CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter deals with the analysis of data that was collected from the survey carried out. Data on graduate recruitment patterns in the local and foreign banks that was gathered from the questionnaires distributed to six banks were analysed in detail in this chapter. Firstly, the data on recruitment practices and preferences were analysed. This was followed by section two which measured the employers' evaluation on graduates. Next, the training practices adopted by the banks were analysed. Finally, employers' perception on the role of universities and colleges were analysed.

4.1 Recruitment Practices and Preferences

As we can see in Table 4.1, local banks preferred local graduates to foreign graduates. The same type of pattern can be observed among foreign banks. Among local banks, 56.67% respondents preferred local graduates and the remaining 43.33% chose foreign graduates. Meanwhile, among foreign banks, 55% respondents chose local graduates and 45% chose foreign graduates.

While a majority of 71.67% respondents from local banks preferred to recruit public university graduates, 85% respondents from foreign banks preferred to recruit private university graduates. Comparison between private college graduates and government college and polytechnics graduates showed a similar pattern. While 85% respondents from foreign banks preferred to recruit graduates from private colleges, only 35% respondents from local banks preferred to recruit graduates from these colleges and the remaining 65% preferred to recruit graduates from government colleges and polytechnics.

Table 4.1 Types of graduates preferred by local and foreign banks

	Local Banks		Foreign Banks	
	Total	*%*	*Total*	*%*
a) Local Graduates	34	56.67	33	55
Foreign Graduates	26	43.33	27	45
Total	***60***	***100***	***60***	***100***
b) Public University Graduates	43	71.67	9	15
Private University Graduates	17	28.33	51	85
Total	***60***	***100***	***60***	***100***
c) Government college and polytechnics graduates	39	65	9	15
Private college graduates	21	35	51	85
Total	***60***	***100***	***60***	***100***

Table 4.2 Mean scores for types of graduates preferred by banks

Types of graduates	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variances
a) Local or Foreign graduates	1.4417	0.49867	0.249
b) Public university or Private university graduates	1.5667	0.49761	0.248
c) Government college & polytechnics or Private college graduates	1.6000	0.49195	0.242

Note: a) Mean score below 1.5 indicates that banks prefer local graduates/public university graduates/government college and polytechnics graduates. Mean score above 1.5 indicates that banks prefer foreign graduate/private university graduates/private college graduates.

To examine the overall pattern of both local and foreign banks, the mean scores were analysed. Table 4.2 shows the mean scores. When compared between local graduates and foreign graduates, the mean score is lesser than 1.5 and this shows that a higher proportion of respondents preferred local graduates. Meanwhile, when compared between public university and private university graduates, the mean score is above 1.5, indicating that a higher proportion of respondents from the banks preferred private university graduates. Comparison between government college and polytechnics graduates and private college graduates show a mean score of 1.6 which is above 1.5. Therefore, a higher proportion of banks preferred to recruit private college graduates.

Table 4.3 T-test comparing types of graduates preferred by local and foreign banks

Types of graduates	Types of banks	Mean	t value	Sig. (2-tailed) p=probability
a) Local or Foreign graduates	Local	1.4333	-0.182	0.856
	Foreign	1.4500		
b) Public university or Private university Graduates	Local	1.2833	-7.571	0.000**
	Foreign	1.8500		
c) Government college & polytechnics or Private college graduates	Local	1.3500	-6.446	0.000**
	Foreign	1.8500		

*Notes: a) ** indicates significant level at 0.05*

b) Mean score below 1.5 indicates that banks prefer local graduates/public university graduates/government college and polytechnics graduates. Mean score above 1.5 indicates that banks prefer foreign graduate/private university graduates/private college graduates.

A t-test was done to determine whether there was a significant difference in each category which was explained above between the local and foreign banks. The results shown in Table 4.3 indicate that there was no significant difference in the types of graduates preferred [(a) local or foreign graduates]. Both local and foreign banks prefer to recruit local graduates to foreign graduates.

However, significant differences were seen in the other two categories. The significant difference in types of graduates preferred [(b) public university or private university graduates] indicates that foreign banks had higher tendencies in preferring private university graduates while local banks had higher tendencies in preferring public university graduates. This is shown by the mean score of local (1.2833) and foreign (1.8500) banks in Table 4.3. On the other hand, the significant difference in the types of graduates preferred [(c) government college and polytechnics graduates or private college graduates], indicates that local banks tended to prefer graduates from government colleges and polytechnics, while foreign banks preferred graduates from private colleges. This is shown by the mean score of local (1.3500) and foreign (1.8500) banks in Table 4.3.

Table 4.4 Ranking of types of graduates preferred by banks

Types of graduates	Mean	Ranking
Public university graduates	2.5750	3
Private university graduates	1.9667	1
Private college graduates	3.3917	4
Foreign graduates	2.3250	2
Government college & Polytechnics graduates	4.7000	5

Notes: a) Scale used: 1-most preferred to 5-least preferred
b) The lower the mean score, the higher the ranking

Respondents of both local and foreign banks were asked to rank the different types of graduates according to their preference. To analyse this, the mean scores were computed. As shown in Table 4.4, the mean scores indicate that respondents from the banks ranked private university graduates (mean score 1.9667) in the first place. This is followed by foreign graduates (mean score 2.3250) in the second rank and public university graduates (mean score 2.5750) in the third rank. Meanwhile, private college graduates (mean score 3.3917) were ranked in the fourth place followed by graduates from government colleges and polytechnics (mean score 4.7000) in the fifth place.

