澳門理工大學
Universidade Politécnica de Macau
Macao Polytechnic University

Macao Polytechnic University

Service User Satisfaction Survey 2022

Summary Report

Academic Affairs Department

February 2023

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

According to the reference guideline of the "Public Services and Organizational Performance Assessment Scheme" of the Macao SAR Government, the public departments should establish a mechanism to collect the opinions of service recipients for the services implemented, so as to collect the opinions of service recipients and achieve continuous improvement. Macao Polytechnic University (hereafter referred to as "the University") conducts the service user satisfaction survey on 9 services in 2022. Based upon users' comments, the University can review and continue to optimise service quality.

The survey is administered using both paper-based and electronic approaches. The questionnaires were distributed to users at each service location throughout the year to invite users to participate in the survey. For non-in-person services, questionnaires were sent by email to users. 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, with a "not applicable" option to avoid respondents responding to irrelevant or unclear items.

2. Results

2.1. Overall distribution of the number of collected questionnaires

Table 2-1-1: number of questionnaires by survey methods

Survey methods	No. of collected questionnaires	No. of valid questionnaires	No. of invalid questionnaires
Paper-based questionnaire	151	143	8
Electronic questionnaire	8	6	2
Total	159	149	10

Table 2-1-2: number of questionnaires by type of service users

Type of service users	No. of valid questionnaires	Percentage (%)
Degree programmes Students	96	64.4
Seniors Academy Students	-	-
Staff	1	0.7
External	19	12.8
Organisations	33	22.1
Total	149	100.0

Table 2-1-3: number of questionnaires by service items

Type of service items	No. of valid questionnaires	Percentage (%)
Degree Programmmes	15	10.1
Training Courses	3	2.0
Fee-based Services	80	53.7
Language Proficiency Test	-	-
Assistance with Job Postings	-	-
Student Locker	-	-
Student Dormitory	6	4.0
Library Circulation Services	12	8.1
Venue Rental Application	33	22.1
Total	149	100.0

2.2. Statistics

Table 2-2-1: Average Satisfaction Levels

Service Factors	Sub-factors	Average Satisfaction Level	Score for Sub-factors	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient#
Level of convenience	Service hours	4.50	4.53	0.634	.781**
	Service location		4.53	0.655	.750**
	Contact methods		4.43	0.762	.697**
Staff	Attitude	4.64	4.72	0.559	.656**
	Professionalism		4.69	0.570	.649**
	Efficiency		4.59	0.711	.665**
	Responsiveness		4.55	0.744	.680**
Environment	Comfort	4.57	4.62	0.657	.776**
	Facilities		4.52	0.729	.803**
Internal process	Waiting time	4.50	4.45	0.816	.764**
	Level of simplicity		4.46	0.782	.773**
	Fairness		4.59	0.694	.865**
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	4.64	4.64	0.597	.787**
E-service	Coverage	4.42	4.41	0.738	.716**
	Level of satisfaction		4.43	0.704	.689**
Service information	Transparency	4.55	4.51	0.652	.792**
	Accuracy		4.59	0.611	.721**
Performance pledge	Coverage	4.54	4.56	0.645	.859**
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators		4.54	0.679	.901**
	Clarity of the indicators		4.51	0.730	.833**
Overall service quality		4.58	4.58	0.642	-

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).

Table 2-2-1: distribution of service satisfaction

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	147	-	-	-	7.48	31.97	60.54	92.52
	Service location	147	-	-	-	8.84	29.25	61.90	91.16
	Contact methods	145	-	-	-	16.55	23.45	60.00	83.45
Staff	Attitude	147	0.68	-	0.68	1.36	22.45	75.51	97.96
	Professionalism	146	0.68	-	0.68	1.37	25.34	72.60	97.95
	Efficiency	146	0.68	-	0.68	8.90	20.55	69.86	90.41
	Responsiveness	146	0.68	-	0.68	10.96	20.55	67.81	88.36
Environment	Comfort	145	0.69	-	0.69	5.52	24.14	69.66	93.79
	Facilities	144	0.69	-	0.69	9.72	25.69	63.89	89.58
Internal process	Waiting time	145	0.69	0.69	1.38	14.48	21.38	62.76	84.14
	Level of simplicity	145	0.69	0.69	1.38	11.72	26.21	60.69	86.90
	Fairness	136	0.74		0.74	7.35	23.53	68.38	91.91
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	145	-	-	-	6.21	23.45	70.34	93.79
E-service	Coverage	127	-	2.36	2.36	7.87	36.22	53.54	89.76
	Level of satisfaction	130	-	0.77	0.77	10.00	34.62	54.62	89.23
Service information	Transparency	139	-	-	-	8.63	31.65	59.71	91.37
	Accuracy	140	-	0.71	0.71	4.29	30.71	64.29	95.00
Performance pledge	Coverage	144	-	0.69	0.69	6.25	29.86	63.19	93.06
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators	143	0.70	-	0.70	6.29	30.77	62.24	93.01
	Clarity of the indicators	143	-	0.70	0.70	11.89	23.08	64.34	87.41
Overall service quality		146	0.68	-	0.68	4.11	31.51	63.70	95.21

