



HUNGARIAN
CENTRAL
STATISTICAL
OFFICE

USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS IN 2014

Taking into account the necessity for an impartial judgment, HCSO charged a company to pursue a series of satisfaction surveys for HCSO in 2014. These focused on the various dimensions of quality measurement, the target groups being the most relevant ones (researchers, media, public administration). Topics examined were quality of subject matter statistics and regional statistics.

The applied methods were:

- online questionnaire;
- 27 in-depth interviews and
- 3 focus-groups.

The online questionnaire was sent out to about 12,000 users, from whom we collected approximately 1,500 usable answers.

The vast majority of respondents – nine tenths of them – basically access the data required by using tables, databases and publications on the website. Some of them receive the data through the Information service or libraries, including the HCSO Library, but they represent a much smaller proportion. Besides, there are also people who purchase the publications. In the use of the Research room, relatively few people are interested.

One of the most important experiences of the surveys is that, in users' opinion, the data quality is basically good and appropriate in international comparison as well. However, a higher degree of adaptation to the needs of certain specific user groups may further increase the recognition of the office. It also became clear to us that the satisfaction with the work and products – data, analyses – of HCSO is connected with the frequency of using the products and the awareness of the data production processes in the office.

The satisfaction with data quality was measured along several dimensions at five-grade scales. These were relevance, accuracy-reliability, timeliness, comparability, accessibility and clarity. On the whole, the data quality in the different subject matter statistics was valued at an average of 4.1 by respondents, and there were hardly any differences between the dimensions of examination. Among the different subject matter statistics, data quality rating was the highest in housing, public utilities, culture, sports, information and communication, business and non-profit organizations, as well as in population and vital events. The young, active age group (30s–40s age groups) was typically more satisfied with subject matter statistics than the others. Women were significantly more satisfied than men.

In case of regional statistics, the differences in the ratings of data quality dimensions were slightly larger than in subject matter statistics. Relevance ('Data provide the necessary information for me') and accuracy-reliability were valued at the highest, while accessibility at the lowest rate. With regard to access to data, significant differences were found between the various spatial levels (region, county, district, settlement), namely, the access to county data is good, while district- and settlement-level data are less easily accessible. In case of regional data, the difference between user groups was significant only in the dimensions relevance and accuracy-reliability. Regarding these two dimensions, the central and local public administration was the most and the business sector and 'other organizations' were the least satisfied.

In addition to the use of data, we also asked about the awareness and use of various services provided by HCSO. Among them, classifying organizations within NACE, the issue of statistical codes and the Information service were the best known, while the EU-INFO Statistical Service,

the Pressroom, the RSS news service and the Research room were the least known. The awareness and use of classifications according to NACE and issue of statistical codes were the highest among the representatives of the business sector, while the awareness and use of the HCSO Library, the Information service and the Research room was the highest in the aggregate category 'other organizations' including researchers, university lecturers, students, the media and public educational institutions as well.

The experiences of interviews confirmed that the attitude of users towards HCSO was basically determined by the intensity (depth and frequency) of the inclusion of information and data obtained from the Office in their work. The majority of the participants in the survey considered that the data published by HCSO were of good quality, reliable and accurate even in international comparison. At the same time, some saw the communication channels of HCSO slightly backward. Many mentioned that the search engine on the website could not be used well and there were some who considered the data query interfaces difficult to handle. It is mostly journalists who feel that HCSO data are relatively easy to access. The representatives of the academic sphere (researchers, teachers) have individual data needs, they often use micro-data for their analyses, therefore, it is much more difficult for them to co-operate with us, though there are expressly satisfied users among them, too. The Office is not always quick enough and not always flexible enough in reacting to the individual needs of researchers. The institutional framework as well as strict data confidentiality rules were reported among the factors hampering co-operation. HCSO's communication was usually positively valued, especially by those who have personal relations with HCSO staff. There has been a need for modern communication channels: Facebook, Twitter and blogs. The names of colleagues were provided on releases earlier on, while only the contact details of the Press and Communication Section are provided on these publications now, which was negatively valued. Nevertheless, those working in the media tended to have good opinion, too, about HCSO's communication.

The surveys of focus groups were made in Budapest, Győr and Szeged, with 8–9 participants per group. The subject was principally the awareness, use and quality of spatial data and publications. Users are relatively satisfied with the quality of spatial data, but the timeliness of their publication is slower than what they would expect. Though many are aware of data production processes and proved to be understanding – what is more they mentioned that they did not consider publication slow in international terms –, they indicated that this timeliness of publication did not allow decision-making mechanisms in the public sector to prepare and support decisions, it allowed at most for subsequent monitoring. So mostly those were satisfied who make their analyses at regional levels and have no special data needs, while analysts interested in urban development and in statistics on small settlements or the journalists of county papers are less satisfied with the possibilities. The needs for analyses differ from one user group to another. Office staff and certain journalists prefer to use ready-made analyses, while researchers use textual analyses not for their own use but for teaching purposes. Printed publications are first of all a potentially quick guide for them. Irrespective of user groups, participants in focus groups said when talking about publications in general that they mostly used the CD annexes of books with a character of data store. At the same time, they apparently hardly knew the several paper-based analyses and more specific data stores presented in focus groups.