Table 4.5 Reasons for preference in recruitment

	Local banks		Foreign Banks	
	Yes (%)	*No (%)*	*Yes (%)*	*No (%)*
English Proficiency	98.33	1.67	100	-
Malay Proficiency	46.67	53.33	25	75
Computer Literacy	100	-	100	-
Wider Knowledge	91.67	8.33	45	55
Foreign-recognised Degree	28.33	71.67	55	45
More exposed to working environment	66.67	33.33	90	10
Better skills (technical, analytical)	80	20	100	-
Willing to pursue extra mile*	80	20	100	-
More capabilities	98.33	1.67	100	-
Others	6.67	93.33	8.33	91.67

* working extra hour and prepared to take risks and challenges

Based on Table 4.5, when asked for the reasons for adopting such a practice and preference in graduate recruitment, local banks who preferred local graduates to foreign graduates, public university graduates to private university graduates, and graduates from government colleges and polytechnics to graduates from private colleges, gave reasons like English proficiency (98.33%), computer literacy (100%), wider knowledge (91.67%), more exposed to working environment (66.67%), better skills (80%), willing to pursue extra mile (80%), and more capabilities (98.33%).

On the other hand, foreign banks who preferred local graduates to foreign graduates, private university graduates to public university graduates, and graduates from private colleges to graduates from government colleges and polytechnics, gave reasons similar to local banks even though their percentage of importance were different. A significant number of respondents from foreign banks (55%) gave foreign-recognised degree as one of their reasons.

Even though proficiency in Malay was not a main reason, 46.67% respondents from local banks considered it one of the reasons, compared to only 25% respondents from foreign banks who considered proficiency in Malay as one of the reasons. Both the respondents from local banks (6.67%) and foreign banks (8.33%) mentioned positive attitude, creative, open minded, and not constrained by local exposure as other reasons for their preference in recruitment.

Table 4.6 Ranking of recruitment criteria

Criteria	Mean	Ranking
Academic record	1.9583	2
Proficiency in English	2.6750	3
Proficiency in Malay	5.8500	6
Past working experience	1.7333	1
Computer literacy	4.0750	4
Skills (technical, analytical)	4.9667	5

Notes: a) Scale used: 1-most preferred to 6-least preferred
b) The lower the mean score, the higher the ranking

Apart from this, the banks were also asked to rank the criteria given priority during recruitment. From the mean scores shown in Table 4.6, we can rank the criteria according to importance. Past working experience with the lowest mean score (1.7333) was ranked in the first place, followed by academic record (mean score 1.9583) and proficiency in English (mean score 2.6750) in the second and third place respectively. Meanwhile, computer literacy (mean score 4.0750) was ranked fourth followed by skills (technical, analytical) in rank five. Proficiency in Malay with mean score 5.8500 was given least importance during recruitment and therefore ranked last.

Table 4.7(a) Importance given to selection criteria by local banks

	Local Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Academic record	61.67	38.33	-	-	-
Proficiency in English	50	31.67	5	5	-
Proficiency in Malay	10	35	26.67	26.67	6.67
Past working experience	61.67	31.67	5	1.67	-
Computer literacy	40	60	-	-	-
Skills (technical, analytical)	10	53.33	35	1.67	-
Performance at interview	5	75	18.33	1.67	-
Strength of recommendation letter	1.67	15	41.67	38.33	3.33
Wider knowledge	3.33	78.33	11.67	5	1.67
Personality	5	78.33	15	1.67	-
Gender	1.67	3.33	16.67	46.67	31.67
Ethnic origin	-	11.67	10	45	20
Marital status	-	5	20	58.33	16.67
Others	-	5	-	-	-

Note: Scale 1-very important 2-important 3-uncertain 4-unimportant 5-very unimportant

Table 4.7(b) Importance given to selection criteria by foreign banks

	Foreign Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Academic record	45	55	-	-	-
Proficiency in English	70	30	-	-	-
Proficiency in Malay	-	15	65	20	-
Past working experience	85	15	-	-	-
Computer literacy	15	85	-	-	-
Skills (technical, analytical)	-	100	-	-	-
Performance at interview	-	75	25	-	-
Strength of recommendation letter	-	45	45	10	-
Wider knowledge	-	70	30	-	-
Personality	-	95	5	-	-
Gender	-	-	-	95	5
Ethnic origin	-	-	30	70	-
Marital status	-	35	30	35	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Scale

1-very important 2-important 3-uncertain 4-unimportant 5-very unimportant

Based on table 4.7(a) and 4.7(b), we can see that respondents from both local and foreign banks considered past working experience as a very important selection criterion. This is followed by academic record and proficiency in English. However, respondents from local banks (61.67%) tended to place greater importance on academic record compared to 45% respondents from foreign banks who considered this criterion as very important.

For proficiency in English, respondents from foreign banks placed greater importance than respondents from the local banks. From Table 4.7(a) and (b), we can see that 70% respondents from foreign banks compared to 50% respondents from local banks considered proficiency in English as very important. Only 5% respondents from local banks considered this criterion as unimportant. On the other hand, while 65% respondents from foreign banks were uncertain with the importance of proficiency in Malay and another 20% considered it unimportant, 35% respondents from local banks considered proficiency in Malay as an important criterion.

Meanwhile, majority of 60% respondents from local banks and 85% from foreign banks considered computer literacy as important. Skills (technical, analytical) were also considered as an important criterion by 53.33% respondents from local banks and all the respondents from foreign banks (100%). In contrast to a majority of 41.67% respondents from local banks who were uncertain with the importance of strength of recommendation letter, 45% respondents from foreign banks considered it as an important criterion.

On the other hand, majority respondents from local banks considered gender, ethnic origin and marital status as unimportant criteria during selection. However, marital status was given importance by the respondents from foreign banks as 35% of them considered this criterion important. Meanwhile, 75% respondents from both local and foreign banks considered performance at interview as an important criterion.

