



# Consumer Satisfaction Survey 2005

Fault restoration and connection of service

**November 2005**

©Australian Communications and Media Authority 2005

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Australian Communications and Media Authority.

Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to:

Manager Communications/Media  
PO Box 13112 Law Courts  
Melbourne VIC 8010

ISBN 0642 78337 3

For more information about the 2005 consumer satisfaction survey, please contact Bill Jolley at ACMA on telephone 03 9963 6894.

---

## **Contents**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>                                      | <b>3</b>  |
| Overview .....  | 3         |
| Findings – fault restoration .....                            | 3         |
| Findings—connection of services .....                         | 4         |
| <b>BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>                       | <b>5</b>  |
| The survey .....  | 5         |
| Methodology .....   | 5         |
| <b>FAULT RESTORATION .....</b>                                | <b>6</b>  |
| Overall satisfaction .....                                    | 6         |
| Reasons for dissatisfaction.....                              | 9         |
| Reasons for satisfaction.....                                 | 13        |
| Satisfaction with technician’s punctuality .....              | 17        |
| <b>CONNECTION OF SERVICE.....</b>                             | <b>18</b> |
| Overall satisfaction .....                                    | 18        |
| Reasons for dissatisfaction.....                              | 22        |
| Reasons for satisfaction.....                                 | 26        |
| Satisfaction with technician’s punctuality .....              | 29        |
| <b>Appendix 1: Precision and presentation of results.....</b> | <b>31</b> |
| Stratified sampling and weighting .....                       | 31        |
| Interpretation of results .....                               | 32        |
| <b>Appendix 2: Main questions.....</b>                        | <b>34</b> |
| <b>Fault restoration survey.....</b>                          | <b>34</b> |
| <b>Connection of service survey .....</b>                     | <b>35</b> |

---

# INTRODUCTION

## Overview

The Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) has conducted the eighth annual consumer satisfaction survey as part of its telecommunications industry monitoring and reporting responsibilities. The 2005 survey concerns fault restoration and connection of service. It was conducted by Roy Morgan Research.

The survey results are reported separately for residential and small business customers, as well as for urban, rural and remote customers. Small businesses are defined as non-manufacturers with fewer than 20 employees and manufacturers with fewer than 100 employees. In accordance with the classification used in the *Telecommunications (Customer Service Guarantee) Standard 2000 (No. 2)* (the CSG Standard):

- urban refers to population centres with more than 10,000 people;
- rural refers to those with between 200 and 10,000 people; and
- remote refers to those with fewer than 200 people.

The CSG Standard specifies minimum performance requirements for telephone service connections, repair and appointment-keeping.

The survey results for the faults and connections modules were consistent with the results from the previous survey in 2004. Satisfaction levels were generally lower with satisfaction levels for business customers significantly lower than for residential customers in general. The differences in satisfaction levels between urban, rural and remote customers were mostly not significant. Results were generally uniform across states and territories except where noted.

In this report, all percentages are shown as whole numbers and therefore rounding errors will be evident in some cases.

## Findings – fault restoration

The proportion of customers in 2005 who were satisfied or very satisfied with the fault repair overall was 66 per cent, down from 69 per cent in 2004. Satisfaction was 67 per cent for residential customers and 59 per cent for business customers, slight decreases when compared with 70 per cent and 62 per cent respectively in 2004.

As in previous years, the main reason for dissatisfaction with fault repair was *the long time taken to repair the fault*.

The main reason for satisfaction with fault repair remains the fact that *the fault had been fixed, or the good quality of the repair*.

Among customers who had arranged an appointment with a technician or another company representative, the share of those satisfied or very satisfied with the person's punctuality was significantly higher than in 2004, reaching 80 per cent for residential customers and 72 per cent for business customers. This compares with 72 per cent and 63 per cent respectively in 2004.

---

Overall satisfaction with fault repairs was highest among remote customers—71 per cent were satisfied or very satisfied. This compares with overall satisfaction levels of around 68–69 per cent for urban, rural and remote customers in 2004.

Satisfaction with the technician's or company representative's punctuality in 2005 was highest among urban customers at 82 per cent. In 2004, it had been highest among urban and remote customers at 72 per cent each.

### **Findings—connection of services**

The proportion of customers in 2005 who were satisfied or very satisfied with their new connection or transfer was 76 per cent, down from 82 per cent in 2004. Satisfaction was 79 per cent for residential customers and 66 per cent for business customers, slight decreases when compared with 82 per cent and 68 per cent, respectively, in 2004.

The main reason for dissatisfaction was when connections or transfers *were performed incorrectly, faultily or not as requested*. The same reason had been the most common in 2004.

In 2005 *a lack of problems* was the main reason for satisfaction with the connection or transfer, compared to 2004 when *a short time to connect or transfer the phone* had been the main reason.

Among customers who had arranged an appointment with a technician or another company representative, 73 per cent of residential customers and 79 per cent of business customers were satisfied or very satisfied with the person's punctuality, which represent slight increases when compared with 71 per cent and 77 per cent, respectively, in 2004.

Dissatisfaction with both the 'connection or transfer of service overall' and the 'punctuality of technicians or company representatives' was more prevalent among rural and remote customers than among urban customers. In comparison, rural customers were more likely to have been dissatisfied with the connection or transfer of service overall in 2004 than customers from other geographic strata, while the difference had been very small in the level of satisfaction with the technician's punctuality.

---

## Background and methodology

### The survey

ACMA has a legislative obligation to monitor and report each year to the Minister on significant matters relating to the performance of carriers and carriage service providers, with particular attention to:

- consumer satisfaction;
- consumer benefits; and
- quality of service.

The first consumer satisfaction survey was conducted in 1998 as an independent survey to measure consumer satisfaction with telecommunications services in Australia. The survey has been conducted annually since then.

The 2005 survey has two modules. It investigates:

- customer satisfaction with fault restoration for fixed line telephone services; and
- customer satisfaction with new connections and transfers for fixed line telephone services.

The survey respondents are Telstra and Optus residential or small business customers of fixed line services. Respondents were randomly drawn from data provided by these carriers. Respondents had either reported a fault with a fixed line service or had a new or additional fixed line connected within their household or business.

### Methodology

As in previous years, the 2005 survey was conducted using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). Interviews were held between 15 June and 3 July, during weekday business hours for small businesses and on weekday evenings and weekends for residential customers.

The questionnaires for the fault restoration and connection of service modules were very similar (see Appendix 2); both referred to services performed over three months between 1 February and 30 April 2005. In previous surveys a six-month survey window was used.

The faults sample comprised 1,302 respondents, randomly selected from a sample pool of 9,013 cases. More interviews than the original target of 1,200 were conducted to ensure that all state and regional quotas were filled. The connections sample consisted of 1,218 respondents randomly drawn from a pool of 11,016 cases.

Stratified sampling was used to ensure that there were enough customers interviewed from rural and remote areas and from all states and territories. In particular, quotas were applied so that for each survey a minimum of 800 urban, 300 rural and 100 remote customers were interviewed. See Appendix 1 for more details.

