



LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPUTER-ASSISTED AND TRACKED FEEDBACK MECHANISM: INFLUENCE ON RESPONSE EFFICIENCY AND CLIENT SATISFACTION

Sta. Ana, Jericho V.¹, Dabao, Mona Lisa E.²
Union College of Laguna

ABSTRACT

This study examined the level of implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms (CATFM) and their influence on response efficiency and client satisfaction in the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) District Offices in Region IV-A CALABARZON. Using a quantitative research design, data were collected from 132 clients through a validated survey instrument. The study assessed five dimensions of CATFM implementation—accessibility compliance, clear data collection and communication, visibility and availability, efficient tracking and resolution, and regular reporting and analysis—and their relationship with response efficiency and client satisfaction. Results revealed a very high level of CATFM implementation across all dimensions, with slightly lower ratings in visual accessibility customization and feedback revision options. Response efficiency and client satisfaction were also rated very high, though areas such as client involvement in evaluating response timeliness and the depth of feedback responses showed room for improvement. Correlation analysis indicated significant positive relationships between CATFM implementation and both response efficiency and client satisfaction. Notably, regular reporting and analysis, along with efficient tracking and resolution, emerged as the strongest predictors of both outcomes. The findings underscore the importance of structured, transparent, and inclusive feedback systems in enhancing public service delivery. Recommendations include improving visual accessibility features, enabling feedback revisions, and strengthening client engagement in evaluating service responsiveness.

KEYWORDS: *Client Satisfaction, Computer-Assisted Feedback, Feedback Mechanism, Public Service Delivery, Response Efficiency*

INTRODUCTION

Effective response efficiency and client satisfaction are critical indicators of service quality in both public and private institutions. Globally, the influence of feedback mechanisms on these indicators has been widely recognized. In the United States, the General Services Administration (GSA) has implemented a comprehensive framework for public feedback mechanisms, emphasizing the importance of timely and well-managed responses to enhance operational effectiveness and foster trust among clients (GSA, 2024). Similarly, the National Center for Environmental Innovations (NCEI) has developed the Lean Government Metrics Guide, which underscores the role of structured feedback systems in streamlining government services (NCEI, 2019). The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) further highlights the positive correlation between effective feedback management and client satisfaction in government services (ACSI, 2023).

In the Philippines, the adoption of digital feedback mechanisms has been gaining traction, albeit at a slower pace compared to more developed countries. The Philippine government has recognized the need to improve public service delivery through enhanced feedback systems. However, challenges such as limited technological infrastructure, lack of standardized protocols, and varying levels of digital literacy among the population have hindered the full realization of these systems' potential.

At the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) regional office, the Public Information Office (PIO) receives daily complaints and concerns from the public. Despite the availability of social media platforms, which offer a convenient and accessible means for the public to provide feedback, these tools are not being utilized effectively. There is no clear protocol on how to leverage social media to enhance public satisfaction, resulting in inefficiencies in response processes and unmet client expectations.

This study investigates the influence of a structured digital feedback mechanism on response efficiency and client satisfaction within the DPWH regional office. By integrating established frameworks such as the GSA's Public Feedback Mechanism, the NCEI's Lean Government Metrics Guide, and the ACSI's customer satisfaction index, this research aims to assess how digital feedback tracking can streamline service delivery and improve overall client experiences. The findings of this study provided valuable insights into the development of effective feedback protocols and the optimization of response processes in public institutions.

Statement of the Problem

These studies demonstrate that feedback quality significantly influences client satisfaction in government services, highlighting the necessity for effective feedback management strategies.



Through the lens of the U.S. General Services Administration's (2024) framework for Implementing a Public Feedback Mechanism; National Center for Environmental Innovations' (2014) Lean Government Metrics Guide; and ACSI's (2022) customer satisfaction index for government, this research determined the level of implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanism and its influence on response efficiency and client satisfaction of DPWH District Offices in Region IV-A CALABARZON.

Specifically, the study sought to determine the following.