Personality too played an important role as 95% respondents from foreign banks and 78.33% from local banks considered it important. Wider knowledge was also an important criterion to both local (78.33% respondents) and foreign banks (70% respondents). Finally, 5% respondents from local banks mentioned that there were other selection criteria which were important as well, such as willingness to learn, ability to adapt to working culture and determination.

Table 4.8 T-test comparing the importance given to selection criteria by local and foreign banks

Criteria	Types of bank	Mean	t value	Sig. (2-tailed) p=probability
Academic record	Local	1.3838	-1.840	0.68
	Foreign	1.5500		
Proficiency in English	Local	1.7333	3.376	0.01**
	Foreign	1.3000		
Proficiency in Malay	Local	2.8500	-1.211	0.228
	Foreign	3.0500		
Past working experience	Local	1.4667	3.204	0.02**
	Foreign	1.1500		
Computer literacy	Local	1.6000	-3.168	0.02**
	Foreign	1.8500		
Skills (technical, analytical)	Local	2.2833	3.294	0.01**
	Foreign	2.0000		
Performance at interview	Local	2.1667	-0.944	0.347
	Foreign	2.2500		
Strength of recommendation letter	Local	3.2667	4.538	0.00**
	Foreign	2.6500		
Wider knowledge	Local	2.2333	-0.632	0.528
	Foreign	2.3000		
Personality	Local	2.1333	1.176	0.242
	Foreign	2.0500		
Gender	Local	4.0333	-0.142	0.887
	Foreign	4.0500		
Ethnic origin	Local	4.0000	2.187	0.031**
	Foreign	3.7000		
Marital status	Local	3.8667	5.957	0.00**
	Foreign	3.0000		

*Notes: a) ** indicates significant level at 0.05*

b) Scale used: 1-very important, 2-important, 3-uncertain, 4-unimportant, and 5-very unimportant

c) Mean score below 3 indicates that criteria is important
Mean score above 3 indicates that criteria is unimportant

A t-test was done to determine whether there was a significant difference in each selection criterion between the local and foreign banks. The results shown in Table 4.8 indicate that there were no significant differences in academic record, proficiency in Malay, performance at interview, wider knowledge, personality, and gender between local and foreign banks. However, criteria like proficiency in English, past working experience, computer literacy, skills (technical, analytical), strength of recommendation letter, ethnic origin and marital status showed significant differences between local and foreign banks.

For proficiency in English, past working experience, skills, strength of recommendation letter, ethnic origin and marital status, foreign banks tended to perceive it as more important than local banks did (this is shown in Table 4.7(a) and (b) and the mean scores of local and foreign banks in Table 4.8). Only in computer literacy, local banks perceived it as more important in the selection of graduates than foreign banks did.

Table 4.9 The importance of field of education

	Local banks		**Foreign Banks**	
	Total	***(%)***	***Total***	***(%)***
Very Important	11	18.33	6	10
Important	41	68.33	45	75
Uncertain	8	13.33	9	15
Unimportant	-	-	-	-
Very Unimportant	-	-	-	-
Total	***60***	***100***	***60***	***100***

Table 4.9 shows the importance of field of education during the process of recruitment. Majority of respondents from both local banks (68.33%) and foreign banks (75%) considered the field of education as an important aspect in recruitment. Compared to 18.33% respondents of local banks, a lower percentage of respondents from foreign banks (10%) considered field of education as a very important aspect.

Table 4.10 Field of education preferred by banks

	Local and Foreign Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Business	23.33	70	6.67	-	-
Economics	17.5	75.83	6.67	-	-
Accounting	53.33	40	6.67	-	-
Commerce	19.17	78.33	2.5	-	-
Banking & Finance	78.33	13.33	-	-	-
Social Sciences	-	3.33	78.33	18.33	-
Law	25	23.33	63.33	10.88	-
Engineering	0.83	43.33	45	7.5	3.33
Information Technology (IT)	35	61.67	0.83	2.5	-
Computer Science	26.67	68.33	2.5	-	2.5
Sciences	0.83	2.5	78.33	15.83	2.5
Religious Studies	-	-	5	53.33	41.67
Education	-	4.17	44.17	49.17	2.5
Others	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Scale

1-most preferred 2-preferred 3-neutral 4-not preferred 5-most not preferred

Table 4.10 shows the field of education given preference during recruitment. From the table we can see that Banking & Finance is the most preferred field of education as 78.33% respondents from the banks expressed that this field is most preferred. This is followed by Accounting as 53.33% respondents from both the banks considered this field as a most preferred field of education.

Respondents from the banks too expressed that they preferred to recruit graduates with Commerce, Economics and Business background. 78.33%, 75.83% and 70% respondents from the banks considered Commerce, Economics and Business as preferred fields of education respectively.

This is followed by fields of education like Computer Science and Information Technology (IT) in which a majority of 68.33% and 61.67% respondents from the banks considered Computer Science and IT as preferred fields of education respectively. It is also

notable that a significant percentage of respondents (35%) considered IT as a most preferred field of education.

While 43.33% respondents from the banks preferred Engineering, 45% of them were neutral with this field. Majority of respondents from the banks were also neutral with fields like Social Sciences, Sciences and Law. Meanwhile, fields like Religious Studies and Education were not preferred.