The composition of the final samples (unweighted) is shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Sample compositions—faults restoration and connection of service surveys, 2005**

|                        | Faults restoration (n <sub>1</sub> = 1,302) |            |            |              | Connections (n <sub>2</sub> =1,218) |            |           |              |
|------------------------|---|------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
|                        | Urban                                       | Rural      | Remote     | Total        | Urban                               | Rural      | Remote    | Total        |
| <b>State</b>           |   |            |            |              |                                     |            |           |              |
| NSW/ACT                | 251   | 136        | 29         | <b>416</b>   | 231                                 | 84         | 5         | <b>320</b>   |
| VIC                    | 255   | 75         | *          | <b>330</b>   | 199                                 | 80         | 2         | <b>281</b>   |
| QLD                    | 216   | 79         | 61         | <b>356</b>   | 281                                 | 87         | 19        | <b>387</b>   |
| SA/NT                  | 27  | 22         | 32         | <b>81</b>    | 30                                  | 39         | 33        | <b>102</b>   |
| WA                     | 33  | 49         | 15         | <b>97</b>    | 65                                  | 25         | 12        | <b>102</b>   |
| TAS                    | 15  | 7          | *          | <b>22</b>    | 9                                   | 17         | *         | <b>26</b>    |
| <b>Customer status</b> |   |            |            |              |                                     |            |           |              |
| Residential            | 726   | 299        | 100        | <b>1,125</b> | 742                                 | 282        | 60        | <b>1,084</b> |
| Business               | 71  | 69         | 37         | <b>177</b>   | 73                                  | 50         | 11        | <b>134</b>   |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>797</b>                                  | <b>368</b> | <b>137</b> | <b>1,302</b> | <b>815</b>                          | <b>332</b> | <b>71</b> | <b>1,218</b> |

\*Note: There are no eligible customers, or a negligible number of such customers, in states and areas not represented in the sample.

## Fault restoration

Respondents were asked questions (see Appendix 2) about their level of satisfaction and their reasons for either being satisfied or dissatisfied with their fault restoration.

Respondents who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative were also asked about their level of satisfaction with the person's punctuality. Their responses are discussed in the following subsections, with particular attention to observed differences between residential and business customers and between those from urban, rural or remote parts of Australia.

## Overall satisfaction

Respondents were asked: *'Thinking about all aspects of the fault repair, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall? Were you: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?'*

Table 2 records the overall satisfaction of customers with their fault repair service.

- The 66 per cent of customers who were satisfied or very satisfied with their fault repair service represents a small decline from 69 per cent in the previous year and back to the 2003 level. Likewise, 27 per cent of customers were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the service they received, a small increase from 24 per cent in the previous year and back to the 2003 level.
- Satisfaction among residential customers (67 per cent) was higher than for business customers (59 per cent). Likewise, dissatisfaction among residential customers (26 per cent) was lower than for business customers (34 per cent). These differences were most evident at the extremes of satisfaction levels—with residential customers more likely to be very satisfied (29 per cent compared with

23 per cent) and business customers more likely to be very dissatisfied (16 per cent compared with 10 per cent).

- Satisfaction among urban customers was 67 per cent, compared with 64 per cent and 71 per cent respectively for rural and remote customers. Conversely, dissatisfaction among urban customers was 26 per cent, compared with 31 per cent and 23 per cent respectively for rural and remote customers. There was little variation among very satisfied customers between the geographic strata, whereas 15 per cent of rural customers were very dissatisfied compared with nine per cent for other customers.
- In 2005, customers in South Australia/Northern Territory were most likely to be very satisfied with the fault repair overall (44 per cent, compared with 27 per cent for the other states/territories). In 2004, South Australia/Northern Territory, along with Tasmania, had the highest proportion of very satisfied customers. Customers in Western Australia, at 14 per cent, were least likely to be very satisfied with the 'fault repair overall' in 2005, although this had not been the case in 2004. There was little difference between the levels of satisfaction in other states.

**Table 2: Customer satisfaction – faults, 2003 to 2005**

| Satisfaction overall               | Year        | Residential | Business   | Total        | Urban      | Rural      | Remote     |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample size                        | 2005        | 1,125       | 177        | <b>1,302</b> | 797        | 368        | 137        |
|                                    | 2004        | 1,056       | 149        | <b>1,205</b> | 804        | 301        | 100        |
|                                    | 2003        | 1,109       | 91         | <b>1,200</b> | 800        | 302        | 98         |
| Very dissatisfied                  | 2005        | 10%         | 16%        | <b>10%</b>   | 9%         | 15%        | 9%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 10%         | 14%        | <b>10%</b>   | 9%         | 11%        | 18%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 10%         | 27%        | <b>13%</b>   | 12%        | 13%        | 13%        |
| Dissatisfied                       | 2005        | 17%         | 18%        | <b>17%</b>   | 17%        | 17%        | 14%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 13%         | 22%        | <b>14%</b>   | 14%        | 15%        | 12%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 17%         | 14%        | <b>16%</b>   | 16%        | 16%        | 13%        |
| <b>Total dissatisfied</b>          | <b>2005</b> | <b>26%</b>  | <b>34%</b> | <b>27%</b>   | <b>26%</b> | <b>31%</b> | <b>23%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>23%</b>  | <b>36%</b> | <b>24%</b>   | <b>23%</b> | <b>27%</b> | <b>30%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>27%</b>  | <b>41%</b> | <b>29%</b>   | <b>29%</b> | <b>29%</b> | <b>26%</b> |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 2005        | 5%          | 8%         | <b>5%</b>    | 5%         | 4%         | 6%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 7%          | 2%         | <b>6%</b>    | 7%         | 5%         | 2%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 6%          | 4%         | <b>6%</b>    | 6%         | 5%         | 7%         |
| Satisfied                          | 2005        | 38%         | 36%        | <b>38%</b>   | 38%        | 38%        | 40%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 40%         | 35%        | <b>40%</b>   | 39%        | 41%        | 46%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 39%         | 37%        | <b>39%</b>   | 40%        | 36%        | 35%        |
| Very satisfied                     | 2005        | 29%         | 23%        | <b>29%</b>   | 29%        | 26%        | 31%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 30%         | 27%        | <b>29%</b>   | 30%        | 27%        | 22%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 28%         | 16%        | <b>27%</b>   | 25%        | 30%        | 32%        |
| <b>Total satisfied</b>             | <b>2005</b> | <b>67%</b>  | <b>59%</b> | <b>66%</b>   | <b>67%</b> | <b>64%</b> | <b>71%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>70%</b>  | <b>62%</b> | <b>69%</b>   | <b>69%</b> | <b>68%</b> | <b>69%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>67%</b>  | <b>53%</b> | <b>65%</b>   | <b>65%</b> | <b>66%</b> | <b>66%</b> |
| Don't know/can't say               | 2005        | 2%          | 0%         | <b>1%</b>    | 2%         | *          | 0%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 1%          | 0%         | <b>1%</b>    | 1%         | *          | 0%         |
|                                    | 2003        | *           | 1%         | <b>1%</b>    | 1%         | 0%         | 1%         |

\* = less than one per cent



Table 3 compares the overall satisfaction with the fault repair of the 59 per cent of customers who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative with the overall satisfaction of those who did not.

- There was no difference in the level of satisfaction (66 per cent) depending on whether or not customers had received a site visit.
- The variation in the level of dissatisfaction was also small, with 27 per cent of customers dissatisfied overall, ranging from 29 per cent for those who had received a technician's visit to 24 per cent for those who did not.