1. The level of implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms as assessed by the clients of the Engineering District Office in terms of:
 - 1.1 accessibility compliance
 - 1.2 clear data collection and communication
 - 1.3 visibility and availability
 - 1.4 efficient tracking and resolution
 - 1.5 regular reporting and analysis;
2. The level of response efficiency of the engineering district office, as assessed by the clients in terms of
 - 2.1 speedy response,
 - 2.2 resolution experience, and
 - 2.3 follow-up experience,
3. The level of client satisfaction in the engineering district office, as assessed by the clients in terms of
 - 3.1 overall satisfaction,
 - 3.2 net promoter experience, and
 - 3.3 feedback quality.
4. The significant correlation between the level of implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms in the Engineering District Office and the level of response efficiency

The significant correlation between the level of implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms in the Engineering District Office and client satisfaction

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative research method to systematically assess the level of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms and their influence on response efficiency and client satisfaction in DPWH District Offices across Region IV-A CALABARZON. A quantitative approach was appropriate as it allowed for objective measurement, statistical analysis, and generalizability of findings across multiple district offices (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Quantitative research enabled the systematic collection of numerical data, which is essential for examining trends, patterns, and relationships among key variables, such as feedback management, response efficiency, and client satisfaction (Babbie, 2020). The use of structured survey questionnaires ensured uniformity in data collection, minimizing researcher bias and increasing the reliability and validity of the findings (Bryman, 2016).

Additionally, the study utilized descriptive statistics to summarize data and Pearson's r correlation analysis to determine relationships between variables. These statistical techniques provided empirical evidence of the impact of feedback mechanisms on service efficiency and client satisfaction, reinforcing the study's rigor.

Moreover, government agencies increasingly rely on data-driven decision-making to improve public service delivery. A quantitative approach supported this objective by providing measurable insights that policymakers can use to enhance digital feedback systems.

Thus, the adoption of a quantitative method in this study ensured a structured, objective, and statistically sound analysis of how computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms contribute to operational efficiency and client satisfaction in DPWH District Offices.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS****LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPUTER-ASSISTED AND TRACKED FEEDBACK MECHANISMS****Table 1.1*****Level of Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms in terms of Accessibility Compliance***

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) I find the feedback system easy to use, even for individuals with disabilities.	3.552	0.514	Very High
b) Images and other visual elements in the system include alternative text or descriptions.	3.500	0.585	Very High
c) The system works well with screen readers or similar assistive technologies.	3.642	0.526	Very High
d) I can access the feedback portal easily on different devices, including my mobile phone.	3.649	0.524	Very High
e) The system provides clear and understandable instructions for users with various accessibility needs.	3.604	0.491	Very High
f) The feedback system supports multiple languages, making it easier for users from different backgrounds to participate.	3.522	0.558	Very High
g) There are options in the system to adjust text size, contrast, or other display settings for better readability.	3.493	0.517	Very High
h) It seems that the feedback system is regularly checked or updated to meet accessibility standards.	3.515	0.597	Very High
i) There is a clear and easy way to report any accessibility issues I encounter while using the system.	3.590	0.509	Very High
Overall	3.563	0.536	Very High

Legend: 3.26-4.00 (Very High); 2.51-3.25 (High); 1.76-2.50 (Low); 1.00-1.75 (Very Low)

Table 1.2***Level of Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms in terms of Clear Data Collection and Communication***

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) I received clear instructions on how to give my feedback.	3.567	0.512	Very High
b) The system only asks for information that is relevant and necessary.	3.590	0.538	Very High
c) I was informed about how my feedback would be used.	3.604	0.506	Very High
d) The system allows me to give both ratings and written comments.	3.634	0.499	Very High
e) I received a confirmation message after submitting my feedback.	3.619	0.546	Very High
f) I can check the status of the feedback I submitted.	3.590	0.509	Very High
g) I feel confident that my data is kept private and secure.	3.597	0.492	Very High
h) The feedback questions were easy to understand.	3.590	0.538	Very High
i) I was able to update or revise my feedback if needed.	3.545	0.529	Very High
Overall	3.593	0.519	Very High

**Table 1.3****Level of Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms in terms of Visibility and Availability**

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) <i>I can easily access the feedback system through the agency's website.</i>	3.582	0.552	Very High
b) <i>It was easy for me to find the feedback portal on the website.</i>	3.590	0.538	Very High
c) <i>The feedback system is available at any time, day or night.</i>	3.672	0.502	Very High
d) <i>The system is consistently available and works reliably.</i>	3.567	0.541	Very High
e) <i>The feedback portal is clearly visible and easy to locate on the website.</i>	3.507	0.517	Very High
f) <i>The system provides notifications if it is down for maintenance or updates.</i>	3.612	0.519	Very High
g) <i>I can access the feedback system from different devices, such as a phone, tablet, or computer.</i>	3.664	0.490	Very High
h) <i>The feedback system is connected with other communication channels (e.g., email, SMS, or social media).</i>	3.537	0.557	Very High
i) <i>The feedback portal is easy to use and navigate.</i>	3.597	0.507	Very High
Overall	3.592	0.525	Very High

