%)	53 (10.3%)	513	5.65	0.855
(H5) Site visits									
0 (0.0%)	5 (1.0%)	11 (2.1%)	36 (7.0%)	101 (19.7%)	284 (55.5%)	75 (14.6%)	512	5.71	0.943

(H6) Social networks									
1 (0.2%)	16 (3.1%)	14 (2.8%)	98 (19.3%)	186 (36.5%)	157 (30.8%)	37 (7.3%)	509	5.10	1.099
(H7) Competition participation									
0 (0.0%)	9 (1.8%)	15 (2.9%)	47 (9.2%)	109 (21.3%)	245 (47.9%)	87 (17%)	512	5.62	1.072

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.765.

Table 2.7 Agreeableness of 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
(P1) Trading environment improved									
0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	4 (0.8%)	18 (3.8%)	100 (21.2%)	319 (67.6%)	29 (6.1%)	472	5.73	0.706
(P2) Bureaucratic procedures simplified									
2 (0.4%)	18 (3.8%)	23 (4.9%)	80 (17.0%)	144 (30.6%)	187 (39.8%)	16 (3.4%)	470	5.07	1.145
(P3) Clients favour more branded products									
1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	8 (1.7%)	32 (6.8%)	82 (17.4%)	293 (62.2%)	51 (10.8%)	471	5.70	0.900

(P4) Rich resources in the mainland									
2 (0.4%)	3 (0.6%)	8 (1.7%)	21 (4.5%)	79 (16.8%)	285 (60.5%)	73 (15.5%)	471	5.80	0.908
(P5) Demand for high quality design work									
0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	13 (2.8%)	46 (9.7%)	311 (65.9%)	98 (20.8%)	472	6.03	0.712

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.663.

Table 2.8 Views from Employers on the Services provided by Hong Kong Designers

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
(E1) Creative									
1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	8 (1.6%)	35 (6.8%)	139 (26.9%)	285 (55.2%)	47 (9.1%)	516	5.62	0.842
(E2) International view									
1 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	6 (1.2%)	23 (4.4%)	96 (18.6%)	291 (56.3%)	98 (19%)	517	5.85	0.865
(E3) Strong design idea									
0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	11 (2.1%)	47 (9.1%)	129 (25%)	252 (48.7%)	76 (14.7%)	517	5.64	0.940
(E4) Strong art sense									
0 (0.0%)	9 (1.8%)	20 (3.9%)	85 (16.6%)	151 (29.4%)	197 (38.4%)	51 (9.9%)	513	5.29	1.087

(E5) Language advantage									
1 (0.2%)	12 (2.3%)	25 (4.8%)	54 (10.5%)	145 (28.1%)	223 (43.2%)	56 (10.9%)	516	5.37	1.127
(E6) Rich brand knowledge									
0 (0.0%)	3 (0.6%)	12 (2.3%)	48 (9.3%)	136 (26.4%)	250 (48.5%)	66 (12.8%)	515	5.58	0.947
(E7) Good quality									
1 (0.2%)	15 (2.9%)	27 (5.2%)	79 (15.3%)	156 (30.3%)	197 (38.3%)	40 (7.8%)	515	5.18	1.148
(E8) Good working attitude									
0 (0.0%)	9 (1.7%)	24 (4.7%)	74 (14.3%)	133 (25.8%)	216 (41.9%)	60 (11.6%)	516	5.36	1.114
(E9) Hard working									
2 (0.4%)	10 (1.9%)	19 (3.7%)	101 (19.6%)	139 (27%)	192 (37.4%)	51 (9.9%)	514	5.23	1.141
(E10) Informed									
0 (0.0%)	5 (1%)	15 (2.9%)	44 (8.6%)	132 (25.7%)	250 (48.6%)	68 (13.2%)	514	5.58	0.987
(E11) Experienced									
0 (0.0%)	13 (2.5%)	19 (3.7%)	86 (16.6%)	166 (32.1%)	200 (38.7%)	33 (6.4%)	517	5.20	1.070
(E12) Location advantage									
0 (0.0%)	15 (2.9%)	24 (4.7%)	51 (9.9%)	131 (25.4%)	248 (48.2%)	46 (8.9%)	515	5.38	1.115
(E13) High working efficiency									
0 (0.0%)	8 (1.6%)	22 (4.3%)	83 (16.2%)	138 (26.9%)	207 (40.4%)	55 (10.7%)	513	5.32	1.097

