

澳門旅遊學院 INSTITUTO DE FORMAÇÃO TURÍSTICA DE MACAU Macao Institute for Tourism Studies

Macao Institute for Tourism Studies

Public Services and Organizational Performance Appraisal System

2020 User Satisfaction Survey Report



Macao Institute for Tourism Studies 2020 User Satisfaction Survey Report

1. Introduction

Objective: 《Public Services and Organizational Performance Appraisal System 》 was promulgated through the Executive Order No. 61/2019 on April 23, 2019. In terms of public services development, the opinions of users determine the development direction, and public satisfaction is one of the measures of organizational performance. Thus, with the aim of achieving continuous improvement, IFTM Macao Institute for Tourism Studies (IFTM) has established a mechanism to collect feedback from target users on a regular basis to understand their views on our public services including the service delivery process and results. In response to this, IFTM conducted a user satisfaction survey on our 24 public services in 2020, as a means to evaluate service quality and to identify areas for improvement.

Survey Period: Survey is conducted each year (subject to the arrangement of individual units of IFTM).

Scope: An anonymous survey inclusive of all IFTM public services under the Performance Pledge Programme (see IFTM's service list).

Survey Factors: There are 10 service factors: 1) Services of Staff Members, 2) Environment, 3) Facilities, 4) Operation Procedures, 5) Availability of Service Information, 6) Performance Pledge Programme, 7) E-Services, 8) Performance Information, 9) Service Integration and 10) Overall Services.

Questionnaire Settings: The questionnaire adopts the 5-point Likert Scale.

Scale	1	2	3	4	5
Degree	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied



2. Survey Results

General Public Services					
No. of Valid Response			999		
Service Factors	Sub-Factors	Average Satisfaction Level	Grading for Sub- Factors	Standard Deviation	
	Initiative		4.46	-0.03	
Services of Staff	Professionalism	4.50	4.45	-0.04	
Members	Grooming		4.57	+0.07	
	Attitude	-	4.49	-0.00	
D • (Convenience	4.50	4.44	-0.06	
Environment	Comfortability		4.55	+0.06	
	Hardware Equipment		4.46	-0.03	
	Clear Instruction		4.49	+0.00	
Facilities	Supporting Facilities	4.49	4.48	-0.01	
	Supporting Measures		4.47	-0.02	
	Venue Security		4.55	+0.06	
	Seamlessness	4.52	4.52	+0.00	
Operation	Efficiency		4.51	-0.01	
Procedures	Effectiveness		4.52	-0.00	
	Fairness		4.52	+0.01	
	Adequacy	4.50	4.49	-0.01	
Availability of	Accessibility		4.49	-0.01	
Service	Accuracy		4.50	+0.00	
Information	Usefulness		4.50	+0.00	
	Confidentiality		4.51	+0.01	
	Scope		4.51	+0.00	
Performance Pledge	Clarity of Indicators		4.52	+0.01	
Programme	Satisfaction with	4.51	4.52	+0.02	
Service	Indicators Channels of	-	1.52	10.02	
Assurance	Expression		4.48	-0.03	
	Necessity		4.50	+0.01	
	Convenience	1	4.52	+0.02	
E-Services	Security	4.50	4.51	+0.01	
	Adequacy		4.50	+0.01	
	Adequate Communication Channels		4.44	-0.05	
Donformance	Adequacy	4.44	4.43	-0.01	
Performance Information	Openness and transparency		4.45	+0.01	



Service Integration	Service Optimization through Cross- Departmental Collaboration/One- Stop Service	4.37	4.37	+0.00
Overall Services	Overall Satisfaction Level	4.54	4.54	+0.00

Result Analysis

The overall score of all the service factors of IFTM was above 4, indicating that users were satisfied with IFTM's services. The "Grooming" got 4.57 points, which was the highest score. In addition, the average score of "Overall Services" was the highest with 4.54 points.

3. Analysis of Users' General Comments

"General Comments"¹ collected from users include:

Services of Pedagogic Affairs Department

• Complaint about poor service attitude (3.53%,6/170)

Services of Educational Restaurant (ER)

- Praise for service attitude of staff members/students (4.03%,15/372)
- Praise for quality of the service and food in the restaurant (1.88%,7/372)
- The overall restaurant service and food quality is good. (1.08%,4/372)
- 'Very satisfied' with the Educational Restaurant (0.81%,3/372)
- Suggest providing more food choices (0.81%,3/372)
- Suggest increasing food portions (0.81%,3/372)

Services of Library (LIB)

• Limited range of books (1.14%, 3/263)

¹ The term "General Comments" refers to the same opinion received three times or more.



