

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

*Opinion Survey on School Principals' Ranking of Universities
in Hong Kong 2013*

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



SURVEY REPORT

Compiled by
Chung Ting-yiu Robert, Pang Ka-lai Karie,
Lee Wai-kin Frank and Chan Wai-man Joyce

24 June 2013

Copyright of this report is held jointly by Media Education Info-Tech Co. Ltd and Public Opinion Programme, the University of Hong Kong. Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of the University of Hong Kong. Dr Robert Chung is fully responsible for the work of the POP.

1. Research Background

- 1.1 In parallel with the "Public Ranking" telephone survey, POP was commissioned by Media Education Info-Tech Co. Ltd for the seventh time to conduct this local school principal survey which aimed to study their perception towards the institutions of higher education in Hong Kong.
- 1.2 POP was responsible for designing the questionnaire, inputting and processing the data while Media Education Info-Tech Co. Ltd was responsible for all other survey logistics such as obtaining the contact list of schools from the database of Education Bureau (i.e. 518 valid addresses), printing and mailing out the questionnaires, following up with chasers, as well as collecting the returned questionnaires. A total of 7 key questions were asked in this year's questionnaire, which is attached in Annex A.
- 1.3 POP was not involved nor consulted on how to make use of the findings from this principal survey to compile the overall rankings of local universities. This was the sole responsibility of Media Education Info-Tech Co. Ltd who would usually take a handful of other elements into consideration.

2. Research Design

- 2.1 The target population of this survey was defined as the principals of all local secondary schools excluding the international schools. No sampling was required.
- 2.2 This study was conducted by self-administered paper questionnaire, returned by the principals via mail or fax. The data collection period started from 28 May and ended on 14 June, 2013. A total of 109 questionnaires were received via fax and were considered valid. The response rate of this survey was 21.0%, with a standard error of sampling of no more than 4.3%, had it been a representative survey (Table 1).

Table 1. Contact information of the survey

Successful Cases	Distributed Questionnaires	Response rate*	Standard Error**
109	518	21.0%	4.3%

* Response rate is calculated as the number of successful cases divided by the number of distributed questionnaires.

** Calculated as if these are random sample surveys.

3. Research Findings

3.1 The questionnaire comprised 7 key questions. First of all, all respondents were asked to evaluate each of the 10 institutions based on their perception of its overall performance using a scale of 0-10, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. Respondents were suggested to take into account the institution's local and international reputation, facilities, campus environment, qualification of its teaching staff, academic research performance, conduct and quality of its students, its learning atmosphere, as well as the diversification and degree of recognition for its courses. Survey results indicated that, in terms of principals' perception, HKU received the highest mean score of 8.76, rated by 109 principals, CUHK came second with an average score of 8.51, whereas HKUST ranked third with a mean score of 8.10. For other universities' performance scores, please refer to Table 2 below.

Table 2. Overall Performance of Each Institution

[Q1] Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of each institution of higher education after taking into consideration its local and international reputation, facilities and campus environment, qualification of its teaching staff, academic research performance, conduct and quality of students as well as its learning atmosphere, diversification and level of recognition of its courses, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. How would you rate the following institutions?				
	Average	Standard error	No of raters	Recognition
HKU	8.76	0.14	109	100.0%
CUHK	8.51	0.13	109	100.0%
HKUST	8.10	0.11	104	95.4%
PolyU	7.16	0.10	102	93.6%
CityU	6.64*	0.10	98	89.9%
HKBU	6.64*	0.09	103	94.5%
HKIED	6.06	0.11	104	95.4%
LU	5.80	0.12	101	92.7%
HKSJU	5.49	0.14	95	87.2%
OUHK	5.27	0.14	93	85.3%

* In three decimal places, the respective mean score of CityU and HKBU are 6.643 and 6.641. Thus, they are ranked fifth and sixth respectively.

3.2 With respect to the perceived overall performance of the Vice-Chancellor/ President/Principal of each institution, taking into consideration one's local and international reputation, approachability, leadership, vision, social credibility and public relations, Professor Joseph S.Y. Sung topped the list with an average score of 9.06 rated by 107 respondents. Professor Lap-chee Tsui of HKU followed and attained a mean score of 8.38 rated by 106 respondents. Meanwhile, Professor Tony F. Chan of HKUST came third scoring 7.60 and rated by 87 respondents (Table 3).