Table 1.4**Level of Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms in terms of Efficient Tracking and Resolution**

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) <i>I receive timely updates about the status of my feedback.</i>	3.493	0.545	Very High
b) <i>My feedback is addressed promptly by the system.</i>	3.507	0.531	Very High
c) <i>I can view the progress of how my feedback is being resolved.</i>	3.590	0.551	Very High
d) <i>There is a clear process in place for resolving issues raised through the feedback system.</i>	3.575	0.526	Very High
e) <i>I received an automated response confirming that my feedback was submitted.</i>	3.545	0.515	Very High
f) <i>I was informed about how long it would take to resolve my feedback.</i>	3.530	0.544	Very High
g) <i>Each feedback submission includes a tracking number or reference ID.</i>	3.567	0.512	Very High
h) <i>I have the option to escalate unresolved issues through the system.</i>	3.530	0.558	Very High
i) <i>I received a detailed report or summary about how my feedback was resolved.</i>	3.537	0.530	Very High
Overall	3.541	0.535	Very High



Table 1.5

Level of Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms in terms of Regular Reporting and Analysis

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) I was informed about the results or findings from the feedback analysis.	3.649	0.494	Very High
b) I can access reports that show trends in the feedback submitted.	3.619	0.487	Very High
c) I believe the agency uses feedback to make meaningful improvements.	3.612	0.489	Very High
d) I was informed about changes made as a result of user feedback.	3.627	0.501	Very High
e) Feedback data is presented using charts, graphs, or other visual tools.	3.552	0.556	Very High
f) I can request specific reports or summaries from the feedback system.	3.560	0.513	Very High
g) The reporting process is transparent and easy to understand.	3.545	0.529	Very High
h) The system provides regular updates about feedback analysis and outcomes.	3.575	0.496	Very High
i) I am satisfied with how the feedback is reported and analyzed.	3.604	0.506	Very High
Overall	3.594	0.508	Very High

LEVEL OF RESPONSE EFFICIENCY

Table 2.1

Level of Response Efficiency in terms of Speedy Response

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) The department responds to feedback submissions within a reasonable time.	3.604	0.506	Very High
b) I am satisfied with how quickly the office responds to my feedback.	3.560	0.555	Very High
c) The office provided a timely response to the feedback I submitted.	3.560	0.513	Very High
d) Issues I raised through the feedback system were resolved quickly by the department.	3.507	0.531	Very High
e) I was informed about how long I should expect to wait for a response.	3.545	0.529	Very High
f) I was able to share my thoughts on how quickly the office responded to my feedback.	3.500	0.517	Very High
g) The department appears to be working to reduce response times to client feedback.	3.567	0.497	Very High
h) I received real-time updates from the office about the status of my feedback.	3.522	0.571	Very High
i) I am satisfied with the efficiency of the department's response to my feedback.	3.567	0.527	Very High
Overall	3.548	0.527	Very High



Table 2.2
Level of Response Efficiency in terms of Resolution Experience

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) The department resolves issues submitted through the feedback system within a reasonable timeframe.	3.530	0.544	Very High
b) I am satisfied with how often the office successfully resolves feedback-related concerns.	3.552	0.514	Very High
c) I received confirmation when my issue was resolved.	3.567	0.541	Very High
d) The feedback system ensures that most issues are resolved effectively.	3.590	0.523	Very High
e) I was able to share my opinion about how well the office resolves feedback.	3.590	0.494	Very High
f) The department appears to be working to improve how often and how quickly issues are resolved.	3.582	0.510	Very High
g) I was informed about the steps involved in resolving my feedback.	3.657	0.477	Very High
h) Issues raised through the feedback system are resolved in a timely manner.	3.582	0.510	Very High
i) There is a clear and structured process for resolving feedback-related concerns.	3.567	0.527	Very High
Overall	3.580	0.515	Very High