**Table 3: Overall satisfaction – faults, 2005**

| Satisfaction overall               | Appointment status    | Residential | Business   | Total        | Urban      | Rural      | Remote     |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample size                        | Appointment           | 650         | 115        | <b>765</b>   | 470        | 203        | 92         |
|                                    | No appointment        | 475         | 62         | <b>537</b>   | 327        | 165        | 45         |
|                                    | All                   | 1,125       | 177        | <b>1,302</b> | 797        | 368        | 137        |
| Very dissatisfied                  | Appointment           | 11%         | 16%        | <b>11%</b>   | 10%        | 16%        | 9%         |
|                                    | No appointment        | 8%          | 15%        | <b>9%</b>    | 7%         | 13%        | 9%         |
|                                    | All                   | 10%         | 16%        | <b>10%</b>   | 9%         | 15%        | 9%         |
| Dissatisfied                       | Appointment           | 18%         | 14%        | <b>18%</b>   | 18%        | 17%        | 14%        |
|                                    | No appointment        | 15%         | 26%        | <b>16%</b>   | 16%        | 16%        | 14%        |
|                                    | All                   | 17%         | 18%        | <b>17%</b>   | 17%        | 17%        | 14%        |
| <b>Total dissatisfied</b>          | <b>Appointment</b>    | <b>29%</b>  | <b>30%</b> | <b>29%</b>   | <b>28%</b> | <b>34%</b> | <b>23%</b> |
|                                    | <b>No appointment</b> | <b>23%</b>  | <b>42%</b> | <b>24%</b>   | <b>23%</b> | <b>28%</b> | <b>23%</b> |
|                                    | <b>All</b>            | <b>26%</b>  | <b>33%</b> | <b>27%</b>   | <b>26%</b> | <b>31%</b> | <b>23%</b> |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Appointment           | 3%          | 9%         | <b>4%</b>    | 4%         | 4%         | 4%         |
|                                    | No appointment        | 7%          | 5%         | <b>6%</b>    | 7%         | 4%         | 12%        |
|                                    | All                   | 5%          | 8%         | <b>5%</b>    | 5%         | 4%         | 6%         |
| Satisfied                          | Appointment           | 35%         | 35%        | <b>35%</b>   | 36%        | 31%        | 43%        |
|                                    | No appointment        | 42%         | 37%        | <b>42%</b>   | 40%        | 47%        | 34%        |
|                                    | All                   | 38%         | 36%        | <b>38%</b>   | 38%        | 38%        | 40%        |
| Very satisfied                     | Appointment           | 32%         | 26%        | <b>31%</b>   | 31%        | 31%        | 30%        |
|                                    | No appointment        | 25%         | 16%        | <b>25%</b>   | 26%        | 20%        | 31%        |
|                                    | All                   | 29%         | 23%        | <b>29%</b>   | 29%        | 26%        | 31%        |
| <b>Total satisfied</b>             | <b>Appointment</b>    | <b>67%</b>  | <b>61%</b> | <b>66%</b>   | <b>68%</b> | <b>62%</b> | <b>74%</b> |
|                                    | <b>No appointment</b> | <b>67%</b>  | <b>54%</b> | <b>66%</b>   | <b>66%</b> | <b>67%</b> | <b>65%</b> |
|                                    | <b>All</b>            | <b>67%</b>  | <b>59%</b> | <b>66%</b>   | <b>67%</b> | <b>64%</b> | <b>71%</b> |
| Don't know/<br>can't say           | Appointment           | *           | 0%         | *            | *          | 0%         | 0%         |
|                                    | No appointment        | 3%          | 0%         | <b>3%</b>    | 4%         | 1%         | 0%         |
|                                    | All                   | 2%          | 0%         | <b>1%</b>    | 2%         | 0%         | 0%         |

\* = less than one per cent

---

## Reasons for dissatisfaction

Respondents who said that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the fault repair were asked to give their reasons. Multiple responses were recorded from respondents who offered more than one reason.

Table 4 records the reasons given by customers for their dissatisfaction with the fault repair service they received.

- *The long time to repair the fault* continued as the main reason for dissatisfaction. It was mentioned by 48 per cent of customers and headed the list of complaints by residential, business, urban, rural and remote customers alike.
- *The fault not fixed or poor quality of repair* was mentioned by 33 per cent of customers, and was the second most common reason given by each of the customer categories.
- *The recurring nature of the fault* was mentioned by 27 per cent of customers, and was the third ranked complaint for all customer categories except for business customers—30 per cent of whom mentioned *the long time until an appointment*.
- The main reasons for customer dissatisfaction were consistent between the 2004 and 2005 surveys, although *the recurring nature of the fault* overtook *the long time until an appointment* as the third highest ranked complaint.
- A higher proportion of remote customers (49 per cent) mentioned *the recurring nature of the fault*, compared with 26 per cent and 30 per cent for urban and rural customers.
- Victorian customers were much less likely to mention *the failure to fix the fault or poor quality of repair* (22 per cent) or *the recurring nature of the fault* (15 per cent), compared with customers from other areas in Australia (36 per cent and 31 per cent respectively). However, they were much more likely to mention *the high cost of fixing the fault* (12 per cent) compared with four per cent for other customers.

**Table 4: Reasons given by dissatisfied customers – faults, 2003 to 2005**

| Reasons for dissatisfaction                        | Year | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|--|------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size  | 2005 | 287         | 62       | <b>349</b> | 204   | 112   | 33     |
|  | 2004 | 262         | 52       | <b>314</b> | 203   | 81    | 30     |
|  | 2003 | 285         | 32       | <b>317</b> | 211   | 83    | 23     |
| Long time to repair fault                          | 2005 | 48%         | 49%      | <b>48%</b> | 46%   | 54%   | 52%    |
|  | 2004 | 44%         | 40%      | <b>44%</b> | 42%   | 48%   | 37%    |
|  | 2003 | 55%         | 63%      | <b>56%</b> | 56%   | 58%   | 32%    |
| Fault not fixed/poor quality of repair             | 2005 | 32%         | 41%      | <b>33%</b> | 34%   | 31%   | 43%    |
|  | 2004 | 37%         | 27%      | <b>36%</b> | 39%   | 30%   | 24%    |
|  | 2003 | 37%         | 50%      | <b>40%</b> | 40%   | 40%   | 57%    |
| Fault is a recurring fault                         | 2005 | 27%         | 27%      | <b>27%</b> | 26%   | 30%   | 49%    |
|  | 2004 | 22%         | 35%      | <b>24%</b> | 23%   | 25%   | 37%    |
|  | 2003 | 25%         | 23%      | <b>25%</b> | 25%   | 24%   | 24%    |
| Long time until appointment                        | 2005 | 22%         | 30%      | <b>23%</b> | 22%   | 25%   | 24%    |
|  | 2004 | 24%         | 29%      | <b>24%</b> | 24%   | 25%   | 8%     |
|  | 2003 | 13%         | 23%      | <b>15%</b> | 15%   | 13%   | 4%     |
| Poor provision of information regarding repair     | 2005 | 15%         | 19%      | <b>15%</b> | 16%   | 15%   | 18%    |
|  | 2004 | 15%         | 15%      | <b>15%</b> | 15%   | 16%   | 11%    |
|  | 2003 | 9%          | 16%      | <b>11%</b> | 12%   | 8%    | 0%     |
| Very costly to fix                                 | 2005 | 6%          | 7%       | <b>6%</b>  | 5%    | 10%   | 4%     |
|  | 2004 | 10%         | 4%       | <b>10%</b> | 11%   | 7%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | 2%          | 3%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 3%    | 0%     |
| Technician was late /did not turn up               | 2005 | 3%          | 0%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 4%    | 0%     |
|  | 2004 | 1%          | 3%       | <b>2%</b>  | 1%    | 3%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | -           | -        | -          | -     | -     | -      |
| Constantly passed from one department to another   | 2005 | 3%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|  | 2004 | 1%          | 4%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | -           | -        | -          | -     | -     | -      |
| Poor customer service                              | 2005 | 2%          | 4%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|  | 2004 | 14%         | 12%      | <b>14%</b> | 15%   | 11%   | 9%     |
|  | 2003 | 11%         | 2%       | <b>9%</b>  | 9%    | 7%    | 43%    |
| They would not take responsibility for the problem | 2005 | 2%          | 0%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|  | 2004 | 2%          | 5%       | <b>3%</b>  | 2%    | 3%    | 4%     |
|  | 2003 | -           | -        | -          | -     | -     | -      |
| Other  | 2005 | 24%         | 17%      | <b>23%</b> | 24%   | 22%   | 20%    |
|  | 2004 | 11%         | 12%      | <b>11%</b> | 13%   | 5%    | 25%    |
|  | 2003 | 4%          | 3%       | <b>4%</b>  | 2%    | 7%    | 2%     |
| Don't know   | 2005 | -           | -        | -          | -     | -     | -      |
|  | 2004 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |

