



澳門理工學院
Instituto Politécnico de Macau
Macao Polytechnic Institute

Macao Polytechnic Institute

Service User Satisfaction Survey 2021

Summary Report

Academic Affairs Department

February 2022

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Results	2
3. Handling of Users' General Comments regarding Continuous Improvement	4
4. Trend Analysis in User Satisfaction.....	5

1. Introduction

In order to gauge the level of satisfaction with services for the purpose of continuous improvement, Macao Polytechnic Institute (hereafter referred to as “the Institute”) conducts the user satisfaction survey throughout the year and the results are published annually. Based upon users’ comments, the Institute can review and continue to optimise service quality. The survey is administered using both paper-based and electronic approaches. The questionnaire makes use of a 5-point Likert scale with the following five options available for respondents: 1-Highly unsatisfactory; 2-Unsatisfactory; 3-Acceptable; 4-Satisfactory; 5-Highly Satisfactory. The survey covers 9 main service areas: level of convenience, staff, environment, internal process, service outcome, e-service, service information, performance pledge and overall service quality. In 2021, a total of 431 questionnaires were received, 12 of which were incomplete, which means that the total number of valid questionnaire responses was 419.

2. Results

Service Factors	Sub-factors	Average Satisfaction Level	Score for Sub-factors	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient [#]
Level of convenience	Service hours	4.53	4.53	0.616	.610**
	Service location		4.56	0.610	.603**
	Contact methods		4.51	0.606	.650**
Staff	Attitude	4.70	4.74	0.457	.653**
	Professionalism		4.69	0.491	.629**
	Efficiency		4.69	0.521	.635**
	Responsiveness		4.67	0.529	.625**
Environment	Comfort	4.61	4.63	0.561	.637**
	Facilities		4.58	0.592	.657**
Internal process	Waiting time	4.62	4.59	0.637	.550**
	Level of simplicity		4.59	0.624	.627**
	Fairness		4.67	0.536	.672**
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	4.71	4.71	0.498	.669**
E-service	Coverage	4.49	4.50	0.720	.617**
	Level of satisfaction		4.48	0.722	.639**
Service information	Transparency	4.61	4.58	0.580	.673**
	Accuracy		4.64	0.521	.694**
Performance pledge	Coverage	4.66	4.65	0.527	.751**
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators		4.67	0.517	.786**
	Clarity of the indicators		4.66	0.552	.766**
Overall service quality		4.70	4.70	0.506	-

The Spearman correlation coefficient between the scores for sub-factors and overall service quality

** The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Service Factors	Sub-factors	No. of Respondents	% of Highly Unsatisfactory	% of Unsatisfactory	% of Unsatisfactory and Highly Unsatisfactory	% of Acceptable	% of Satisfactory	% of Highly Satisfactory	% of Satisfactory and Highly Satisfactory
Level of convenience	Service hours	415	-	0.5	0.5	5.1	34.9	59.5	94.4
	Service location	417	-	-	-	6.2	31.7	62.1	93.8
	Contact methods	397	-	-	-	5.8	37.5	56.7	94.2
Staff	Attitude	418	-	-	-	0.7	24.9	74.4	99.3
	Professionalism	416	-	-	-	1.4	27.6	70.9	98.5
	Efficiency	417	-	-	-	2.9	24.9	72.2	97.1
	Responsiveness	415	-	-	-	2.9	27.2	69.9	97.1
Environment	Comfort	415	-	-	-	4.1	28.4	67.5	95.9
	Facilities	414	-	0.2	0.2	4.6	31.6	63.5	95.1
Internal process	Waiting time	408	-	0.5	0.5	6.6	26.7	66.2	92.9
	Level of simplicity	409	-	0.5	0.5	5.9	27.4	66.3	93.7
	Fairness	398	-	0.3	0.3	2.5	27.1	70.1	97.2
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	407	-	0.2	0.2	1.2	26.3	72.2	98.5
E-service	Coverage	375	0.5	0.8	1.3	7.7	30.4	60.5	90.9
	Level of satisfaction	378	0.5	0.8	1.3	7.9	31.2	59.5	90.7
Service information	Transparency	388	-	0.3	0.3	3.9	33.2	62.6	95.8
	Accuracy	392	-	-	-	2.0	31.6	66.3	97.9
Performance pledge	Coverage	396	-	-	-	2.5	29.5	67.9	97.4
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators	399	-	-	-	2.3	28.6	69.2	97.8
	Clarity of the indicators	400	-	-	-	4.0	26.0	70.0	96.0
Overall service quality		411	-	0.2	0.2	1.5	26.8	71.5	98.3

