



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

# **Macao Polytechnic Institute**

## **User Satisfaction Survey 2019**

### **Summary Report**

Academic Affairs Department

March 2020

## 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 MPI services for the purpose of continuous improvement, the user satisfaction survey is conducted throughout the year in 2019 and the results are published annually. Based upon users' comments, MPI can review and continue to optimise service quality. The survey is offered through both paper and electronic formats. 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 2019, a total of 625 questionnaires were received, 25 of which were incomplete, which means that the total number of valid questionnaire responses was 600.

## 2. Results

Service Factors	Sub-factors	Average Satisfaction Level	Score for Sub-factors	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient <sup>#</sup>
Level of convenience	Service hours	4.43	4.46	0.66	0.600
	Service location		4.40	0.74	0.633
	Contact methods		4.42	0.72	0.658
Staff	Attitude	4.60	4.64	0.62	0.699
	Professionalism		4.61	0.63	0.702
	Efficiency		4.60	0.66	0.656
	Responsiveness		4.56	0.67	0.698
Environment	Comfort	4.49	4.52	0.69	0.636
	Facilities		4.46	0.72	0.665
Internal process	Waiting time	4.54	4.51	0.72	0.595
	Level of simplicity		4.52	0.71	0.668
	Fairness		4.59	0.66	0.713
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	4.60	4.60	0.66	0.678
E-service	Coverage	4.41	4.41	0.74	0.668
	Level of satisfaction		4.41	0.76	0.657
Service information	Transparency	4.49	4.44	0.73	0.745
	Accuracy		4.53	0.67	0.755
Performance pledge	Coverage	4.54	4.53	0.67	0.752
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators		4.55	0.67	0.796
	Clarity of the indicators		4.54	0.68	0.797
Overall service quality		4.57	4.57	0.64	-/-

<sup>#</sup> The Spearman correlation coefficient between the scores for sub-factors and overall service quality

<sup>\*\*</sup> 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	595	0.3	0.5	0.8	5.9	39.8	53.4	93.2
	Service location	598	1.0	0.5	1.5	7.9	38.6	52.0	90.6
	Contact methods	572	0.5	0.5	1.0	8.9	36.7	53.3	90.0
Staff	Attitude	596	0.7	0.3	1.0	2.9	27.0	69.1	96.1
	Professionalism	595	0.8	-	0.8	2.9	29.9	66.4	96.3
	Efficiency	596	0.7	0.5	1.2	4.0	28.2	66.6	94.8
	Responsiveness	593	0.5	0.3	0.8	5.9	29.5	63.7	93.2
Environment	Comfort	594	0.7	0.2	0.9	7.1	31.1	60.9	92.0
	Facilities	589	0.7	0.3	1.0	8.3	33.6	57.0	90.6
Internal process	Waiting time	589	0.5	0.8	1.3	8.0	28.5	62.1	90.6
	Level of simplicity	589	0.8	0.7	1.5	5.6	31.1	61.8	92.9
	Fairness	579	0.9	0.2	1.1	4.1	29.0	65.8	94.8
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	587	0.9	0.2	1.1	3.9	28.3	66.8	95.1
E-service	Coverage	550	0.9	-	0.9	10.2	35.5	53.5	89.0
	Level of satisfaction	548	0.9	0.5	1.4	9.5	35.0	54.0	89.0
Service information	Transparency	572	0.9	0.5	1.4	7.3	35.8	55.4	91.2
	Accuracy	574	0.9	-	0.9	4.7	34.1	60.3	94.4
Performance pledge	Coverage	572	0.9	-	0.9	4.5	34.8	59.8	94.6
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators	574	0.9	-	0.9	4.5	32.2	62.4	94.6
	Clarity of the indicators	575	0.9	-	0.9	5.2	31.7	62.3	94.0
Overall service quality		587	0.9	0.2	1.1	2.6	34.4	62.0	96.4

The results reveal that the users' average satisfaction level for overall service quality was 4.57. Among the eight service factors, "staff" and "service outcome" gained the highest mean score (4.60) respectively while "e-service" scored the lowest (4.41). In terms of service sub-factors, "staff – attitude" gained the highest mean score (4.64) while "level of convenience – service location" gained the lowest score (4.40).

From the users' level of satisfaction, it shows that 96.4% of the respondents were satisfied or highly satisfied with MPI overall service quality; 2.6% of the respondents found MPI services acceptable and 1.1% of the respondents were unsatisfied or highly unsatisfied with MPI 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 – professionalism" (96.3%), "staff – attitude" (96.1%) and "service outcome – fitness for purpose" (95.1%); the three service sub-factors that users were satisfied or highly satisfied with the least were "e-service – coverage" (89.0%) / "e-service – level of satisfaction" (89.0%), "level of convenience – contact methods" (90.0 %), as well as "level of convenience – service location" (90.6%) / "environment – facilities" (90.6%) / "internal process – waiting time" (90.6%). The service sub-factors that users were unsatisfied or highly unsatisfied with the most were "level of convenience – service location" (1.5%) / "internal process – level of simplicity" (1.5%), "e-service – level of satisfaction" (1.4%) / "service information – transparency" (1.4%), as well as "internal process - waiting time" (1.3%).

In general, among the eight service factors, MPI average satisfaction level score was 4.4 and above, while the level of satisfaction for each service sub-factor attained 90% and above except "e-service – coverage" (89.0%) and "e-service – level of satisfaction" (89.0%).

### **3. Handling of Users' General Comments regarding Continuous Improvement**

Among the 600 valid questionnaires, 48 (8.0%) provided comments and suggestions. Most of the comments were related to "payment service", "student locker application", "student hostel application" and "venue rental application". Suggestions include extension of service hours, expansion of the coverage of e-services, optimisation of the facilities, etc. Quite a number of positive comments were also received.

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	2017		2018		2019	
		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	4.41	4.45	4.51	4.50	4.46	4.43
	Service location	4.50		4.50		4.40	
	Contact methods	4.44		4.48		4.42	
Staff	Attitude	4.66	4.61	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.60
	Professionalism	4.61		4.67		4.61	
	Efficiency	4.59		4.66		4.60	
	Responsiveness	4.58		4.60		4.56	
Environment	Comfort	4.53	4.51	4.60	4.57	4.52	4.49
	Facilities	4.48		4.54		4.46	
Internal process	Waiting time	4.50	4.53	4.54	4.58	4.51	4.54
	Level of simplicity	4.52		4.57		4.52	
	Fairness	4.58		4.62		4.59	
Service outcome	Fitness for purpose	4.61	4.61	4.65	4.65	4.60	4.60
E-service	Coverage	4.43	4.42	4.48	4.50	4.41	4.41
	Level of satisfaction	4.41		4.52		4.41	
Service information	Transparency	4.46	4.50	4.51	4.56	4.44	4.49
	Accuracy	4.53		4.60		4.53	
Performance pledge	Coverage	4.53	4.53	4.59	4.59	4.53	4.54
	Level of satisfaction with the indicators	4.54		4.59		4.55	
	Clarity of the indicators	4.53		4.59		4.54	
Overall service quality		4.56	4.56	4.61	4.61	4.57	4.57

Compared to last year, the scores of all the eight service factors were similar, the score for overall service quality slightly decreased by 0.04 to 4.57, still at the level of satisfactory. The largest decreases were recorded in “e-service”, which decreased 0.09, “level of convenience” and “environment”, which decreased 0.08 respectively, as well as “service information”, which decreased 0.07.