4. Improvements

The following improvements measures are introduced in response to the survey results and collected user opinions:

Services of Pedagogic Affairs Department

- Continuously review the work of frontline staff members and remind them of the public's dissatisfactions in due course;
- Continuously arrange relevant training courses for frontline staff members.

Services of Educational Restaurant (ER)

- Continuously add a variety of dishes for guests to choose from. The Educational Restaurant launched a number of well-received new dishes including starters, main dishes and desserts in August and October 2020;
- The restaurant has calculated the food cost for each dish, so it is hard to adjust portions. Nevertheless, it may increase or adjust diversified dishes to suit different tastes in response to guests' suggestions.

Services of Library (LIB)

• The library has strengthened the promotion of book purchase suggestions, and continuously observed the usage of the library, to make timely improvements.

		2020 (Current Year)		
Service Factors	Sub-Factors	Grading for Sub-Factors	Average Satisfaction Level	
	Initiative	4.46		
Services of Staff	Professionalism	4.45	4.50	
Members	Grooming	4.57		
	Attitude	4.49		
En sino num on t	Convenience	4.44	4.50	
Environment	Comfortability	4.55		
	Hardware Equipment	4.46		
	Clear Instruction	4.49	4 40	
Facilities	Supporting Facilities	4.48	4.49	
	Supporting Measures	4.47		
	Venue Security	4.55		

5. Trend Analysis (Compared with previous year)



Operation ProceduresSeamlessness4.52Efficiency4.514.52Effectiveness4.52Fairness4.52Availability of Service InformationAdequacy4.49Accessibility4.49Accessibility4.49Accuracy4.50Usefulness4.50Confidentiality4.51Performance Pledge Programme Service AssuranceClarity of Indicators4.52Channels of Expression4.48Necessity4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.45Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop Service4.37AuguationServiceService4.37		G 1	4.52	
Operation Procedures Effectiveness 4.52 Effectiveness 4.52 Fairness 4.52 Adequacy 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.50 Usefulness 4.50 Confidentiality 4.51 Scope 4.51 Satisfaction with Indicators 4.51 Satisfaction with Indicators 4.51 Channels of Expression 4.48 Necessity 4.50 Convenience 4.52 Security 4.50 Adequacy 4.50 Adequacy 4.50 Adequacy 4.43 Adequacy 4.43 Performance Adequacy 4.43 Information Openness and transparency 4.45 Service Optimization 4.37 4.37				
Effectiveness 4.52 Fairness 4.52 Fairness 4.52 Adequacy 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.49 Accessibility 4.50 Usefulness 4.50 Confidentiality 4.51 Scope 4.51 Clarity of Indicators 4.52 Programme Satisfaction with Indicators Service Assurance Convenience Channels of Expression 4.48 Necessity 4.50 Convenience 4.50 Convenience 4.50 Adequacy 4.50 Adequacy 4.50 Adequacy 4.43 Adequacy 4.43 Performance Adequacy 4.43 Information Openness and transparency 4.43 Openness and transparency 4.43 Servic	Oneration Procedures	Efficiency		4.52
Availability of Service InformationAdequacy4.49Accessibility4.49Accessibility4.49Accessibility4.49Accuracy4.50Usefulness4.50Usefulness4.50Confidentiality4.51Scope4.51Clarity of Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.50Channels of Expression4.48Necessity4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.45Service IntegrationService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.37AdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptaceAdaptace4.37AdaptaceAdaptace	Operation rocedures	Effectiveness	4.52	
Availability of Service Information Accessibility 4.49 4.50 Accuracy 4.50 4.50 4.50 Usefulness 4.50 4.50 4.50 Confidentiality 4.51 4.51 4.51 Performance Pledge Programme Service Assurance Clarity of Indicators 4.52 4.51 Channels of Expression 4.48 4.51 4.51 Channels of Expression 4.48 4.50 Convenience 4.52 4.50 Adequacy 4.50 4.50 Adequacy 4.40 4.44 Openness and transparency 4.43 4.44 Openness and transparency 4.45 4.37 Service Optimization 4.37 4.37		Fairness	4.52	
Availability of Service InformationAccuracy4.504.50Accuracy4.50Usefulness4.50Usefulness4.50Confidentiality4.51Confidentiality4.51Confidentiality4.51Performance Pledge Programme Service AssuranceClarity of Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.524.51Channels of Expression4.484.51Convenience4.524.50Convenience4.524.50Security4.514.50Adequacy4.504.50Adequacy4.434.44InformationOpenness and transparency4.43Service IntegrationService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.37AdaptationAdaptation4.37		Adequacy	4.49	
InformationAccuracy4.50InformationUsefulness4.50Confidentiality4.51Confidentiality4.51Confidentiality4.51Clarity of Indicators4.52Performance Pledge Programme Service AssuranceClarity of IndicatorsClarity of Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.52Channels of Expression4.48Necessity4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43InformationService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.37Service Integration4.37		Accessibility	4.49	4.50
Usefulness4.50Confidentiality4.51Confidentiality4.51Scope4.51Clarity of Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.52Channels of Expression4.48Convenience4.52Service Assurance6Convenience4.52Security4.50Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.43Adequacy4.43Information6Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.374.37		Accuracy	4.50	4.50
Performance Programme Service AssuranceScope4.51Clarity of Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.52Satisfaction with Indicators4.52Channels of Expression4.48Necessity4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.43Performance InformationAdequacyService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.374.37	mormation	Usefulness	4.50	
Performance Pledge Programme Service AssuranceClarity of Indicators4.524.51Satisfaction with Indicators4.524.51Channels of Expression4.481Channels of Expression4.484.50Convenience4.524.50Security4.514.50Adequacy4.504.50Adequate Communication Channels4.44Performance InformationAdequacy4.43Openness and transparency4.434.44Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.374.37		Confidentiality	4.51	
Performance Predge Programme Service AssuranceCounty of Indicators4.524.51Satisfaction with Indicators </th <th></th> <td>Scope</td> <td>4.51</td> <td></td>		Scope	4.51	
Programme Service AssuranceSatisfaction with Indicators4.524.51Channels of Expression4.48Channels of Expression4.48Necessity4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.44Channels4.44Performance InformationAdequacyService IntegrationService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.37Adaption4.37	Performance Pledge	Clarity of Indicators	4.52	4 5 1
E-ServicesNecessity4.50Convenience4.52Security4.51Adequacy4.50Adequate Communication Channels4.44Mereformance InformationAdequacyPerformance InformationAdequacyOpenness and transparency4.43Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.374.37	Programme	Satisfaction with Indicators	4.52	4.51
E-ServicesConvenience4.52Security4.514.50Adequacy4.50Adequate Communication Channels4.44Performance InformationAdequacy4.43Openness and transparency4.45Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.374.37		Channels of Expression	4.48	
E-ServicesSecurity4.514.50Adequacy4.50Adequacy4.60Adequate Communication Channels4.444.44Performance InformationAdequacy4.434.44Openness and transparency4.454.45Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.37		Necessity	4.50	
E-ServicesSecurity1.51Adequacy4.50Adequate Communication Channels4.44Performance InformationAdequacy4.43Openness and transparency4.45Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.37		Convenience	4.52	
Adequacy4.50Adequate Communication Channels4.44Performance InformationAdequacy4.43Openness and transparency4.45Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.374.37	E-Services	Security	4.51	4.50
Performance InformationAdequacy4.434.44Openness and transparency4.454.45Service Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.37		Adequacy	4.50	
InformationOpenness and transparency4.45Service IntegrationService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.37			4.44	
Service IntegrationService Optimization through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.374.37	Performance	Adequacy	4.43	4.44
Service Integrationthrough Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop4.37	Information	Openness and transparency	4.45	
	Service Integration	through Cross-Departmental Collaboration/One-Stop	4.37	4.37
Overall ServicesOverall Satisfaction Level4.544.54	Overall Services	Overall Satisfaction Level	4.54	4.54