Table 3. Overall Performance of Each Vice-Chancellor / President / Principal

[Q2] Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of Vice-Chancellor / President / Principal of each institution while taking his local and international reputation, approachability to the public, leadership, vision, social credibility and public relations into consideration, with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half. How would you rate the following Vice-Chancellors / Presidents / Principal?

	Average	Standard error	No of raters	Recognition
CUHK – Prof. Joseph J.Y. SUNG	9.06	0.10	107	98.2%
HKU – Prof. Lap-chee TSUI	8.38	0.12	106	97.2%
HKUST – Prof. Tony F. CHAN	7.60	0.13	87	79.8%
HKIED – Prof. Yin Cheong CHENG	7.32	0.14	93	85.3%
PolyU – Prof. Timothy W. TONG	6.81	0.15	79	72.5%
HKSYU – Dr. Chi-yung CHUNG	6.66	0.20	79	72.5%
HKBU – Prof. Albert CHAN	6.59	0.17	91	83.5%
CityU – Prof. Way KUO	6.49	0.17	83	76.1%
OUHK – Prof. John C.Y. LEONG	6.15	0.17	72	66.1%
LU – Prof. Yuk-shee CHAN	5.99	0.16	75	68.8%

3.3 The next question asked the respondents' opinion on the qualities which most Hong Kong university students lack of. Results showed that "commitment to society" was most commonly cited, as chosen by 60% of respondents. The next tier included "work attitude", "conduct, honesty", "global prospect / foresight" and "social / interpersonal skills", accounting for and 58%, 46%, 44% and 41% of respondents correspondingly (Table 4).

Table 4. Perceived Deficiencies among the University Students in Hong Kong

[Q3] What do you think are the qualities which most Hong Kong university students lack of? You may check as many choices as you like.			
	Frequency	% of total responses (Base = 505 responses from 107 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 107)
Commitment to society	64	12.7%	59.8%
Work attitude	62	12.3%	57.9%
Conduct, honesty	49	9.7%	45.8%
Global prospect / foresight	47	9.3%	43.9%
Social / interpersonal skills	44	8.7%	41.1%
Proficiency in Chinese, English and Putonghua	37	7.3%	34.6%
Emotion stability	30	5.9%	28.0%
Job opportunity	28	5.5%	26.2%
Critical thinking and problem-solving ability	25	5.0%	23.4%
Communication skills	25	5.0%	23.4%
Social / work experience	23	4.6%	21.5%
Creativity	22	4.4%	20.6%
Academic and professional knowledge	18	3.6%	16.8%
Financial management	18	3.6%	16.8%
Self-confidence	11	2.2%	10.3%
Computer proficiency	1	0.2%	0.9%
Not lack of anything	1	0.2%	0.9%
Total	505	100.0%	
Base	107		
Missing case(s)	2		

3.4 Question 4 is newly added this year and asked the principals what their major concerns are on whether to teach moral and national education in their school and multiple answers were allowed. Results revealed that 69% of the principals were most concerned with “the curriculum”, while 49% with “directions of teaching” and 45% with “teaching materials”. Other less common concerns included “assessment criteria”, “teachers’ reactions”, “public opinion” and “parents’ reactions”, accounting for 31% to 36% of the total sample. Meanwhile, 9% of the principals would not consider teaching moral and national education in their school as all (Tables 5 & 6).

Table 5. Major concerns on teaching moral and national education

[Q4] On whether to teach moral and national education in your school, what are your major concerns?	Frequency	% of total responses (Base = 357 responses from 108 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 108)
The curriculum	75	21.0%	69.4%
Directions of teaching	53	14.8%	49.1%
Teaching materials	49	13.7%	45.4%
Assessment criteria	39	10.9%	36.1%
Teachers' reactions	35	9.8%	32.4%
Public opinion	34	9.5%	31.5%
Parents' reactions	33	9.2%	30.6%
Learning motivations	20	5.6%	18.5%
Will not consider at all	10	2.8%	9.3%
Others (see Table 6)	9	2.5%	8.3%
Total	357	100.0%	
Base	108		
Missing case(s)	1		