The results indicate that the users' average satisfaction level for overall service quality was 4.7. Among the eight service factors, "Fitness for purpose" gained the highest mean score (4.71) while "e-service" scored the lowest (4.49). In terms of service sub-factors, "staff – attitude" gained the highest mean score (4.74) while "e-service – level of satisfaction" gained the lowest score (4.48).

In terms of the user distribution across the satisfactory spectrum, it shows that 98.3% of the respondents were satisfied or highly satisfied with the overall service quality of the Institute; 1.5% of the respondents found the service of the Institute acceptable and 0.2% of the respondents were unsatisfied or highly unsatisfied with the services. According to the distribution of users' level of satisfaction, the three service sub-factors that users were satisfied or highly satisfied with the most were "staff – attitude" (99.3%), "staff –

professionalism” (98.5%) / “fitness for purpose” (98.5%), and “accuracy” (97.9%); the three service sub-factors that users were satisfied or highly satisfied with the least were “e-service - level of satisfaction” (90.7%), “e-service - coverage” (90.9%), as well as “internal process - waiting time” (92.9%). The service sub-factors that users were unsatisfied or highly unsatisfied with the most were “e-service - level of satisfaction” (1.3%) / “e-service - coverage” (1.3%), “level of convenience - service hours” (0.5%) / “internal process - waiting time” (0.5%) / “internal process - level of simplicity” (0.5%), as well as “internal process - fairness” (0.3%) / “service information - Transparency” (0.3%).

In general, among the eight service factors, the average satisfaction level score of the Institute was 4.49 or above, while the level of satisfaction for each service sub-factor attained 90.7% or above.

3. Handling of Users’ General Comments regarding Continuous Improvement

Among the 419 valid questionnaires, 11 (2.6%) provided comments and suggestions. Most of the comments were related to “receipt of fees”, “venue rental application” and “student hostel application”. Suggestions include the level of convenience of chargeable services, advice on venue rental services, and broadening of student hostel services.

All comments have been conveyed to the relevant departments for their responses and follow-up actions so as to optimise each of the services continuously.

4. Trend Analysis in User Satisfaction

Service Factors	Sub-factors	Year 2019		Year 2020		Year 2021	
		Mean Score for Sub-factors	Average Satisfaction Level	Mean Score for Sub-factors	Average Satisfaction Level	Mean Score for Sub-factors	Average Satisfaction Level
Level of convenience	Service hours	4.46	4.43	4.57	4.54	4.53	4.53
	Service location	4.40		4.56		4.56	
	Contact methods	4.42		4.50		4.51	
Staff	Attitude	4.64	4.60	4.75	4.71	4.74	4.70
	Professionalism	4.61		4.73		4.69	
	Efficiency	4.60		4.67		4.69	
	Responsiveness	4.56		4.69		4.67	
Environment	Comfort	4.52	4.49	4.57	4.55	4.63	4.61
	Facilities	4.46		4.53		4.58	
Internal process	Waiting time	4.51	4.54	4.58	4.62	4.59	4.62
	Level of simplicity	4.52		4.61		4.59	
	Fairness	4.59		4.67		4.67	
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	4.60	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.71	4.71
E-service	Coverage	4.41	4.41	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.49
	Level of satisfaction	4.41		4.47		4.48	
Service information	Transparency	4.44	4.49	4.57	4.59	4.58	4.61
	Accuracy	4.53		4.61		4.64	
Performance pledge	Coverage	4.53	4.54	4.65	4.64	4.65	4.66
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators	4.55		4.65		4.67	
	Clarity of the indicators	4.54		4.63		4.66	
Overall service quality		4.57	4.57	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.70

Compared to last year, the score for overall service quality increased by 0.04 to 4.7, at the level of satisfactory. The largest increases were recorded in “environment” which increased 0.06; “service outcome” which increased 0.05, as well as “service information” and “performance pledge”, which increased 0.02 respectively.