Table 5 compares the reasons for dissatisfaction with the fault repair service given by customers who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative with the reasons given by those who did not.

- *The long time to repair the fault*, having been mentioned by 48 per cent of dissatisfied customers overall, was less likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (44 per cent) than by those who did not (55 per cent). This was true for all customer categories—residential, business, urban, rural and remote.
- Conversely, the reason *the fault not fixed or poor quality of repair*, having been mentioned by 33 per cent of dissatisfied customers overall, was more likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (40 per cent) than by those who did not (22 per cent). This was true for all customer categories.
- Similarly, customers who mentioned *the fault is a recurring fault* (27 per cent) and *the long time until appointment* (23 per cent) were more likely to have done so if they had received a technician's visit (33 per cent compared with 18 per cent, and 25 per cent compared with 19 per cent respectively).

**Table 5: Reasons given by dissatisfied customers – faults, 2005**

| Reasons for dissatisfaction                            | Appointment Status | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size  | Appointment        | 171         | 38       | <b>209</b> | 123   | 64    | 22     |
|  | No appointment     | 116         | 24       | <b>140</b> | 81    | 48    | 11     |
|  | All                | 287         | 62       | <b>349</b> | 204   | 112   | 33     |
| Long time to repair fault                              | Appointment        | 45%         | 38%      | <b>44%</b> | 44%   | 43%   | 45%    |
|  | No appointment     | 53%         | 66%      | <b>55%</b> | 49%   | 69%   | 66%    |
|  | All                | 48%         | 49%      | <b>48%</b> | 46%   | 54%   | 52%    |
| Fault not fixed/poor quality of repair                 | Appointment        | 39%         | 45%      | <b>40%</b> | 40%   | 40%   | 47%    |
|  | No appointment     | 20%         | 34%      | <b>22%</b> | 23%   | 19%   | 35%    |
|  | All                | 32%         | 41%      | <b>33%</b> | 34%   | 31%   | 43%    |
| Fault is a recurring fault                             | Appointment        | 32%         | 39%      | <b>33%</b> | 34%   | 29%   | 53%    |
|  | No appointment     | 20%         | 9%       | <b>18%</b> | 12%   | 32%   | 39%    |
|  | All                | 27%         | 27%      | <b>27%</b> | 26%   | 30%   | 49%    |
| Long time until appointment                            | Appointment        | 22%         | 41%      | <b>25%</b> | 22%   | 34%   | 20%    |
|  | No appointment     | 20%         | 10%      | <b>19%</b> | 22%   | 13%   | 34%    |
|  | All                | 22%         | 30%      | <b>23%</b> | 22%   | 25%   | 24%    |
| Poor provision of information regarding repair         | Appointment        | 16%         | 18%      | <b>16%</b> | 16%   | 16%   | 17%    |
|  | No appointment     | 15%         | 14%      | <b>21%</b> | 15%   | 13%   | 22%    |
|  | All                | 15%         | 19%      | <b>15%</b> | 16%   | 15%   | 18%    |
| Costly to fix  | Appointment        | 4%          | 8%       | <b>5%</b>  | 4%    | 7%    | 6%     |
|  | No appointment     | 9%          | 6%       | <b>8%</b>  | 5%    | 14%   | 0%     |
|  | All                | 6%          | 7%       | <b>6%</b>  | 5%    | 10%   | 4%     |
| They failed to show up for appointments/turned up late | Appointment        | 4%          | 0%       | <b>4%</b>  | 2%    | 7%    | 0%     |

| Reasons for dissatisfaction   | Appointment Status | Residential | Business | Total | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
|   | No appointment     | -           | -        | -     | -     | -     | -      |
|   | All                | 3%          | 0%       | 2%    | 2%    | 4%    | 0%     |
| Without a phone for too long (until fault was fixed)                            | Appointment        | 3%          | 0%       | 2%    | 3%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 5%          | 8%       | 5%    | 6%    | 4%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 3%          | 3%       | 3%    | 4%    | 3%    | 0%     |
| They weren't interested in my problem/they pass the buck/gave me the run-around | Appointment        | 3%          | 0%       | 2%    | 3%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 3%          | 0%       | 3%    | 4%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 3%          | 0%       | 3%    | 3%    | 1%    | 0%     |
| Poor customer service   | Appointment        | 2%          | 6%       | 2%    | 2%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 1%          | 0%       | 1%    | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 2%          | 4%       | 2%    | 2%    | 1%    | 0%     |
| Couldn't get through to them/on hold for too long                               | Appointment        | 2%          | 0%       | 2%    | 2%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 2%          | 0%       | 2%    | 2%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 2%          | 0%       | 2%    | 2%    | 0%    | 0%     |
| Had to pay for calls diverted to my mobile (too expensive)                      | Appointment        | 2%          | 0%       | 2%    | 2%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 8%          | 0%       | 7%    | 9%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 4%          | 0%       | 4%    | 5%    | 2%    | 0%     |
| Technician had poor attitude/was rude   | Appointment        | 2%          | 5%       | 2%    | 2%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 0%          | 12%      | 1.6%  | 1%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 1%          | 8%       | 2%    | 2%    | 2%    | 0%     |
| They said it was our fault when it was actually their fault                     | Appointment        | 1%          | 0%       | 1%    | 1%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 4%          | 0%       | 3%    | 5%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 2%          | 0%       | 2%    | 2%    | 1%    | 0%     |
| Inconvenient time for appointments/appointment in office hours only             | Appointment        | 1%          | 0%       | 1%    | 1%    | 1%    | 6%     |
|   | No appointment     | 0%          | 0%       | *     | *     | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 1%          | 0%       | 1%    | 1%    | 1%    | 4%     |
| Had to fix it myself/a friend fixed it for me                                   | Appointment        | 1%          | *        | 1%    | 1%    | 0%    | 6%     |
|   | No appointment     | 1%          | 0%       | 1%    | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 1%          | *        | 1%    | 1%    | 0%    | 4%     |
| Other   | Appointment        | 13%         | 2%       | 11%   | 8%    | 21%   | 14%    |
|   | No appointment     | 11%         | 12%      | 11%   | 13%   | 7%    | 7%     |
|   | All                | 12%         | 6%       | 11%   | 10%   | 15%   | 12%    |

\*= less than one per cent

---

## Reasons for satisfaction

Respondents who said that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the fault repair were asked to give their reasons. Multiple responses were recorded from respondents who offered more than one reason.