Table 6. Q4 (Other answers in exact wordings)

1. 已有其他科目含有相關元素
2. 必定要開，毋需考慮
3. 並非推行德育及國民教育科最適切之方案
4. 香港既是中國的一個城市，便有責任讓他們認識中國。
5. 教師工作量
6. 課時的安排
7. 課程在早會、週會、通識已包括
8. 學生反應
9. 學校教育理念

3.5 Question 5 is also newly added this year and asked school principals whether they thought the policy on the Secondary School Places Allocation system should be continued. Results revealed that 47% of the principals thought it should be continued, while 53% believed it should not. The principals were then asked to provide some reasons for their choices. Among the 50 principals who thought the policy should be continued, 45 (90% of sub-sample) believe the policy could ensure “gender equality”. Follow at a considerable distance, 8 thought it could ensure “more even academic performance” of students. 7 each found it could “facilitates students’ social development” and believed “no problem with the policy”. As for why those 56 principals thought the policy should not be continued, 50 (91% of sub-sample) believed it was “unfair to boys due to their late development”. 26 each thought it would cause “gender imbalance” and “affect future studies and careers of the boys” while 14 believed it would “affect students’ social development” (Tables 7 to 10).

Table 7. Opinions on the policy on the Secondary School Places Allocation system

[Q5a] Since 2002, places for boys and girls are no longer handled separately in the Secondary School Places Allocation system. Do you think the policy should be continued?		
	Frequency	% of valid respondents (Base = 106)
Should continue	50	47.2%
Should not continue	56	52.8%
Total	106	100.0%
Base	109	
Missing case(s)	3	

Table 8. Reasons for continuing the policy

[Q5b] [Only ask those who answered “should continue” in Q5a, base=50] Why?			
	Frequency	% of total responses (Base = 68 responses from 50 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 50)
Gender equality	45	66.2%	90.0%
More even academic performance	8	11.8%	16.0%
Facilitates students’ social development	7	10.3%	14.0%
No problem with the policy	7	10.3%	14.0%
Facilitates teaching	1	1.5%	2.0%
Total	68	100.0%	
Base	50		
Missing case(s)	0		

Table 9. Reasons for not continuing the policy

[Q5c] [Only ask those who answered "should not continue" in Q5a, base=56] Why?			
	Frequency	% of total responses (Base = 124 responses from 55 respondents)	% of total sample (Base = 55)
Unfair to boys due to their late development	50	40.3%	90.9%
Gender imbalance	26	21.0%	47.3%
Affects future studies and careers of the boys	26	21.0%	47.3%
Affects students' social development	14	11.3%	25.5%
Affects school facilities	8	6.5%	14.5%
Total	124	100.0%	
Base	55		
Missing case(s)	1		

Table 10. Q5-Other comments on the policy on the Secondary School Places Allocation system (in exact wordings)

1. Difficult to decide.
2. 阻礙男生多元化發展 (因為現時評核以語文決定派位)
3. 希望盡快取消這種派位方法，每間學校 (男女校) 比例相約，讓青年人「身心」平衡發展，符合新高中多元化學習的精神。
4. 回應社會普遍對平等的要求
5. 如沒有能照顧不同學生需要的措施配合下，不宜按能力分組派位，以致造成更多的不公平
6. 應透過 positive discrimination 增強向高小男生的支援，協助男生突破因較遲成熟而產生的學習障礙。

3.6 Next, respondents were asked to rate how confident they were in the Hong Kong education system led by the Education Bureau using a scale of 0 to 100 marks, in which higher marks indicated a higher level of confidence. Results showed that 102 valid respondents gave a mean score of 53.8 marks, which was subject to a standard error of 1.80 marks (Table 11).

Table 11. Confidence in the Hong Kong education system

[Q6] Overall speaking, how confident are you in the education system led by the Education Bureau? Please rate your confidence in 0 to 100 marks, 0 represents not confident at all, 50 represents half-half and 100 represents very confident.		
	Frequency	% of valid respondents (Base = 105)
0 – 9	4	3.8
10 – 19	1	1.0
20 – 29	1	1.0
30 – 39	7	6.7
40 – 49	11	10.5
50	28	26.7
51 – 59	3	2.9
60 – 69	21	20.0
70 – 79	17	16.2
80 – 89	7	6.7
90 – 100	2	1.9
Don't know	3	2.9
Total	105	100.0%
Missing case(s)	4	
Mean	53.8	
Median	50.0	
Standard error of mean	1.80	
Valid base	102	

3.7 The last question was in open-end format that served to probe for respondents' in-depth opinions regarding the subject matter and/or the survey. Please refer to Table 9 below for the submissions received.