3. Analysis

In 2022, a total of 159 questionnaires were received, of which 10 (6.29%) were considered invalid due to incompletion. No questionnaire was received during the survey period for the "Language Proficiency Test", "Assistance with Job Postings", and "Student Locker" services.

The results indicate that the users' average satisfaction level for overall service quality was 4.58. Among the eight service factors, "staff" and "service outcome" gained the highest mean score (4.64) while "e-service" scored the lowest (4.42). In terms of service

sub-factors, "staff – attitude" gained the highest mean score (4.72) while "e-service – coverage" gained the lowest score (4.41).

In terms of the distribution of service satisfaction, it shows that 95.21% of the respondents were satisfied or highly satisfied with the overall service quality; 4.11% of the respondents found the service acceptable and 0.68% 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" (97.96%), "staff – professionalism" (97.95%) and "service information - accuracy" (95.00%); the three service sub-factors that users were satisfied or highly satisfied with the least were "Level of convenience - contact methods" (83.45%) , "internal process - waiting time" (84.14%) and "internal process - level of simplicity" (86.90%). The service sub-factors that users were unsatisfied or highly unsatisfied with the most were "e-service - coverage" (2.36%), "internal process - waiting time" (1.38%) / "internal process - level of simplicity" (1.38%), as well as "e-service - level of satisfaction" (0.77%).

In general, among the eight service factors, the average satisfaction level score was 4.42 or above, while the level of satisfaction for each service sub-factor attained 83.45% or above.

4. Handling of Users' General Comments regarding Continuous Improvement

Among the 149 valid questionnaires, 18 comments and suggestions were provided. Most of the comments were related to "receipt of fees", "library services" and "venue rental application". Suggestions include the level of convenience of e-service of chargeable services, library services and venue rental services.

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

5. Trend Analysis in User Satisfaction

Table 5-1: average satisfaction level trend analysis

Service Factors	Sub-factors	Year 2020		Year 2021		Year 2022	
		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	4.57	4.54	4.53	4.53	4.53	4.50
	Service location	4.56		4.56		4.53	
	Contact methods	4.50		4.51		4.43	
Staff	Attitude	4.75	4.71	4.74	4.70	4.72	4.64
	Professionalism	4.73		4.69		4.69	
	Efficiency	4.67		4.69		4.59	
	Responsiveness	4.69		4.67		4.55	
Environment	Comfort	4.57	4.55	4.63	4.61	4.62	4.57
	Facilities	4.53		4.58		4.52	
Internal process	Waiting time	4.58	4.62	4.59	4.62	4.45	4.50
	Level of simplicity	4.61		4.59		4.46	
	Fairness	4.67		4.67		4.59	
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	4.66	4.66	4.71	4.71	4.64	4.64
E-service	Coverage	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.49	4.41	4.42
	Level of satisfaction	4.47		4.48		4.43	
Service information	Transparency	4.57	4.59	4.58	4.61	4.51	4.55
	Accuracy	4.61		4.64		4.59	
Performance pledge	Coverage	4.65	4.64	4.65	4.66	4.56	4.54
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators	4.65		4.67		4.54	
	Clarity of the indicators	4.63		4.66		4.51	
Overall service quality		4.66	4.66	4.70	4.70	4.58	4.58

Compared to last year, the scores of all the eight service factors were similar, all reaching the level of satisfactory. The largest decreases were recorded in "Internal process" and "Performance pledge", which decreased 0.12, "Service outcome" and "E-service", which decreased 0.07 respectively, as well as "service information" and "Staff", which decreased 0.06. The score for overall service quality slightly decreased by 0.12 to 4.58, still at the level of satisfactory.