Table 6 records the reasons given by customers for their satisfaction with the fault repair service they received.

- *The fault having been fixed or good quality of repair* continued as the main reason for satisfaction. It was mentioned by 60 per cent of satisfied or very satisfied customers and headed the list of reasons given by residential, business, urban, rural and remote customers alike.
- *The short time to repair the fault* was mentioned by 42 per cent of customers, and was the second most common reason given by each of the customer categories.
- *The short time until appointment* (17 per cent) and *the technician was polite/helpful* (16 per cent) were closely ranked for third place, although the gap between them was wider for business customers (28 per cent and 19 per cent respectively).
- The main reasons given for customer satisfaction in the 2004 and 2005 surveys were consistent, although *the technician was polite/helpful* moved ahead of *good provision of information regarding repair* to become the fourth-ranked reason for satisfaction.
- A lower proportion of rural customers (54 per cent) mentioned *the fault having been fixed or good quality of repair*, compared with 62 per cent and 58 per cent for urban and remote customers respectively. Similarly, they were less likely to mention *the short time to repair the fault* (38 per cent) than urban and remote customers (43 per cent each).

**Table 6: Reasons given by satisfied customers faults, 2003 to 2005**

| Reasons for satisfaction                               | Year | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|--|------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size  | 2005 | 764         | 102      | <b>866</b> | 529   | 240   | 97     |
|  | 2004 | 714         | 93       | <b>807</b> | 534   | 206   | 67     |
|  | 2003 | 749         | 53       | <b>802</b> | 532   | 204   | 66     |
| Fault fixed/good quality of repair                     | 2005 | 59%         | 67%      | <b>60%</b> | 62%   | 54%   | 58%    |
|  | 2004 | 55%         | 71%      | <b>44%</b> | 44%   | 45%   | 40%    |
|  | 2003 | 67%         | 65%      | <b>67%</b> | 66%   | 67%   | 74%    |
| Short time to repair fault                             | 2005 | 42%         | 43%      | <b>42%</b> | 43%   | 38%   | 43%    |
|  | 2004 | 44%         | 46%      | <b>56%</b> | 57%   | 53%   | 64%    |
|  | 2003 | 47%         | 42%      | <b>47%</b> | 45%   | 49%   | 40%    |
| Short time until appointment                           | 2005 | 16%         | 28%      | <b>17%</b> | 16%   | 22%   | 18%    |
|  | 2004 | 17%         | 17%      | <b>17%</b> | 19%   | 13%   | 11%    |
|  | 2003 | 12%         | 5%       | <b>11%</b> | 11%   | 12%   | 11%    |
| Technician was polite/courteous/helpful                | 2005 | 16%         | 19%      | <b>16%</b> | 16%   | 19%   | 21%    |
|  | 2004 | 4%          | 2%       | <b>4%</b>  | 5%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | 5%          | 8%       | <b>6%</b>  | 6%    | 6%    | 0%     |
| Good provision of information regarding repair         | 2005 | 9%          | 6%       | <b>9%</b>  | 9%    | 11%   | 10%    |
|  | 2004 | 11%         | 16%      | <b>11%</b> | 10%   | 13%   | 3%     |
|  | 2003 | 8%          | 10%      | <b>8%</b>  | 8%    | 9%    | 4%     |
| Calls diverted to a mobile service (at no charge)      | 2005 | 4%          | 8%       | <b>5%</b>  | 4%    | 6%    | 3%     |
|  | 2004 | 3%          | 2%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 3%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | 4%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 4%    | 2%     |
| Was not charged  | 2005 | 3%          | 4%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 3%    | 0%     |
|  | 2004 | 8%          | 2%       | <b>7%</b>  | 7%    | 8%    | 1%     |
|  | 2003 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | *     | 0%     |
| Technician turned up on time/when they said they would | 2005 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 1%    | 1%     |
|  | 2004 | -           | -        | -          | -     | -     | -      |
|  | 2003 | -           | -        | -          | -     | -     | -      |
| Other  | 2005 | 4%          | 0%       | <b>4%</b>  | 3%    | 5%    | 4%     |
|  | 2004 | 6%          | 7%       | <b>6%</b>  | 6%    | 5%    | 5%     |
|  | 2003 | 7%          | 8%       | <b>8%</b>  | 8%    | 6%    | 21%    |
| Don't know   | 2005 | 2%          | 4%       | <b>3%</b>  | 2%    | 3%    | 5%     |
|  | 2004 | 2%          | 0%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | 2003 | 2%          | 1%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 1%    | 1%     |

\* = less than one per cent

---

Table 7 compares the reasons for satisfaction with the fault repair service given by customers who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative with the reasons given by those who did not.

- *The fault having been fixed or good quality of repair*, having been mentioned by 60 per cent of satisfied customers overall, was more likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (68 per cent) than by those who did not (49 per cent). This was true for all customer categories.
- Customers who mentioned *the short time until appointment* (17 per cent) were more likely to have done so if they had received a technician's visit (21 per cent compared with 12 per cent for those who did not). Those who mentioned *the technician was polite/helpful* (16 per cent) were also more likely to have done so if they had received a technician's visit (20 per cent compared with 12 per cent for those who did not).
- Conversely, *the short time to repair the fault*, having been mentioned by 42 per cent of customers overall, was less likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (36 per cent) than by those who did not (51 per cent). This was true for all customer categories apart from business customers.