Table 2.3
Level of Response Efficiency in terms of Follow-up Experience

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) The department regularly follows up on the feedback I submitted.	3.537	0.544	Very High
b) It seems the office keeps track of how often follow-ups are conducted.	3.522	0.558	Very High
c) I received follow-up communication after my issue was addressed.	3.597	0.522	Very High
d) I was able to share my opinion about the follow-up process.	3.522	0.531	Very High
e) The department appears to be working to improve how often and how well it follows up on feedback.	3.537	0.515	Very High
f) The system provides reports showing how frequently follow-ups are conducted.	3.545	0.500	Very High
g) I was informed about the steps involved in the follow-up process.	3.537	0.500	Very High
h) The department ensures that follow-ups are done consistently and on time.	3.537	0.500	Very High
i) There is a clear and structured process for conducting follow-ups on feedback.	3.545	0.500	Very High
Overall	3.542	0.519	Very High

**LEVEL OF CLIENT SATISFACTION****Table 3.1*****Level of Client Satisfaction in terms of Overall Satisfaction***

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) The feedback system meets my expectations as a user.	3.597	0.507	Very High
b) I find the feedback system easy to use and navigate.	3.634	0.483	Very High
c) Using the feedback system was a positive experience for me.	3.649	0.494	Very High
d) I am satisfied with the quality of the responses I received.	3.604	0.521	Very High
e) The feedback system effectively addressed my concerns.	3.575	0.496	Very High
f) I would be willing to use the feedback system again in the future.	3.627	0.501	Very High
g) The feedback system helps improve my satisfaction with the agency's services.	3.567	0.527	Very High
h) I find the feedback system reliable and trustworthy.	3.575	0.526	Very High
i) Overall, the feedback system provided a satisfactory experience.	3.642	0.497	Very High
Overall	3.608	0.506	Very High

Table 3.2***Level of Client Satisfaction in terms of Net Promoter Experience***

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
a) I would likely recommend the feedback system to others.	3.545	0.529	Very High
b) The system encourages users to share and recommend it to others.	3.560	0.513	Very High
c) I am satisfied with how likely I am to recommend the feedback system.	3.515	0.531	Very High
d) I find the feedback system worth recommending to others.	3.507	0.517	Very High
e) My experience with the system makes me more likely to promote it.	3.537	0.515	Very High
f) I would speak positively about the feedback system to others.	3.545	0.529	Very High
g) I am satisfied with how well the system encourages positive word-of-mouth.	3.604	0.491	Very High
h) The system makes it easy for users to recommend it to others.	3.604	0.491	Very High
i) I actively promote the feedback system because of my positive experience.	3.619	0.503	Very High
Overall	3.560	0.513	Very High

Table 3.3***Level of Client Satisfaction in terms of Feedback Quality***

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The responses provided through the feedback system were clear and helpful.	3.642	0.497	Very High
The feedback I received was relevant to the concern I raised.	3.619	0.503	Very High
The responses were detailed and provided useful information.	3.582	0.566	Very High
The feedback I received was helpful and gave me clear next steps.	3.545	0.557	Very High
The system provides accurate and reliable responses to feedback.	3.619	0.517	Very High
The feedback I received was easy to understand and clearly explained.	3.612	0.519	Very High
The feedback system helps improve the quality of responses over time.	3.604	0.506	Very High
I find the system effective in delivering high-quality responses.	3.612	0.504	Very High
The system maintains a high standard for the quality of feedback provided.	3.627	0.501	Very High
Overall	3.607	0.519	Very High

**Table 4.1*****Influence of the Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms on Response Efficiency in terms of Speedy Response***

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant: Speedy Response)	0.174	0.318		0.546	0.586
• Accessibility Compliance	0.083	0.097	0.079	0.851	0.396
• Clear Data Collection and Communication	0.219	0.097	0.195	2.266	0.025
• Visibility and Availability	0.154	0.112	0.130	1.376	0.171
• Efficient Tracking and Resolution	0.265	0.099	0.256	2.672	0.009
• Regular Reporting and Analysis	0.223	0.118	0.180	1.894	0.060

Note: Sig. <0.05 is interpreted as significant

Model Summary: R = 0.701; R Square = 0.491; Adjusted R Square = 0.471; SEE = 0.264

ANOVA: F = 24.724, Sig. = 0.000

Table 4.2***Influence of the Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms on Response Efficiency in terms of Resolution Experience***

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant: Resolution Experience)	0.485	0.318		1.527	0.129
• Accessibility Compliance	0.224	0.097	0.217	2.304	0.023
• Clear Data Collection and Communication	0.007	0.097	0.007	0.076	0.939
• Visibility and Availability	-0.001	0.112	-0.001	-0.008	0.994
• Efficient Tracking and Resolution	0.270	0.099	0.267	2.720	0.007
• Regular Reporting and Analysis	0.366	0.118	0.301	3.114	0.002

Note: Sig. <0.05 is interpreted as significant

Model Summary: R = 0.685; R Square = 0.470; Adjusted R Square = 0.449; SEE = 0.264

ANOVA: F = 22.681, Sig. = 0.000.