		2019 (Last Year)		
Service Factors	Sub-Factors	Score of Sub- Factors	Average Satisfaction Score	
	Service Hour	4.33		
Level of Convenience	Service Location	4.25	4.31	
	Communication Channels	4.36		
	Attitude	4.49		
Services of Staff Members	Knowledge	4.43	4.44	
	Efficiency	4.42		



	Initiative	4.42	
Environment	Comfortability	4.38	4.34
Environment	Equipment Setting	4.30	4.34
	Response Time	4.40	
Operation Procedures	Simplicity	4.34	4.38
	Fairness	4.39	
Service	Service Conformance	4.42	4.42
Availability of	Disclosure	4.38	4.40
Service Information	Accuracy	4.43	
E-Services	Scope	4.22	4.23
E-Services	Satisfaction Level	4.23	4.23
	Scope	4.36	4.36
Performance Pledge Programme	Satisfaction with Indicators	4.37	
	Clarity of Indicators	4.33	
Overall Services	Overall Satisfaction Level	4.38	4.38

The satisfaction scores of this year are similar to those of last year. All the factors and sub-factors scored above 4 points, and no item scored below 3 points or showed a decrease of more than 1 point. "Overall Services" had a gain of 0.16 points. The IFTM will continue to monitor the 2021 survey results, conduct research and analysis on the positive and negative comments from customers, and implement all measures for continuous improvement.

- The End -