Table 4.11 Marketability of field of education according to banks

	Local and foreign Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Business	26.67	72.5	-	0.83	-
Economics	16.67	77.5	5	-	-
Accounting	53.33	45.83	0.83	-	-
Commerce	16.67	82.5	0.83	-	-
Banking & Finance	90.83	8.33	0.83	-	-
Social Sciences	0.83	2.5	70.83	25.83	-
Law	3.33	14.17	70.83	11.67	-
Engineering	0.83	40.83	46.67	8.33	3.33
Information Technology (IT)	44.17	51.67	4.17	-	-
Computer Science	24.17	69.17	2.5	-	4.17
Sciences	0.83	1.67	69.17	25.83	2.5
Religious Studies	-	1.67	2.5	20	75.83
Education	-	2.5	20	75.83	1.67
Others	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Scale
1-most marketable 2-marketable 3-uncertain 4-not marketable
5-most not marketable

Table 4.11 measures the marketability of fields of education which was mentioned earlier. Majority respondents considered Banking & Finance and Accounting as most marketable. For Banking & Finance, 90.83% respondents from the banks considered this field of education as most marketable while for Accounting, 53.33% respondents said that this field is most marketable.

This is followed by fields of education like Commerce, Economics and Business in which 82.5%, 77.5% and 72.5% respondents from the banks respectively considered these fields as marketable.

For Computer Science, 69.17% respondents from the banks considered this field as marketable. On the other hand, majority respondents (51.67%) considered IT as marketable and it is notable here that a significant percentage of respondents (44.17%) considered IT as most marketable as well.

While 40.83% respondents from the banks considered Engineering as marketable, 46.67% were uncertain with the marketability of this field. Then, while 70.83% respondents were uncertain with the marketability of both Social Sciences and Law, 69.17% respondents were uncertain with the marketability of Sciences.

Fields like Religious Studies and Education were least important as 75.83% respondents considered Education as not marketable and another 75.83% respondents considered Religious Studies as most not marketable.

From here we can observe that fields of education like Banking & Finance especially are most marketable in the banks. This is followed by fields like Accounting, Commerce, Economics, Business, IT, and Computer Science, which are marketable in this sector. Fields of education like Sciences, Social Sciences and Education are not marketable while Religious Studies are not marketable at all.

Table 4.12 The importance given to Information Communication Technology (ICT) by local and foreign banks

	Local banks		Foreign Banks	
	Total	*(%)*	*Total*	*(%)*
Very Important	25	41.67	33	55
Important	33	55	27	45
Uncertain	2	3.33	-	-
Unimportant	-	-	-	-
Very Unimportant	-	-	-	-
Total	**60**	**100**	**60**	**100**

Table 4.12 shows the importance given to Information Communication Technology (ICT) knowledge. 41.67% respondents from local banks considered the knowledge of ICT as very important in graduate recruitment and another 55% see it as an important aspect. Compared to local banks, a higher percentage of respondents from foreign banks (55%) considered the knowledge of ICT as very important. The remaining 45% respondents considered it as important.

Table 4.13 Methods of recruitment practised by local and foreign banks

	Local banks		Foreign Banks	
	Total	*(%)*	*Total*	*(%)*
Newspaper advertisement	58	96.67	60	100
Scholarship bonds	26	43.33	-	-
Labour departments	6	10	-	-
Through contact with the universities	47	78.33	-	-
Other personal contacts	32	53.33	60	100
Others	26	43.33	18	30

Table 4.13 shows the methods of recruitment used by local and foreign banks. Majority of respondents from local banks (96.67%) mentioned that their banks used newspaper advertisement for graduate recruitment while all the respondents from foreign banks (100%) said that their banks too used this method.

About 43.33% respondents from local banks said that they use scholarship bonds as a method of recruitment and this was contrasting to foreign banks as none of them used this

method. Labour departments and contact with the universities were also methods of recruitment utilised by local banks. 10% of the respondents said that their banks used labour departments and 78.33% said that they have contacts with the universities.

Meanwhile, all the foreign banks studied used other personal contacts to recruit graduates compared to 53.3% respondents from local banks who said that their banks used the same method. Other methods like job search websites and employee referrals were also mentioned by 43.33% respondents from local banks and 30% respondents from foreign banks.

Table 4.14 Preference shown by local and foreign banks in awarding scholarships

	Local Banks (%)					**Foreign Banks (%)**				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Public Universities	35	40	21.67	3.33	-	-	-	78.33	21.67	-
Private Universities	1.67	3.33	50	36.67	8.33	-	11.67	66.67	21.67	-
Private Colleges	1.67	3.33	48.33	36.67	10	-	-	85	15	-
Foreign Universities	-	6.67	46.67	36.67	10	-	65	30	5	-
Government Colleges & Polytechnics	5	31.67	35	26.67	1.67	-	5	75	20	-

Note: Scale
1-Strongly agree 2-Agree 3-Uncertain 4-Disagree 5-Strongly disagree

Table 4.14 shows the preference shown in awarding scholarship bonds. Respondents from local banks strongly agreed to award scholarships to public university students, followed by students from government colleges and polytechnics. While 35% respondents from local banks strongly agreed to award scholarships to public university students, 31.67% of them agreed to give scholarships to government colleges and polytechnics.

78.33% respondents from foreign banks were uncertain with public university students but 65% of them agreed to award scholarships to foreign university students. Majority of respondents from both local (48.33%) and foreign banks (85%) were uncertain with private college students while only 11.67% respondents from foreign banks agreed to award scholarships to private university students.