Table 4.3***Influence of the Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms on Response Efficiency in terms of Follow-up Experience***

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant: Follow-up Experience)	0.496	0.294		1.684	0.095
• Accessibility Compliance	-0.091	0.090	-0.094	-1.006	0.317
• Clear Data Collection and Communication	0.205	0.089	0.200	2.295	0.023
• Visibility and Availability	0.151	0.104	0.139	1.458	0.147
• Efficient Tracking and Resolution	0.193	0.092	0.204	2.096	0.038
• Regular Reporting and Analysis	0.391	0.109	0.345	3.595	0.000

Note: Sig. <0.05 is interpreted as significant

Model Summary: R = 0.692; R Square = 0.479; Adjusted R Square = 0.458; SEE = 0.245

ANOVA: F = 23.497, Sig. = 0.000.

**Table 5.1*****Influence of the Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms on Client Satisfaction in terms of Overall Satisfaction***

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig. at .05 level
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant: Overall Satisfaction)	0.336	0.302		1.111	0.269
• Accessibility Compliance	0.191	0.093	0.190	2.066	0.041
• Clear Data Collection and Communication	0.038	0.092	0.035	0.409	0.683
• Visibility and Availability	0.227	0.106	0.200	2.132	0.035
• Efficient Tracking and Resolution	0.133	0.094	0.134	1.406	0.162
• Regular Reporting and Analysis	0.326	0.112	0.275	2.912	0.004

*Note: Sig. <0.05 is interpreted as significant**Model Summary: R = 0.704; R Square = 0.496; Adjusted R Square = 0.476; SEE = 0.251**ANOVA: F = 25.209, Sig. = 0.000.***Table 5.2*****Influence of the Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms on Client Satisfaction in terms of Net Promoter Experience***

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig. at .05 level
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant: Net Promoter Experience)	0.002	0.264		0.008	0.993
• Accessibility Compliance	0.024	0.081	0.024	0.295	0.768
• Clear Data Collection and Communication	0.136	0.080	0.127	1.688	0.094
• Visibility and Availability	0.102	0.093	0.091	1.101	0.273
• Efficient Tracking and Resolution	0.217	0.083	0.222	2.633	0.009
• Regular Reporting and Analysis	0.514	0.098	0.437	5.257	0.000

*Note: Sig. <0.05 is interpreted as significant**Model Summary: R = 0.780; R Square = 0.608; Adjusted R Square = 0.593; SEE = 0.220**ANOVA: F = 39.719, Sig. = 0.000.***Table 5.3*****Influence of the Implementation of Computer-Assisted and Tracked Feedback Mechanisms on Client Satisfaction in terms of Feedback Quality***

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig. at .05 level
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant: Feedback Quality)	0.138	0.299		0.462	0.645
• Accessibility Compliance	0.181	0.091	0.177	1.978	0.050
• Clear Data Collection and Communication	0.182	0.091	0.167	2.009	0.047
• Visibility and Availability	0.119	0.105	0.104	1.135	0.259
• Efficient Tracking and Resolution	0.036	0.093	0.036	0.383	0.702
• Regular Reporting and Analysis	0.449	0.110	0.373	4.065	0.000

*Note: Sig. <0.05 is interpreted as significant**Model Summary: R = 0.724; R Square = 0.524; Adjusted R Square = 0.505; SEE = 0.248**ANOVA: F = 28.126, Sig. = 0.000*

The regression analysis in Table 5.3 examined the predictive influence of CATFM dimensions on client satisfaction in terms of feedback quality. The model was statistically significant, $F(5, 126) = 28.126$, $p < .001$, with an R^2 of .524, indicating that 52.4% of



the variance in feedback quality can be explained by the predictors. This demonstrates a strong relationship between CATFM implementation and the perceived clarity, relevance, and helpfulness of responses.