**Table 7: Reasons given by satisfied customers – faults, 2005**

| Reasons for satisfaction                               | Appointment status | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size  | Appointment        | 453         | 69       | <b>522</b> | 325   | 131   | 66     |
|  | No appointment     | 311         | 33       | <b>344</b> | 204   | 109   | 31     |
|  | All                | 764         | 102      | <b>866</b> | 529   | 240   | 97     |
| Fault fixed/good quality of repair                     | Appointment        | 68%         | 70%      | <b>68%</b> | 69%   | 64%   | 63%    |
|  | No appointment     | 48%         | 60%      | <b>49%</b> | 51%   | 43%   | 48%    |
|  | All                | 59%         | 67%      | <b>60%</b> | 62%   | 54%   | 58%    |
| Short time to repair fault                             | Appointment        | 34%         | 45%      | <b>36%</b> | 38%   | 28%   | 34%    |
|  | No appointment     | 52%         | 37%      | <b>51%</b> | 52%   | 50%   | 66%    |
|  | All                | 42%         | 43%      | <b>42%</b> | 43%   | 38%   | 43%    |
| Technician was polite/courteous/helpful                | Appointment        | 20%         | 20%      | <b>20%</b> | 18%   | 25%   | 21%    |
|  | No appointment     | 11%         | 18%      | <b>12%</b> | 12%   | 12%   | 20%    |
|  | All                | 16%         | 19%      | <b>16%</b> | 16%   | 19%   | 21%    |
| Short time until appointment                           | Appointment        | 19%         | 31%      | <b>21%</b> | 20%   | 24%   | 18%    |
|  | No appointment     | 12%         | 19%      | <b>12%</b> | 9%    | 19%   | 17%    |
|  | All                | 16%         | 28%      | <b>17%</b> | 16%   | 22%   | 18%    |
| Good provision of information regarding repair         | Appointment        | 10%         | 3%       | <b>9%</b>  | 9%    | 10%   | 10%    |
|  | No appointment     | 9%          | 16%      | <b>9%</b>  | 8%    | 11%   | 10%    |
|  | All                | 9%          | 6%       | <b>9%</b>  | 9%    | 11%   | 10%    |
| Was not charged  | Appointment        | 4%          | 5%       | <b>4%</b>  | 4%    | 6%    | 0%     |
|  | No appointment     | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | All                | 3%          | 4%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 3%    | 0%     |
| Calls diverted to a mobile service (at no charge)      | Appointment        | 2%          | 5%       | <b>3%</b>  | 2%    | 4%    | 2%     |
|  | No appointment     | 7%          | 17%      | <b>8%</b>  | 7%    | 9%    | 7%     |
|  | All                | 4%          | 8%       | <b>5%</b>  | 4%    | 6%    | 3%     |
| Technician turned up on time/when they said they would | Appointment        | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 2%    | 2%     |
|  | No appointment     | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|  | All                | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 1%    | 1%     |
| Other  | Appointment        | 5%          | 0%       | <b>4%</b>  | 4%    | 7%    | 3%     |
|  | No appointment     | 3%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 2%    | 6%     |
|  | All                | 4%          | 0%       | <b>4%</b>  | 3%    | 5%    | 4%     |
| Don't know   | Appointment        | 2%          | 4%       | <b>2%</b>  | 3%    | 2%    | 6%     |
|  | No appointment     | 2%          | 6%       | <b>3%</b>  | 2%    | 4%    | 3%     |
|  | All                | 2%          | 4%       | <b>3%</b>  | 2%    | 3%    | 5%     |

---

## Satisfaction with technician's punctuality

Of all customers surveyed, 59 per cent had arranged an on-site visit from a technician or another company representative—58 per cent of residential customers and 65 per cent of business customers. Respondents who had received a technician's visit were asked about the person's punctuality: *'How satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with the extent to which the person from the phone company arrived on time for the appointment? Were you very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?'*

Table 8 records the satisfaction of customers with the punctuality of their technician or other company representative.

- The 79 per cent of customers who were satisfied or very satisfied with the person's punctuality represents a significant increase from 71 per cent in 2004. Likewise, 14 per cent of customers were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the person's punctuality, which is down from 21 per cent in 2004.
- Satisfaction among residential customers (80 per cent) was higher than for business customers (72 per cent), and dissatisfaction among residential customers (14 per cent) was lower than for business customers (21 per cent). These differences were most evident at the less extreme satisfaction levels—with residential customers more likely to be satisfied (44 per cent compared with 33 per cent) and business customers more likely to be dissatisfied (11 per cent compared with six per cent).
- Dissatisfaction was strongly expressed across all customer categories. Of the 14 per cent of customers who expressed dissatisfaction, eight per cent were very dissatisfied compared with six per cent who were dissatisfied.
- Satisfaction among urban customers was 82 per cent, compared with 70 per cent and 72 per cent respectively for rural and remote customers. Dissatisfaction among urban customers was 12 per cent, compared with 22 per cent and 20 per cent respectively for rural and remote customers.

**Table 8: Customer satisfaction with technician’s punctuality – faults, 2003 to 2005**

| Satisfaction with punctuality      | Year        | Residential | Business   | Total      | Urban      | Rural      | Remote     |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample size                        | 2005        | 650         | 115        | <b>765</b> | 470        | 203        | 92         |
|                                    | 2004        | 605         | 102        | <b>707</b> | 465        | 178        | 64         |
|                                    | 2003        | 649         | 60         | <b>709</b> | 475        | 171        | 63         |
| Very dissatisfied                  | 2005        | 8%          | 10%        | <b>8%</b>  | 7%         | 11%        | 11%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 9%          | 9%         | <b>9%</b>  | 8%         | 11%        | 9%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 9%          | 10%        | <b>9%</b>  | 9%         | 8%         | 18%        |
| Dissatisfied                       | 2005        | 6%          | 11%        | <b>6%</b>  | 5%         | 11%        | 9%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 12%         | 17%        | <b>12%</b> | 11%        | 15%        | 9%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 11%         | 4%         | <b>10%</b> | 10%        | 9%         | 15%        |
| <b>Total dissatisfied</b>          | <b>2005</b> | <b>14%</b>  | <b>21%</b> | <b>14%</b> | <b>12%</b> | <b>22%</b> | <b>20%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>21%</b>  | <b>26%</b> | <b>21%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>26%</b> | <b>18%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>20%</b>  | <b>14%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>33%</b> |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 2005        | 2%          | 6%         | <b>3%</b>  | 2%         | 5%         | 7%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 7%          | 8%         | <b>7%</b>  | 7%         | 6%         | 9%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 4%          | 5%         | <b>4%</b>  | 3%         | 6%         | 6%         |
| Satisfied                          | 2005        | 44%         | 33%        | <b>42%</b> | 45%        | 34%        | 46%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 41%         | 36%        | <b>41%</b> | 42%        | 35%        | 52%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 46%         | 58%        | <b>48%</b> | 50%        | 43%        | 32%        |
| Very satisfied                     | 2005        | 37%         | 39%        | <b>37%</b> | 37%        | 36%        | 26%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 30%         | 27%        | <b>30%</b> | 30%        | 32%        | 20%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 28%         | 20%        | <b>27%</b> | 24%        | 33%        | 29%        |
| <b>Total satisfied</b>             | <b>2005</b> | <b>80%</b>  | <b>72%</b> | <b>79%</b> | <b>82%</b> | <b>70%</b> | <b>72%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>72%</b>  | <b>63%</b> | <b>71%</b> | <b>72%</b> | <b>67%</b> | <b>72%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>74%</b>  | <b>78%</b> | <b>75%</b> | <b>74%</b> | <b>76%</b> | <b>61%</b> |
| Don't know/can't say               | 2005        | 4%          | 2%         | <b>4%</b>  | 4%         | 3%         | 1%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 1%          | 3%         | <b>1%</b>  | 2%         | 1%         | 0%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 3%          | 3%         | <b>3%</b>  | 3%         | 2%         | 1%         |

## Connection of service

Respondents were asked questions (see Appendix 2) about their level of satisfaction and their reasons for either being satisfied or dissatisfied with the connection service they received. Respondents who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative were also asked about their level of satisfaction with the person’s punctuality. Their responses are discussed in the following subsections, with particular attention to observed differences between residential and business customers and between those from urban, rural or remote parts of Australia.

### Overall satisfaction

Respondents were asked: ‘*Apart from the costs involved, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with the “telephone transfer” / “new connection”? Were you: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?*’.

Table 9 records the overall satisfaction of customers with their telephone connection service.