Table 12. Opinions / Suggestions from School Principals (in exact wordings)

[Q7] Is there any other opinion you would like to bring to the attention of the researchers? [open-end question]	
1.	EDB shall have short, medium and long term plannings.
2.	Q4-Q6 與調研題目無關，學校自主大，對香港教育的信心不在教育局，在教師團隊
3.	現時中學的語文培訓不足，包括普通話培訓、外語培訓
4.	對教師的專業培訓不足，未能監察教師的學術發展，教學動力以及未來老師老化，長期病患者人數激增，老師 60 歲才退休，影響學生學習等問題。
5.	政府對中學（津貼）投放的資源太少！
6.	教育局缺乏長遠目光和承擔，太多「見步行步」的心態。例：未能就「雙非童」的未來教育需求，及早籌謀。

中學校長眼中的大專院校排名意見調查 2013
Opinion Survey for Secondary School Principals on the
Ranking of Universities in Hong Kong 2013

Remark: please put a "✓" inside the or fill in your answers directly as appropriate.

Q1. 請你以 0-10 分評價你對以下各間大專院校的整體表現，當中 **0 分代表極差，5 分代表一般，10 分代表極佳**。請你綜合有關院校的本地與國際聲譽及名氣、設備及校園環境、教職員資歷、學術研究表現、學生成績及品行質素、學習氣氛與課程多元化及認可度等等，然後作出整體評分。 Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of each institution of higher education after taking into consideration its local and international reputation, facilities and campus environment, qualification of its teaching staff, academic research performance, conduct and quality of students as well as its learning atmosphere, diversification and level of recognition of its courses, **with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half**. How would you rate the following institutions?

大專院校 (按英文字母順序排列)		評分 (0-10 分)	不知道/難講
Institutions (in alphabetical order)		Rating (0-10 marks)	Don't know
香港城市大學	City University of Hong Kong (CityU)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港浸會大學	Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港樹仁大學	Hong Kong Shue Yan University (HKSYU)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
嶺南大學	Lingnan University (LU)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港中文大學	The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港教育學院	The Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIEd)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港理工大學	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港科技大學	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港公開大學	The Open University of Hong Kong (OUHK)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港大學	The University of Hong Kong (HKU)	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q2. 請你再以 0-10 分評價各院校校長的整體表現，當中 **0 分代表極差，5 分代表一般，10 分代表極佳**。請你綜合有關校長的本地及國際知名度、親民度、領導能力、洞察力、社會公信力及對外公共關係等等，然後作出整體評分。 Please use a scale of 0-10 to evaluate the overall performance of Vice-Chancellor / President of each institution while taking his local and international reputation, approachability to the public, leadership, vision, social credibility and public relations into consideration, **with 0 representing the worst, 10 representing the best and 5 being half-half**. How would you rate the following Vice-Chancellors / Presidents?

校長 (依照上題次序)		評分 (0-10 分)	不知道/難講
Vice-Chancellor / President (in same order as in Q1)		Rating (0-10 marks)	Don't know
香港城市大學	郭位教授 CityU – Prof. Way KUO	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港浸會大學	陳新滋教授 HKBU – Prof. Albert CHAN	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港樹仁大學	鍾期榮博士 HKSYU – Dr. Chi-yung CHUNG	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
嶺南大學	陳玉樹教授 LU – Prof. Yuk-shee CHAN	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港中文大學	沈祖堯教授 CUHK – Prof. Joseph J.Y. SUNG	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港教育學院	鄭燕祥教授 HKIEd – Prof. Yin Cheong CHENG	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港理工大學	唐偉章教授 PolyU – Prof. Timothy W. TONG	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港科技大學	陳繁昌教授 HKUST – Prof. Tony F. CHAN	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港公開大學	梁智仁教授 OUHK – Prof. John C.Y. LEONG	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>
香港大學	徐立之教授 HKU – Prof. Lap-chee TSUI	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q3. 你認為現時香港的大學生最欠缺些什麼？【可選多項】