Three predictors were significant: Regular Reporting and Analysis ($\beta = .373$, $p < .001$), Clear Data Collection and Communication ($\beta = .167$, $p = .047$), and Accessibility Compliance ($\beta = .177$, $p = .050$). Regular reporting and analysis exerted the strongest influence, reinforcing its role in ensuring that feedback is systematically analyzed and translated into actionable improvements—a finding consistent with Jung et al. (2020) and Aubé-Péterkin et al. (2022). The significance of clear data collection and communication aligns with Ruble et al. (2018), who emphasized that transparent communication enhances the relevance and clarity of responses. Similarly, accessibility compliance supports Xu et al. (2024) and Chemnad & Othman (2024), who argued that inclusive design fosters user confidence and satisfaction.

Conversely, Visibility and Availability ($p = .259$) and Efficient Tracking and Resolution ($p = .702$) were not significant predictors, suggesting that while these dimensions facilitate engagement and operational efficiency, they do not directly influence perceptions of feedback quality. This contrasts with Wang et al. (2024), who posited that visibility of feedback processes can improve perceived responsiveness. In the DPWH context, quality appears to be driven more by transparency and inclusivity than by system availability or tracking speed.

Overall, these findings indicate that feedback quality is primarily shaped by accountability mechanisms and communication clarity, rather than by visibility or resolution speed. For DPWH, prioritizing structured reporting, clear communication protocols, and accessibility enhancements will likely yield the greatest improvements in perceived feedback quality.

The regression analyses for client satisfaction indicators—overall satisfaction, Net Promoter Experience, and feedback quality—show that CATFM implementation strongly predicts satisfaction outcomes, explaining between 49.6% and 60.8% of variance. Across all models, Regular Reporting and Analysis consistently emerged as the most influential predictor, underscoring its role in fostering transparency and trust. Efficient Tracking and Resolution also significantly influenced Net Promoter Experience, while Clear Data Collection and Communication and Accessibility Compliance were important for feedback quality. These findings align with prior research, which emphasizes that structured reporting and clear communication enhance user confidence and perceived service quality.

Conversely, Visibility and Availability and Accessibility Compliance, despite high descriptive ratings, were less consistent predictors of satisfaction, suggesting that while these features support engagement, they do not strongly drive loyalty or perceptions of feedback quality. This contrasts with studies that link visibility to improved organizational reputation. For DPWH, these results imply that client satisfaction depends more on accountability mechanisms and actionable communication than on interface accessibility alone. Strengthening reporting practices and resolution processes will likely yield the greatest improvements in satisfaction and advocacy.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The results of this study led the researcher to the following conclusions:

1. The study revealed a very high level of implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms across all five dimensions. Clients consistently rated the system highly in terms of accessibility compliance, particularly its compatibility with assistive technologies and multi-device access. Clear data collection and communication were also rated very high, with users appreciating the transparency and clarity of instructions. Visibility and availability were strong, especially in terms of 24/7 access and device compatibility, though minor improvements were suggested for integration with other platforms. Efficient tracking and resolution were well-structured, with users valuing the transparency and systematic processes, albeit noting slight delays in updates. Regular reporting and analysis emerged as a key strength, with clients acknowledging the system's responsiveness to feedback and its role in driving service improvements.

2. The findings indicate a very high level of response efficiency in all three areas. Clients reported satisfaction with the speed of responses, noting that the department actively works to reduce response times and provides timely acknowledgments. Resolution experience was also rated very high, with clients appreciating the structured processes and transparency in how issues were addressed. Follow-up experience received similarly high marks, particularly for consistent communication and the presence of clear follow-up procedures. However, there remains room for improvement in involving clients more in evaluating the timeliness and effectiveness of responses and follow-ups.

3. Client satisfaction was assessed to be at a very high level across all three indicators. Clients expressed strong approval of the feedback system's usability, reliability, and ability to meet their expectations. The Net Promoter Experience scores suggest that users are not only satisfied but also willing to recommend the system to others, indicating a high level of trust and loyalty. Feedback quality was also highly rated, with clients valuing the clarity, relevance, and helpfulness of responses. Nonetheless, enhancing the depth and actionability of feedback could further elevate satisfaction levels.

4. The analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between the implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms and response efficiency. Specifically, efficient tracking and resolution, clear data collection and communication,



and regular reporting and analysis were found to significantly influence speedy response, resolution experience, and follow-up experience. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. These underscore the importance of structured systems and transparent communication in enhancing the responsiveness of public service delivery.