- 
- The 76 per cent of customers who were satisfied or very satisfied with their connection service is a significant decrease from 82 per cent in 2004. However, with 15 per cent of customers dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their connection service, there was no significant change in dissatisfaction from 14 per cent in 2004.
  - Satisfaction among residential customers (79 per cent) was significantly higher than for business customers (66 per cent). Conversely, dissatisfaction among residential customers (14 per cent) was lower than for business customers (20 per cent). Dissatisfied business customers tended to be very dissatisfied (13 per cent out of a total of 20 per cent who expressed dissatisfaction). Likewise, if they were satisfied, they had a greater tendency to be very satisfied (34 per cent out of 66 per cent who expressed satisfaction).
  - Satisfaction among remote customers was 68 per cent, compared with 76 per cent for urban customers and 77 per cent for rural customers. Likewise, dissatisfaction among remote customers was 27 per cent, compared with 15 per cent and 16 per cent respectively for urban and rural customers.
  - Remote customers were less satisfied and more dissatisfied in 2005 than for the previous year. Their satisfaction was down from 86 per cent in 2004 to 68 per cent in 2005; and their dissatisfaction was up from 11 per cent in 2004 to 27 per cent in 2005. The satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels in 2004 were consistent with the levels of 2003.

**Table 9: Customer satisfaction – connections, 2003 to 2005**

| Satisfaction overall               | Year        | Residential | Business   | Total        | Urban      | Rural      | Remote     |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample size                        | 2005        | 1,084       | 134        | <b>1,218</b> | 815        | 332        | 71         |
|                                    | 2004        | 1,073       | 129        | <b>1,202</b> | 800        | 302        | 100        |
|                                    | 2003        | 1,154       | 46         | <b>1,200</b> | 823        | 302        | 75         |
| Very dissatisfied                  | 2005        | 6%          | 13%        | <b>7%</b>    | 6%         | 11%        | 12%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 4%          | 12%        | <b>5%</b>    | 4%         | 8%         | 6%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 5%          | 19%        | <b>7%</b>    | 6%         | 8%         | 3%         |
| Dissatisfied                       | 2005        | 8%          | 7%         | <b>8%</b>    | 8%         | 5%         | 16%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 9%          | 15%        | <b>9%</b>    | 9%         | 7%         | 6%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 10%         | 13%        | <b>10%</b>   | 10%        | 9%         | 7%         |
| <b>Total dissatisfied</b>          | <b>2005</b> | <b>14%</b>  | <b>20%</b> | <b>15%</b>   | <b>15%</b> | <b>16%</b> | <b>27%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>13%</b>  | <b>27%</b> | <b>14%</b>   | <b>13%</b> | <b>15%</b> | <b>11%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>15%</b>  | <b>32%</b> | <b>17%</b>   | <b>17%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>10%</b> |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 2005        | 7%          | 14%        | <b>8%</b>    | 8%         | 7%         | 3%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 4%          | 5%         | <b>4%</b>    | 5%         | 4%         | 3%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 4%          | 5%         | <b>4%</b>    | 4%         | 3%         | 2%         |
| Satisfied                          | 2005        | 50%         | 32%        | <b>47%</b>   | 47%        | 47%        | 42%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 50%         | 38%        | <b>49%</b>   | 50%        | 47%        | 47%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 51%         | 40%        | <b>50%</b>   | 51%        | 43%        | 54%        |
| Very satisfied                     | 2005        | 28%         | 34%        | <b>30%</b>   | 30%        | 29%        | 26%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 32%         | 30%        | <b>32%</b>   | 32%        | 33%        | 39%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 29%         | 22%        | <b>29%</b>   | 27%        | 37%        | 34%        |
| <b>Total satisfied</b>             | <b>2005</b> | <b>79%</b>  | <b>66%</b> | <b>76%</b>   | <b>76%</b> | <b>77%</b> | <b>68%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>83%</b>  | <b>68%</b> | <b>82%</b>   | <b>82%</b> | <b>80%</b> | <b>86%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>80%</b>  | <b>62%</b> | <b>79%</b>   | <b>78%</b> | <b>80%</b> | <b>88%</b> |

Table 10 compares the overall satisfaction with the connection service of the 55 per cent of customers who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative with the overall satisfaction of those who did not.

- There was only a very slight difference in the level of satisfaction (76 per cent overall) depending on whether customers had received a site visit (75 per cent) compared with those who did not (77 per cent).
- Among remote customers (68 per cent satisfied or very satisfied overall) there was some difference with the satisfaction level being 61 per cent for those who had a technician's visit and 73 per cent for those who did not.
- Among rural customers (77 per cent satisfied or very satisfied overall) there was some difference with the satisfaction level, at 70 per cent for those who had a technician's visit and 80 per cent for those who did not.
- For business customers (66 per cent being satisfied or very satisfied overall), satisfaction for those who received a technician's visit was 69 per cent, compared with 62 per cent for those who did not.
- The difference in the level of dissatisfaction between customers who had an onsite visit and those who did not was noticeable. The overall level of dissatisfaction was 15 per cent, with 21 per cent of customers who had received a technician's visit dissatisfied, compared with 12 per cent for those who did not.
- Dissatisfaction was higher among customers who had received a technician's visit across all customer categories.

**Table 10: Overall satisfaction – connections, 2005**

| <b>Satisfaction level</b>                    | <b>Appointment status</b> | <b>Residential</b> | <b>Business</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Urban</b> | <b>Rural</b> | <b>Remote</b> |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Sample size                                  | Appointment               | 589                | 86              | <b>675</b>   | 439          | 190          | 46            |
|  | No appointment            | 495                | 48              | <b>543</b>   | 376          | 142          | 25            |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>1,084</b>       | <b>134</b>      | <b>1218</b>  | <b>815</b>   | <b>332</b>   | <b>71</b>     |
| Very dissatisfied                            | Appointment               | 7%                 | 14%             | <b>9%</b>    | 8%           | 15%          | 16%           |
|  | No appointment            | 6%                 | 12%             | <b>6%</b>    | 6%           | 9%           | 10%           |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>6%</b>          | <b>13%</b>      | <b>7%</b>    | <b>6%</b>    | <b>11%</b>   | <b>12%</b>    |
| Dissatisfied                                 | Appointment               | 12%                | 11%             | <b>12%</b>   | 12%          | 10%          | 17%           |
|  | No appointment            | 6%                 | 1%              | <b>5%</b>    | 6%           | 2%           | 15%           |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>8%</b>          | <b>7%</b>       | <b>8%</b>    | <b>8%</b>    | <b>5%</b>    | <b>16%</b>    |
| <b>Total dissatisfied</b>                    | <b>Appointment</b>        | <b>19%</b>         | <b>25%</b>      | <b>21%</b>   | <b>20%</b>   | <b>25%</b>   | <b>32%</b>    |
|  | <b>No appointment</b>     | <b>11%</b>         | <b>13%</b>      | <b>12%</b>   | <b>12%</b>   | <b>11%</b>   | <b>25%</b>    |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>14%</b>         | <b>20%</b>      | <b>15%</b>   | <b>15%</b>   | <b>16%</b>   | <b>27%</b>    |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied/can't say | Appointment               | 3%                 | 6%              | <b>4%</b>    | 4%           | 4%           | 7%            |
|  | No appointment            | 9%                 | 25%             | <b>11%</b>   | 11%          | 9%           | 3%            |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>7%</b>          | <b>14%</b>      | <b>9%</b>    | <b>9%</b>    | <b>8%</b>    | <b>4%</b>     |
| Satisfied                                    | Appointment               | 50%                | 29%             | <b>43%</b>   | 43%          | 44%          | 46%           |
|  | No appointment            | 51%                | 36%             | <b>49%</b>   | 49%          | 49%          | 40%           |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>50%</b>         | <b>32%</b>      | <b>47%</b>   | <b>47%</b>   | <b>47%</b>   | <b>42%</b>    |
| Very satisfied                               | Appointment               | 28%                | 39%             | <b>32%</b>   | 33%          | 25%          | 16%           |
|  | No appointment            | 29%                | 26%             | <b>28%</b>   | 27%          | 32%          | 33%           |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>29%</b>         | <b>34%</b>      | <b>30%</b>   | <b>30%</b>   | <b>29%</b>   | <b>26%</b>    |
| <b>Total satisfied</b>                       | <b>Appointment</b>        | <b>78%</b>         | <b>69%</b>      | <b>75%</b>   | <b>76%</b>   | <b>70%</b>   | <b>61%</b>    |
|  | <b>No appointment</b>     | <b>79%</b>         | <b>62%</b>      | <b>77%</b>   | <b>77%</b>   | <b>80%</b>   | <b>73%</b>    |
|  | <b>All</b>                | <b>79%</b>         | <b>66%</b>      | <b>76%</b>   | <b>76%</b>   | <b>77%</b>   | <b>68%</b>    |