(E14) High flexibility									
1 (0.2%)	17 (3.3%)	27 (5.2%)	120 (23.2%)	151 (29.2%)	169 (32.7%)	32 (6.2%)	517	5.01	1.160
(E15) Considerate									
1 (0.2%)	15 (2.9%)	30 (5.8%)	136 (26.3%)	162 (31.3%)	154 (29.8%)	19 (3.7%)	517	4.90	1.106
(E16) High charge									
4 (0.8%)	18 (3.5%)	29 (5.6%)	83 (16.1%)	86 (16.7%)	211 (41.0%)	84 (16.3%)	515	5.33	1.336
(E17) Bad language communication skill									
6 (1.2%)	125 (24.2%)	103 (20%)	133 (25.8%)	87 (16.9%)	56 (10.9%)	6 (1.2%)	516	3.70	1.377
(E18) Not familiar with Mainland culture									
4 (0.8%)	75 (14.6%)	75 (14.6%)	108 (21%)	136 (26.5%)	104 (20.2%)	12 (2.3%)	514	4.28	1.418

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.952.

Table 2.9 Views from Mainland Employers on the Needs, Expectations, and Wishes of Design Industry

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Cannot Decide	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	SD
(N1) Educating the general public to understand and appreciate design starting from childhood									
2 (0.4%)	6 (1.2%)	16 (3.1%)	51 (9.9%)	109 (21.1%)	283 (54.7%)	50 (9.7%)	517	5.53	1.022
(N2) Providing more placement opportunities for design students before graduation									

0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	6 (1.2%)	66 (12.8%)	331 (64%)	112 (21.7%)	517	6.05	0.661
(N3) Providing more favorable work environments for designers (e.g. providing more staff training and room for creativity)									
0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (1.7%)	68 (13.2%)	333 (64.5%)	104 (20.2%)	516	6.02	0.682
(N4) Putting more efforts into uniting designers, design associations and design industries to create more synergic and cooperative relationships									
0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	6 (1.2%)	27 (5.2%)	85 (16.4%)	321 (62.1%)	77 (14.9%)	517	5.84	0.795
(N5) Introducing a professional chartered system for designers to promote their professionalism									
4 (0.8%)	3 (0.6%)	11 (2.1%)	33 (6.4%)	113 (21.9%)	268 (51.8%)	85 (16.4%)	517	5.69	1.012
(N6) Enhancing Hong Kong designers' image through organizing more international competitions and exhibitions									
0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	13 (2.5%)	31 (6%)	105 (20.3%)	282 (54.7%)	84 (16.3%)	516	5.76	0.898
(N7) Providing more financial and loan supports for design entrepreneurs to improve their product diversification and brand establishment									
4 (0.8%)	15 (2.9%)	9 (1.7%)	56 (10.9%)	92 (17.8%)	258 (50.0%)	82 (15.9%)	516	5.56	1.180
(N8) Introducing stricter legislation for the protection of intellectual property									
0 (0.0%)	4 (0.8%)	8 (1.6%)	40 (7.8%)	69 (13.4%)	263 (51.1%)	131 (25.4%)	515	5.89	0.976

Note: The above measurement items exhibited good reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.799.

Table 2.10 Views from Mainland 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
(T1) Hong Kong should continue to serve as a bridge for foreign enterprises to enter the PRD market.									
1 (0.2%)	16 (3.1%)	23 (4.5%)	56 (10.9%)	141 (27.4%)	257 (49.9%)	21 (4.1%)	515	5.28	1.088
(T2) There is an increasing demand for professionals who have a good mastery of design management.									
1 (0.2%)	0(0.0%)	5 (1%)	22 (4.3%)	98 (19%)	348 (67.4%)	42 (8.1%)	516	5.77	0.724
(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.									
2 (0.4%)	23 (4.5%)	22 (4.3%)	62 (12.0%)	112 (21.7%)	251 (48.6%)	44 (8.5%)	516	5.30	1.222
(T4) More attempts are being made for organizations to move from OEM to ODM or OBM.									
2 (0.4%)	5 (1.0%)	4 (0.8%)	78 (15.2%)	112 (21.8%)	279 (54.3%)	34 (6.6%)	514	5.46	0.963
(T5) There is an increasing amount of design service outsourcing.									
6 (1.2%)	88 (17.1%)	49 (9.5%)	149 (28.9%)	129 (25%)	84 (16.3%)	11 (2.1%)	516	4.17	1.396
(T6) More design services are being exported to the Mainland.									
3 (0.6%)	30 (5.8%)	26 (5.0%)	103 (20.0%)	146 (28.3%)	193 (37.5%)	14 (2.7%)	515	4.93	1.225

Note: The above measurement items exhibited moderate reliability, Cronbach's alpha [α] =0.677.