5. There is a significant positive correlation between the implementation of computer-assisted and tracked feedback mechanisms and client satisfaction. Regular reporting and analysis consistently emerged as the most influential factor across all satisfaction indicators, including overall satisfaction, net promoter experience, and feedback quality. Accessibility compliance and visibility also contributed significantly, particularly in shaping perceptions of inclusivity and ease of use. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. These results affirm that well-implemented feedback systems not only improve operational efficiency but also foster higher levels of client satisfaction and trust.

Recommendations

Considering the results and conclusions of this study, the researcher respectfully recommends the following.

1. Although accessibility compliance was rated very high, the lowest indicator was the availability of options to adjust text size, contrast, or other display settings. It is recommended that the DPWH enhance the feedback system's visual customization features to better accommodate users with visual impairments. This includes integrating adjustable font sizes, high-contrast modes, and customizable color schemes to ensure inclusivity.
2. The ability to update or revise submitted feedback and the clarity of instructions were among the lowest-rated items. To address this, the system should incorporate a feature that allows users to edit or append their feedback after submission. Additionally, revising the instructional content to be more user-friendly and accessible—possibly through visual guides or multilingual support—can improve user experience.
3. Another lowest-rated item was the opportunity for clients to share their thoughts on how quickly the office responded. It is recommended that the feedback system include a post-response evaluation feature where clients can rate and comment on the timeliness of the response they received. This will not only enhance transparency but also provide valuable insights for continuous improvement.
4. Since Regular Reporting and Analysis and Efficient Tracking and Resolution were found to significantly influence response efficiency, it is recommended that DPWH institutionalize a standardized reporting schedule and ensure that feedback tracking systems are consistently updated. This includes generating automated reports on response times and resolution rates to identify bottlenecks and improve service delivery.
5. Given that Regular Reporting and Analysis, Accessibility Compliance, and Visibility and Availability significantly influenced client satisfaction, it is recommended that the agency continue to enhance transparency by publicly sharing feedback outcomes and improvements made. Additionally, maintaining high accessibility standards and ensuring the feedback system is prominently visible and easy to use across platforms will further strengthen client trust and satisfaction.

REFERENCES

1. Abdallah, W., Aref, S., & Thabet, M. (2020). Educational environment and its relation to nursing student academic achievement. *Minia Scientific Nursing Journal*, 007(1), 26-33. <https://doi.org/10.21608/msnj.2020.188017>
2. ACSI. (2022). Government | The American Customer Satisfaction Index. *The American Customer Satisfaction Index*. <https://theacsi.org/industries/government/>
3. ACSI. (2022). Government | The American Customer Satisfaction Index. *The American Customer Satisfaction Index*. <https://theacsi.org/industries/government/>
4. Ajjola, L., Igharo, V., Anieto, N. N., & Mwaikambo, L. (2023). Improving state government's responsiveness to family planning interventions in nigeria using an innovative reflection and action tool. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 11(Supplement 2), e2200189. <https://doi.org/10.9745/ghsp-d-22-00189>
5. Ajjola, L., Igharo, V., Anieto, N., & Mwaikambo, L. (2023). Improving state government's responsiveness to family planning interventions in nigeria using an innovative reflection and action tool. *Global Health Science and Practice*, 11(Supplement 2), e2200189. <https://doi.org/10.9745/ghsp-d-22-00189>
6. Aldinç, H., Gün, C., Yaylacı, S., Senuren, C. O., Güven, F., Şahiner, M., ... & Türkmen, S. (2022). Comparison of self versus expert-assisted feedback for cricothyroidotomy training: a randomized trial. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03519-z>
7. Alshihre, F., Chinyio, E., Nzekwe-Excel, C., & Daniel, E. I. (2020). Improving clients' satisfaction in construction projects: the case of saudi arabia. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 10(5), 709-723. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bepam-12-2019-0140>
8. Alzubi, A. (2024). Digital media and edtech-based instruction for students and teachers with disabilities in jordan. *Journal of Digital Learning and Distance Education*, 3(5), 1077-1084. <https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v3i5.352>
9. American Customer Satisfaction Index. (2023). American Customer Satisfaction Index Federal Government Report 2022 Citizen Satisfaction with Federal Government Services Surges. https://www.theacsi.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/23jan_FED-GOV-Report.pdf