Table 4.15 T-test comparing types of students awarded scholarships by local and foreign banks

Types of students	**Type of bank**	**Mean**	**t value**	**Sig. (2-tailed) p= probability**
Public universities	Local	1.9333	-10.597	0.000**
	Foreign	3.2167		
Private universities	Local	3.4667	2.960	0.004**
	Foreign	3.1000		
Private colleges	Local	3.5000	3.116	0.002**
	Foreign	3.1500		
Foreign universities	Local	3.5000	8.793	0.000**
	Foreign	2.4000		
Government colleges & Polytechnics	Local	2.8833	-1.986	0.049**
	Foreign	3.1500		

*Notes: a) ** indicates significance level at 0.05*

b) Scale used: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-uncertain, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree

c) Mean score below 3 indicates that banks agree to award scholarships
Mean score above 3 indicates that banks disagree to award scholarships

A t-test was done to determine whether there were significant differences in the pattern of awarding scholarships to public university, private university, private college, foreign university, and government colleges and polytechnics students between local and foreign banks. The results shown in Table 4.15 indicate that there were significant

differences between local and foreign banks in the pattern of awarding scholarships to all the five types of students.

The mean scores in Table 4.15 show that scholarships awarded to public university students by local banks were the highest, followed by scholarships awarded to foreign university students by foreign banks, scholarships awarded to government colleges and polytechnics students by local banks and to private university students by foreign banks.

The significant difference in awarding scholarships to public university students showed that respondents from local banks awarded scholarships to public university students while respondents from foreign banks were not keen on these students (this is shown by the mean score in Table 4.15).

The significant difference shown in private university students indicates that both the respondents from local and foreign banks were not keen on awarding scholarships to these students but respondents from local banks showed a higher tendency of not being keen compared to respondents from foreign banks. The significant difference in private college students showed a similar result in which respondents from local banks had a higher tendency of not being keen in awarding scholarships to private college students.

In the meantime, the significant difference in foreign university students indicates that while respondents from foreign banks awarded scholarships to them, respondents from local banks were not very keen. Finally, the significant difference shown in government colleges and polytechnics students indicates that while respondents from local banks awarded scholarships to these students, respondents from foreign banks were not keen on awarding scholarships to them.

4.2 Employers' Evaluation on Graduates

Table 4.16 shows the importance of extra-curricular activities towards job performance of graduates. Majority of respondents from local banks (65%) considered participation in societies and students unions as an important aspect to job performance while in foreign banks, 60% respondents considered this aspect as important.

Table 4.16 The importance of extra-curricular activities

	Local Banks (%)					Foreign Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Participation in societies and student unions	5	65	23.33	6.67	-	5	60	15	20	-
Sports and games	5	66.67	23.33	5	-	3.33	56.67	20	20	-
Cultural activities	1.67	6.67	43.33	48.33	-	-	-	20	65	9
Hobbies	1.67	5	20	73.33	-	-	-	-	58.33	41.67

Note: Scale
1-very important 2-important 3-uncertain 4-unimportant 5-very unimportant

Meanwhile, 66.67% respondents from local banks and 56.67% respondents from foreign banks considered sports and games as important. Cultural activities and hobbies were considered less important by both local and foreign banks. A significant amount of 65% respondents from foreign banks considered cultural activities as unimportant and another 41.67% considered hobbies as very unimportant to job performance. For local banks, 48.33% respondents considered cultural activities as unimportant while 73.33% considered hobbies as unimportant.

Table 4.17(a) Criteria affecting job performance according to local banks

	Local Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Relevant academic and professional qualification	45	55	-	-	-
Past experience	81.67	16.67	1.67	-	-
Computer Literacy	41.67	56.67	1.67	-	-
Language Proficiency	53.33	46.67	1.67	-	-
Technical expertise	8.33	70	20	1.67	-

Note: Scale

1-Strongly agree 2-Agree 3-Uncertain 4-Disagree 5-Strongly disagree

Table 4.17(b) Criteria affecting job performance according to foreign banks

	Local Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Relevant academic and professional qualification	50	50	-	-	-
Past experience	85	15	-	-	-
Computer Literacy	36.67	60	3.33	-	-
Language Proficiency	56.67	43.33	-	-	-
Technical expertise	11.67	71.67	16.67	-	-

Note: Scale

1-Strongly agree 2-Agree 3-Uncertain 4-Disagree 5-Strongly disagree

Table 4.17(a) and (b) show the criteria affecting job performance. Respondents from both local (81.67%) and foreign banks (85%) strongly agreed that past experience was important to job performance. This was followed by language proficiency in which 53.33% respondents from local banks and 56.67% respondents from foreign banks strongly agreed that language proficiency was important to job performance. Even though respondents from both banks agreed that past experience and language proficiency were important to job performance, we can see from the tables that foreign banks tended to stress more on these criteria than local banks.

This was followed by relevant academic or professional qualifications where 45% respondents from local banks and 50% respondents from foreign banks strongly agreed that this criterion was important to job performance.

For computer literacy, most respondents agreed that this criterion is important to job performance. Only 1.67% respondents from local banks and 3.33% respondents from foreign banks were uncertain with the importance of computer literacy to job performance. Meanwhile, 70% respondents from local banks and 71.67% respondents from foreign banks agreed that technical skills were important to job performance.

Table 4.18 Ratings given to public, private and foreign university graduates by local and foreign banks according to aspects affecting job performance

Aspects	Type of bank	Mean	t value	Sig. (2-tailed) p=probability
Technical expertise **(Public university graduates)**	Local	2.7000	0.000	1.000
	Foreign	2.7000		
Technical expertise **(Private university graduates)**	Local	2.1667	-1.589	0.115
	Foreign	2.3000		
Technical expertise **(Foreign graduates)**	Local	1.6500	-1.007	0.316
	Foreign	1.7500		
Ability to think rationally and systematically **(Public university graduates)**	Local	2.5667	4.582	0.000**
	Foreign	2.1333		
Ability to think rationally and systematically **(Private university graduates)**	Local	2.3333	2.685	0.008**
	Foreign	2.1000		
Ability to think rationally and systematically **(Foreign graduates)**	Local	1.7000	-0.527	0.599
	Foreign	1.7500		
Ability to write clearly **(Public university graduates)**	Local	2.5333	0.733	0.465
	Foreign	2.4500		
Ability to write clearly **(Private university graduates)**	Local	2.2833	0.2077	0.040**
	Foreign	2.1000		
Ability to write clearly **(Foreign graduates)**	Local	1.5833	3.515	0.001**
	Foreign	1.2500		
Ability to speak clearly **(Public university graduates)**	Local	2.7833	-4.876	0.000**
	Foreign	3.4333		
Ability to speak clearly **(Private university graduates)**	Local	2.1833	0.154	0.878
	Foreign	2.1667		
Ability to speak clearly **(Foreign graduates)**	Local	1.3167	0.171	0.864
	Foreign	1.3000		

