



SPOT-CHECKING OF DATA PROCESSING

The processing of accomplished survey questionnaires was in accordance with the prescribed guidelines of GCG. Data processing was overseen by the Technical Expert/ Statistician of UP CIFAL with the assistance of the Data Processing Supervisor.

The accomplished survey questionnaires were first checked if each of the respondents satisfy the minimum requirements—1) no close family member or relative working in MWSS-CO; 2) no close family member or relative working in any marketing or market research firm; 3) their engagement with MWSS-CO fall under the enumerated list of transaction or services availed from the MWSS-CO. The respondents of the SSS were from a pre-identified list provided by the MWSS-CO. Both the UP CIFAL Philippines and MWSS-CO complied with the requirements indicated in the GCG prescribed methodology to ensure elimination bias.

During the first phase (January-June) of the SSS, two responses were removed from the accomplished 51 surveys: thus, bringing down the number of completed and valid surveys to 49. The two respondents were excluded from the analysis since their engagement did not qualify among the services availed listed in the survey instrument. Furthermore, they had no or very limited engagement with the MWSS-CO, and most of their answers were “Not Applicable.” During the conduct of the survey, the enumerator noted that the said respondents repeatedly raised that they have limited engagement in the MWSS-CO. The same set of respondents were called for the second phase of the SSS (July – December). Out of the 49, 44 respondents agreed to participate in the second SSS. Ninety-three (93) complete and valid survey questionnaires were used for the combined analysis for the 2020 SSS.

Once the accomplished survey questionnaires passed the screener items or questions, the survey forms were cleaned and checked for consistencies before being subjected to analysis. The research and data processing supervisor did only minor edits to facilitate coding and other required methods of analysis. Each of the questionnaires was checked for typographical consistencies (spelling, punctuation, and even spacing) and consistencies in following the numerical codes indicted in the survey questionnaire. Incomplete forms were returned to the enumerators for completion. Where necessary, enumerators were tasked to do follow-ups to complete missing items.

After passing clearance for minor edits and consistency checks, the 93 accomplished surveys were subjected to both descriptive and statistical analysis. The descriptive analysis of the survey results was presented using descriptive statistics, in particular computation of the man scores and observation of the modal scores. These were presented through a tabular frequency count together with the percentage share of the participants' numerical scores. Where applicable, variance for each group was calculated and included in the accompanying discussions of selected tables. Statistical analysis also followed the GCG's Plan of Analysis. The Analysis Plan required plotting

each attribute's derived importance and satisfaction level into scatter diagrams consisting of four boxes, namely: *important and high rated*, *important and low rated*, *not important, and high rated*, *not important, and low rated*. To assess the derived importance of each attribute, the evaluation team utilized the pairwise correlation coefficients (Pearson's r) calculated for each survey item and the Overall Satisfaction score as a proxy for the "derived importance of each attribute."

The formatting of the tables and the overall presentation of results followed the template that the UP CIFAL Philippines has been using in the previous SSS. The comments of the MWSS-CO were addressed in the revised and final version of the report.