10. Asi, M. A. and Adaya, R. (2023). Compliance to total quality management in one philippine province. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 11(11). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2023.1135>
11. Aubé-Péterkin, M., Ehlebracht, A., & Petrella, F. (2022). Feedback and formative assessment in competency by design: the experience of residents and supervisors within a urology training program. *Canadian Urological Association Journal*, 17(4). <https://doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.8103>
12. Babbie, E. (2020). *The Practice of Social Research* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning. https://archive.org/details/practiceofsocial0000babb_p1v1
13. Babbie, E. (2020). *The Practice of Social Research* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning. https://archive.org/details/practiceofsocial0000babb_p1v1
14. Bolton, G., Greiner, B., & Ockenfels, A. (2018). Dispute resolution or escalation? the strategic gaming of feedback withdrawal options in online markets. *Management Science*, 64(9), 4009-4031. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2802>
15. Chavula, M. P., Zulu, J. M., & Hurtig, A. (2022). Factors influencing the integration of comprehensive sexuality education into educational systems in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Reproductive Health*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-022-01504-9>
16. Chemnad, K. and Othman, A. (2024). Digital accessibility in the era of artificial intelligence – bibliometric analysis and systematic review. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1349668>
17. Chen, B., Bao, L., Zhang, R., Zhang, J., Liu, F., Wang, S., ... & Li, M. (2023). A multi-strategy computer-assisted efl writing learning system with deep learning incorporated and its effects on learning: a writing feedback perspective. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 61(8), 60-102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331231189294>
18. Chevance, M., Kruijssen, J. M. D., Krumholz, M. R., Groves, B., Keller, B., Hughes, A., ... & Usero, A. (2021). Pre-supernova feedback mechanisms drive the destruction of molecular clouds in nearby star-forming disc galaxies. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 509(1), 272-288. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2938>
19. Christensen, T., Yamamoto, K., & Aoyagi, S. (2020). Trust in local government: service satisfaction, culture, and demography. *Administration & Society*, 52(8), 1268-1296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399719897392>
20. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
21. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
22. Cromhout, D. H., Duffett, R. G., & Steenkamp, P. (2021). The influence of student-community partner working relationships on satisfaction: a south african university service learning programme. *International E-Journal of Educational Studies*, 5(10), 89-105. <https://doi.org/10.31458/iej.950995>
23. Dawes, J. (2022). Net promoter and revenue growth: an examination across three industries. *Australasian Marketing Journal (Amj)*, 32(1), 4-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582221132039>
24. Diliyasi, K. and Sulistiadi, W. (2024). Use of net promoter score (nps) in hospital marketing strategy to increase patient satisfaction and loyalty. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*, 4(03), 907-911. <https://doi.org/10.46799/ijssr.v4i03.615>
25. Dogra, T. (2023). A comparative analysis of service quality in public and private sector hotels. *Journal of Tourism Management Research*, 10(1), 47-61. <https://doi.org/10.18488/31.v10i1.3369>
26. Gabbe, B. J., Hart, M., Brown, A., McLellan, S., Morgan, M. J., Beck, B., ... & Cameron, P. (2022). Does patient preference for online or telephone follow-up impact on response rates and data completeness following injury?. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 93(5), 679-685. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ta.0000000000003592>
27. Hu, X., Wang, S., Qin, X., Dai, H., Ren, W., Luo, D., ... & Shao, L. (2023). High-resolution iterative feedback network for camouflaged object detection. *Proceedings of the Aai Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(1), 881-889. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i1.25167>
28. Jung, S., Hwang, H., Lee, K., Lee, H., Kim, E., Kim, M., ... & Cho, I. (2020). Barriers and facilitators to implementation of medication decision support systems in electronic medical records: mixed methods approach based on structural equation modeling and qualitative analysis. *Jmir Medical Informatics*, 8(7), e18758. <https://doi.org/10.2196/18758>
29. Kagwanja, N., Gilson, L., Tsofa, B., Olivier, J., Leli, H., & Molyneux, S. (2024). Understanding health system responsiveness to public feedback at the sub-national level: insights from kilifi county, kenya. *Plos Global Public Health*, 4(12), e0002814. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0002814>
30. U.S. General Services Administration. (2024, March). Implementing a Public Feedback Mechanism. <https://www.section508.gov/manage/laws-and-policies/implementing-public-feedback-mechanism/>
31. U.S. General Services Administration. (2024, March). Implementing a Public Feedback Mechanism. <https://www.section508.gov/manage/laws-and-policies/implementing-public-feedback-mechanism/>
32. Wang, T., Lund, B., Marengo, A., Pagano, A., Mannuru, N., Teel, Z., ... & Pange, J. (2023). Exploring the potential impact of artificial intelligence (ai) on international students in higher education: generative ai, chatbots, analytics,