'Table 4.18, continued'

Ability to work independently **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.5500 2.7500	-1.928	0.056
Ability to work independently **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.3167 2.2333	0.910	0.365
Ability to work independently **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.7833 1.3333	5.104	0.000**
Ability to socialise **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.7667 1.7500	0.143	0.886
Ability to socialise **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.0000 1.9000	1.062	0.291
Ability to socialise **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.7000 1.7500	-0.497	0.620
Ability to realise organizational goals **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.5333 2.5000	0.322	0.748
Ability to realise organizational goals **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.2833 2.3000	-0.168	0.867
Ability to realise organizational goals **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.6667 1.9000	-2.685	0.008**
Leadership qualities **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.5167 2.0500	2.725	0.007**
Leadership qualities **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.2500 2.0500	2.245	0.027**
Leadership qualities **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.8500 2.0333	-3.205	0.002**
Organisational abilities **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.5167 2.9333	-4.626	0.000**
Organisational abilities **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.2833 2.1667	1.217	0.226
Organisational abilities **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.5833 1.5500	0.316	0.753
Responsiveness to monetary incentive **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.9667 2.0667	-1.503	0.135
Responsiveness to monetary incentive **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.9833 2.1667	-2.482	0.014**
Responsiveness to monetary incentive **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.7667 2.0167	-3.752	0.000**

'Table 4.18, continued'

Company loyalty **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.6167 1.5500	0.516	0.607
Company loyalty **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.8000 2.5500	3.008	0.003**
Company loyalty **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	3.7500 3.6667	0.637	0.525
Trainability **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.1333 1.8500	2.714	0.008**
Trainability **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.9833 2.0000	-0.178	0.859
Trainability **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.7333 1.7833	-0.439	0.661
Capacity for Preciseness & Carefulness **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.8333 2.8000	0.405	0.686
Capacity for Preciseness & Carefulness **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.5167 1.9500	7.216	0.000**
Capacity for Preciseness & Carefulness **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.9667 1.5500	4.621	0.000**
Ability to move forward/willingness to pursue extra mile* **(Public university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.8333 3.0500	-1.597	0.113
Ability to move forward/willingness to pursue extra mile **(Private university graduates)**	Local Foreign	2.0500 2.1000	-0.581	0.563
Ability to move forward/willingness to pursue extra mile **(Foreign graduates)**	Local Foreign	1.6667 1.7000	-0.351	0.726

*Notes: a) ** indicates significance level at 0.05*
b) Scale used: 1-very good, 2-good, 3-average, 4-poor and 5-very poor
c) Mean score below 3 indicates that graduates are rated good
Mean score above 3 indicates that graduates are rated poor

The respondents of both foreign and local banks were asked to rate the public, private and foreign university graduates according to aspects affecting job performance like technical expertise, ability to think rationally and systematically, ability to write clearly, ability to speak clearly, ability to work independently, ability to socialise, ability to realise organisational goals, leadership qualities, organisational abilities, responsiveness to

* working extra hour and prepared to take risks and challenges

monetary incentive, company loyalty, trainability, capability for preciseness and carefulness, and ability to move forward/willingness to pursue extra mile (working extra hour, taking initiative or risk, etc).

To measure the rates given to them by both the respondents from local and foreign banks, the mean scores were computed. As shown in Table 4.18, the mean scores indicate that in mostly all the aspects mentioned above, the foreign graduates were given higher rates or were rated good compared to public and private university graduates. However, in rating the graduates' company loyalty, both local (mean=3.7500) and foreign (mean=3.6667) banks rated the company loyalty of foreign graduates as poor. In this aspect, respondents from local and foreign banks rated public university graduates as good, followed by private university graduates.

Meanwhile, in graduates' ability to socialise, all the three types of graduates were rated good by both the local and foreign banks. A similar pattern can be observed in graduates' responsiveness to monetary incentive and trainability in which all the three types of graduates were rated good.

A t-test was done to examine whether there were significant differences in the ratings given by local and foreign banks. As shown in Table 4.18, in the aspect of technical expertise, ability to socialise and ability to move forward/willingness to pursue extra mile, there were no significant differences between the ratings given by respondents from the local and foreign banks. However, significant differences were seen in the other remaining aspects.

As shown in Table 4.18, in the graduates' ability to think rationally and systematically, ratings given to public and private university graduates by respondents from local and foreign banks showed significant difference. Respondents from foreign banks tended to give a better rate for both the public and private university graduates' ability to

think rationally and systematically than respondents from local banks did (this is shown by the mean score in Table 4.18).

In the ability to write clearly, there were significant differences in the ratings given to private and foreign university graduates. For both these graduates, foreign banks tended to give higher rates compared to the rates given by local banks. Significant difference was also seen in the public university graduates' ability to speak clearly. In this aspect, respondents from foreign banks (mean=3.4333) tended to rate these graduates poorly compared to the respondents from local banks (mean=2.7833) who rated them good.