What do you think are the qualities which most Hong Kong university students lack of? [multiple answers allowed]

<input type="checkbox"/> 品德、誠實 Conduct, honesty	<input type="checkbox"/> 社會／工作經驗 Social / work experience	<input type="checkbox"/> 自信 Self-confidence
<input type="checkbox"/> 中、英文及普通話能力 Proficiency in Chinese, English and Putonghua	<input type="checkbox"/> 思考及解決問題能力 Critical thinking and problem-solving ability	<input type="checkbox"/> 學術能力、專業知識 Academic and professional knowledge
<input type="checkbox"/> 情緒控制 Emotion stability	<input type="checkbox"/> 溝通技巧 Communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/> 國際視野／遠見 Global prospect / foresight
<input type="checkbox"/> 工作態度 Work attitude	<input type="checkbox"/> 對社會的承擔 Commitment to society	<input type="checkbox"/> 創意 Creativity
<input type="checkbox"/> 待人接物態度 Social / interpersonal skills	<input type="checkbox"/> 電腦應用能力 Computer proficiency	<input type="checkbox"/> 就業機會 Job opportunity
<input type="checkbox"/> 理財能力 Financial management	<input type="checkbox"/> 沒有欠缺什麼 Not lack of anything	<input type="checkbox"/> 不知道／難講 Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> 其他 (請註明) Others (please specify): _____		

Q4. 你對於是否在你的學校開設德育及國民教育科，主要考慮什麼因素？【可選多項】

On whether to teach moral and national education in your school, what are your major concerns? [multiple answers allowed]

<input type="checkbox"/> 課程內容 The curriculum	<input type="checkbox"/> 教學材料 Teaching materials	<input type="checkbox"/> 教學方向 Directions of teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> 評核準則 Assessment criteria	<input type="checkbox"/> 學習動機 Learning motivations	<input type="checkbox"/> 老師反應 Teachers' reactions
<input type="checkbox"/> 家長反應 Parents' reactions	<input type="checkbox"/> 社會輿論 Public opinion	<input type="checkbox"/> 不作考慮 Will not consider at all
<input type="checkbox"/> 其他因素 Other factors: _____		

Q5. 自 2002 年起，男女學生在升中派位中不再分開派位組別。你認為有關政策應否繼續推行？原因為何？【可選多項】

Since 2002, places for boys and girls are no longer handled separately in the Secondary School Places Allocation system. Do you think the policy should be continued? Why? [multiple answers allowed]

<input type="checkbox"/> 應該繼續，原因如下： Should continue, for these reasons:		<input type="checkbox"/> 不應繼續，原因如下： Should not continue, for these reasons:	
<input type="checkbox"/> 男女平等 Gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/> 學生成績比較平均 More even academic performance	<input type="checkbox"/> 對男生不公平，因為發展較慢 Unfair to boys due to their late development	<input type="checkbox"/> 男女比例失衡 Gender imbalance
<input type="checkbox"/> 促進學生社交發展 Facilitates students' social development	<input type="checkbox"/> 幫助教學 Facilitates teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> 影響學生社交發展 Affects students' social development	<input type="checkbox"/> 影響學校設施 Affects school facilities
<input type="checkbox"/> 政策沒有問題 No problem with the policy		<input type="checkbox"/> 影響男生升學和工作 Affects future studies and careers of the boys	
<input type="checkbox"/> 其他意見 Other views: _____			

Q6. 整體來說，你對現時由教育局領導下的香港教育制度有沒有信心？請以 0 至 100 分表示，0 分代表完全無信心，50 分代表一半半，100 分代表非常有信心。

Overall speaking, how confident are you in the education system led by the Education Bureau? Please rate your confidence in 0 to 100 marks, 0 represents not confident at all, 50 represents half-half and 100 represents very confident.

評分 Rating (0-100): _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 不知道／難講 Don't know
--------------------------	--

Q7. 其他意見 Other opinions

問卷完，多謝合作！ Thank you for completing the questionnaire.