Another aspect in which significant difference was seen is the foreign graduates' ability to work independently. Both the respondents from local and foreign banks rated them good in this aspect but respondents from foreign banks (mean=1.3333) gave them a higher rate compared to the respondents from local banks (mean=1.7833).

Significant difference was also seen in foreign graduates' ability to realise organisational goals in which the respondents from local banks gave them a higher rate for this aspect. Ratings for leadership qualities of all the three types of graduates too showed significant differences. As shown by the mean scores, respondents from foreign banks had better regards for both public and private university graduates' leadership qualities compared to the respondents from local banks. Meanwhile, respondents from local banks (mean=1.8500) had better regards for the leadership qualities of foreign graduates compared to the respondents from foreign banks (mean=2.0333).

Public university graduates' organisational abilities also showed significant difference between the ratings given by respondents from local and foreign banks. For this aspect, respondents from local banks (mean=2.5167) tended to rate public university graduates higher than foreign banks (mean=2.9333) did. Significant differences in the ratings given by respondents from local and foreign banks were also seen in private and

foreign university graduates' responsiveness to monetary incentive. The significant differences here indicate that for both private and foreign university graduates, the respondents from local banks tended to give higher rates compared to foreign banks.

In the aspect of company loyalty, only the ratings given to private university graduates showed significant difference. This is because, as shown by the mean score in Table 4.18, respondents from local banks (mean=2.8000) tended to give lower rates for private university graduates' company loyalty than the rates given by respondents from foreign banks (mean=2.5500).

Finally, significant difference in the ratings given by respondents from local and foreign banks can be seen in private and foreign university graduates' capacity for preciseness and carefulness. It shows that for both private and foreign university graduates, respondents from foreign banks tended to rate them higher than the ratings given by local banks (this is shown by the mean score in Table 4.18).

4.3 Training Practises Adopted by Local and Foreign Banks

As shown in Table 4.19, we can see that local banks were more willing to provide training and lessons on ICT. 13.33% respondents from local banks strongly agreed and 65% of them agreed to provide training and lessons on ICT compared to only 5% respondents from foreign banks who strongly agreed and 45% respondents who agreed to provide training and lessons. The remaining 50% of respondents from foreign banks were uncertain about this aspect.

Table 4.19 Willingness of local and foreign banks to provide training and lessons on Information Communication Technology (ICT) to graduates

	Local Banks		**Foreign Banks**	
	Total	***%***	***Total***	***%***
Strongly Agree	8	13.33	3	5
Agree	39	65	27	45
Uncertain	8	13.33	30	50
Disagree	5	8.33	-	-
Strongly Disagree	-	-	-	-
Total	***60***	***60***	***60***	***60***

Table 4.20 Training practises adopted by local and foreign banks

	Local Banks				**Foreign Banks**			
	Yes		***No***		***Yes***		***No***	
	Total	***%***	***Total***	***%***	***Total***	***%***	***Total***	***%***
Formal on-the-job training	40	66.67	20	33.33	40	66.67	20	33.33
Informal on-the-job training	59	98.33	1	1.67	60	100	-	-
Overseas training	3	5	57	95	1	1.67	59	98.33
Training in specialised training institution	25	41.67	35	58.33	15	25	45	75
Others	4	6.67	56	93.33	-	-	60	100

Table 4.20 shows the types of training practiced by the local and foreign banks. Majority local and foreign banks provided both formal and informal on-the-job training to their staffs but higher percentage of respondents from local banks (98.33%) and foreign banks (100%) were fonder of informal on-the-job training. 41.67% respondents from local banks said that their banks provided training in specialised training institutions compared to only 25% respondents from foreign banks who said that their banks provide training in these institutions. Meanwhile, 95% respondents from local banks and 98.33% from foreign banks said that their banks do not provide overseas training. Only four out of the 60 respondents from local banks mentioned that their banks provided other types of trainings. The types of training they mentioned were training in Institut Bank-Bank Malaysia (IBBM) and in-house training. Meanwhile according to the respondents from foreign banks, they do not provide other types of trainings.

Table 4.21 Importance of in-service training for graduates

	Local Banks		**Foreign Banks**	
	Total	***%***	***Total***	***%***
Very Essential	31	51.67	20	33.33
Essential	28	46.67	36	60
Neutral	1	1.67	4	6.67
Unessential	-	-	-	-
Very unessential	-	-	-	-
Total	***60***	***100***	***60***	***100***

Table 4.21 shows the importance of in-service training in equipping graduates without working experiences. Only 33.33% respondents from foreign banks considered in-service training as very essential compared to 51.67% and 46.67% respondents from local banks who considered it very essential and essential respectively. However, 60% respondents from foreign banks did consider in-service training as essential and only 6.67% of them were neutral.

4.4 Perception of Employers on the role of Universities

Table 4.22(a) and (b) show the perception of both local and foreign banks towards the role of universities or colleges. From the table we can see that majority respondents from both local banks (51.67%) and foreign banks (55%) considered imparting specific skills as very important. This was followed by the role of developing the ability to think rationally and systematically in which 55% respondents from foreign banks and 35% respondents from local banks considered this role as very important.

Table 4.22(a) Local banks' perception towards the role of universities/colleges

	Local Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Imparting a broad and general education	23.33	71.67	5	-	-
Imparting specific skills	51.67	45	3.33	-	-
Developing the ability to think rationally and systematically	35	56.67	8.33	-	-
Creating sensitivity and awareness to changes in community needs and problems	8.33	25	55	11.67	-

Note: Scale
1-very important 2-important 3-neutral 4-unimportant 5-very unimportant

Table 4.22(b) Foreign banks' perception towards the role of universities/colleges

	Foreign Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Imparting a broad and general education	20	80	-	-	-
Imparting specific skills	55	45	-	-	-
Developing the ability to think rationally and systematically	55	45	-	-	-
Creating sensitivity and awareness to changes in community needs and problems	-	33.33	56.67	10	-

Note: Scale
1-very important 2-important 3-neutral 4-unimportant 5-very unimportant

For the role of imparting a broad and wide general education, majority respondents from local banks (71.67%) and 80% respondents from foreign banks considered it important as well. On the other hand, for the role of creating sensitivity and awareness to changes in community needs and problems, majority respondents from local (55%) and foreign banks (56.67%) were neutral with this role.

Table 4.23 Types of graduates banks expect universities/ colleges to produce

	Mean
Capability to communicate well in English	1.2083
Very good academic qualification	1.4750
Equipped with training/technical expertise	1.6500
Exposed to working environment	1.8750
Capability to communicate well in Malay	2.7750
Others	1.0000^

Notes: a) Scale used: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-uncertain, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree

b) Mean score below 3 indicates that banks agree with the types of graduates they expect universities/colleges to produce Mean score above 3 indicates that banks disagree with the types of graduates they expect universities/colleges to produce

c) ^ - t cannot be computed because the standard deviation of both groups are 0

In indicating their agreement to the types of graduates they expect universities/colleges to produce, the respondents from the banks tended to agree that they expect universities/colleges to produce graduates who were capable to communicate well in English, followed by graduates with very good academic qualification, equipped with training and technical expertise, and exposed to working environment which scored a mean of 1.2083, 1.4750, 1.65 and 1.8750 respectively as shown in Table 4.23. Even though they agreed that universities/colleges should produce graduates with capability to communicate well in Malay, the mean score of 2.775 indicated that it was not very important. Apart from this, five out of 120 respondents mentioned that they expect universities or colleges to

produce graduates with other qualities like presentation skills, ability to work under pressure and self-discipline.

Table 4.24 T-test comparing the types of graduates local and foreign banks expect universities/colleges to produce

	Type of bank	**Mean**	**t value**	**Sig. (2-tailed) p=probability**
Very good academic qualification	Local Foreign	1.6167 1.3333	3.103	0.002**
Capability to communicate well in English	Local Foreign	1.2833 1.1333	2.041	0.043**
Capability to communicate well in Malay	Local Foreign	2.4500 3.1000	-4.825	0.000**
Exposed to working environment	Local Foreign	1.9167 1.8333	1.036	0.302
Equipped with training/technical expertise	Local Foreign	1.6833 1.6167	0.669	0.505

*Notes: a) ** indicates significance level at 0.05*

b) Scale used: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-uncertain, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree

c) Mean score below 3 indicates that banks agree with the types of graduates they expect universities/colleges to produce
Mean score above 3 indicates that banks disagree with the types of graduates they expect universities/colleges to produce

The difference in each of the expectation between local and foreign banks was examined by a t-test. Based on Table 4.24, three out of the five criteria which showed significant differences were very good academic qualification, capability to communicate well in English, and capability to communicate well in Malay. The significant differences indicated that foreign banks tended to express greater agreement with producing graduates with very good academic qualification and capability to communicate well in English than local banks did. On the other hand, while local banks tended to agree with producing graduates who were capable to communicate well in Malay, foreign banks disagreed on this aspect.

Table 4.25(a) Roles that should be played by Higher Educational Institutions to produce graduates who are marketable according to local banks

	Local Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Provide training/internship	68.33	30	1.67	-	-
Provide more professional courses	33.33	56.67	5	-	5
Conduct professional language courses	51.67	43.44	-	3.33	1.67
Others	-	3.33	-	-	-

Note: Scale
1-Strongly agree 2-Agree 3-Uncertain 4-Disagree 5-Strongly disagree

Table 4.25(b) Roles that should be played by Higher Educational Institutions to produce graduates who are marketable according to foreign banks

	Foreign Banks (%)				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Provide training/internship	80	20	-	-	-
Provide more professional courses	20	60	20	-	-
Conduct professional language courses	65	30	5	-	-
Others	-	5	-	-	-

Note: Scale
1-Strongly agree 2-Agree 3-Uncertain 4-Disagree 5-Strongly disagree

Table 4.25(a) and (b) show the role that should be played by Higher Educational Institutions to produce graduates who are marketable. A significant percentage of 80% respondents from foreign banks strongly agreed that universities should provide training or internships. Similarly 68.33% respondents from local banks strongly agreed with this role. This was followed by the role of conducting professional language courses in which 65% respondents from foreign banks and 51.67% respondents from local banks strongly agreed with this role.

Meanwhile, 56.67% respondents from local banks and 60% from foreign banks agreed that higher educational institutions should provide more professional courses. There were also other roles that the respondents from local banks (3.33%) and foreign banks (5%)

agreed the higher educational institutions should play, such as inducing analytical thinking and participation.

For the open-ended question in which respondents were asked to give their opinion on what is lacking in our higher education system and suggestions to improve them, only seven respondents out of 120 responded to this question. Some said that the exam-oriented approach that is currently being practiced in most of the higher educational institutions is way outdated. They suggested that universities should induce more participation from students. They also suggested that students should be exposed to a balanced approach in learning so that they have knowledge of both theoretical and practical aspects.

One of the respondents also said that students should be exposed to the labour market outlook so that they will be able to choose fields of education that are marketable. Most of the respondents stressed on the medium of language. They suggested that English should be used as the medium of instruction to enhance graduates marketability. They also mentioned the outdated skills being taught to students as it will deter students from being equipped with current and modern skills and techniques especially in the area of Information Technology (IT). Respondents also suggested that graduates should be more independent, creative and forward thinking.