---

## Reasons for dissatisfaction

Respondents who said that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the connection service were asked to give their reasons. Multiple responses were recorded from respondents who offered more than one reason.

Table 11 records the reasons given by customers for their dissatisfaction with the connection service they received.

- *The connection/transfer being performed incorrectly or not as requested* continued to be the main reason for dissatisfaction. It was mentioned by 51 per cent of customers overall, and headed the list of complaints by all customer categories. It was mentioned by 30 per cent of remote customers, 42 per cent of residential customers and 77 per cent of business customers.
- *The long time to connect/transfer the phone* was mentioned by 36 per cent of customers overall, and ranked second among their reasons for dissatisfaction. It was mentioned by only 19 per cent of remote customers.
- *The long time until appointment* was mentioned by 27 per cent of remote customers and 25 per cent of rural customers, although it ranked fourth overall—having been mentioned by just 14 per cent of customers.
- *The poor provision of information regarding connection/transfer* was mentioned by 18 per cent of customers, and was the third ranked complaint overall. However, it was only mentioned by five per cent of remote customers.
- Remote customers mentioned some issues more frequently than urban or rural customers. *The technician was not fully informed of my needs* was mentioned by 19 per cent of remote customers but by only one per cent of customers overall. *Problems with the internet connection* was mentioned by 13 per cent of remote customers but by less than one per cent of customers overall.
- The main reasons for customer dissatisfaction were consistent between the 2004 and 2005 surveys, although *billing errors* overtook *the high cost of connection/transfer* as the fifth-highest ranked complaint.
- New South Wales/Australian Capital Territory customers were much more likely to mention *the poor provision of information* (31 per cent) or *billing errors* (23 per cent) compared with customers from other areas of Australia (12 per cent and five per cent respectively).

**Table 11: Reasons given by dissatisfied customers – connections, 2003 to 2005**

| Reasons for dissatisfaction   | Year | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|---|------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size   | 2005 | 173         | 34       | <b>207</b> | 128   | 61    | 18     |
|   | 2004 | 144         | 36       | <b>180</b> | 118   | 51    | 11     |
|   | 2003 | 182         | 13       | <b>195</b> | 137   | 48    | 10     |
| Connection/transfer performed incorrectly/faultily/not as requested | 2005 | 42%         | 77%      | <b>51%</b> | 52%   | 52%   | 30%    |
|   | 2004 | 45%         | 38%      | <b>44%</b> | 46%   | 35%   | 76%    |
|   | 2003 | 33%         | 40%      | <b>34%</b> | 33%   | 41%   | 70%    |
| Long time to connect/transfer the phone                             | 2005 | 35%         | 40%      | <b>36%</b> | 35%   | 41%   | 19%    |
|   | 2004 | 38%         | 44%      | <b>39%</b> | 40%   | 33%   | 77%    |
|   | 2003 | 33%         | 38%      | <b>34%</b> | 34%   | 31%   | 10%    |
| Poor provision of information regarding connection/transfer         | 2005 | 12%         | 36%      | <b>18%</b> | 18%   | 18%   | 5%     |
|   | 2004 | 17%         | 40%      | <b>19%</b> | 20%   | 18%   | 13%    |
|   | 2003 | 16%         | 16%      | <b>16%</b> | 17%   | 11%   | 20%    |
| Long time until appointment   | 2005 | 6%          | 38%      | <b>14%</b> | 12%   | 25%   | 27%    |
|   | 2004 | 14%         | 9%       | <b>14%</b> | 13%   | 14%   | 38%    |
|   | 2003 | 21%         | 25%      | <b>22%</b> | 24%   | 11%   | 20%    |
| Billing errors (eg sent to wrong address)                           | 2005 | 10%         | 11%      | <b>10%</b> | 9%    | 15%   | 18%    |
|   | 2004 | 3%          | 4%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 5%    | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | 7%          | 0%       | <b>5%</b>  | 4%    | 10%   | 0%     |
| High cost of connection/transfer                                    | 2005 | 11%         | 7%       | <b>10%</b> | 9%    | 12%   | 7%     |
|   | 2004 | 10%         | 10%      | <b>10%</b> | 10%   | 7%    | 9%     |
|   | 2003 | 5%          | 10%      | <b>6%</b>  | 6%    | 4%    | 0%     |
| The technician did not turn up for appointment                      | 2005 | *           | 15%      | <b>4%</b>  | 5%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | 2004 | 5%          | 5%       | <b>5%</b>  | 5%    | 7%    | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | -           | -        | <b>-</b>   | -     | -     | -      |
| Overcharged/additional costs incurred                               | 2005 | 2%          | 1%       | <b>2%</b>  | *     | 8%    | 0%     |
|   | 2004 | 5%          | 5%       | <b>5%</b>  | 5%    | 3%    | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | 3%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b>  | 2%    | 7%    | 0%     |
| The service centre staff were unhelpful/rude                        | 2005 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 0%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | 2004 | 8%          | 8%       | <b>8%</b>  | 7%    | 15%   | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | -           | -        | <b>-</b>   | -     | -     | -      |
| Other   | 2005 | 24%         | 14%      | <b>21%</b> | 22%   | 20%   | 44%    |
|   | 2004 | 21%         | 41%      | <b>24%</b> | 21%   | 33%   | 9%     |
|   | 2003 | 12%         | 11%      | <b>12%</b> | 12%   | 8%    | 20%    |
| Don't know /can't say   | 2005 | 2%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 0%    | 7%    | 0%     |
|   | 2004 | 0%          | 0%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | 3%          | 0%       | <b>2%</b>  | 3%    | 2%    | 0%     |

\* = less than one per cent



---

Table 12 compares the reasons for dissatisfaction with the connection service given by customers who had an on-site visit from a technician or other company representative with the reasons given by those who did not.

- *The connection/transfer performed faultily or not as requested*, having been mentioned by 51 per cent of dissatisfied customers overall, was more likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (60 per cent) than by those who did not (42 per cent). This was true for residential, urban and rural customers, but not for business and remote customers.
- *The long time to connect/transfer the phone*, having been mentioned by 36 per cent of dissatisfied customers overall, was less likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (32 per cent) than by those who did not (41 per cent). This was true for residential, business and urban customers but not for rural and remote customers.
- *The poor provision of information regarding the connection/transfer*, having been mentioned by 18 per cent of dissatisfied customers overall, was more likely to have been mentioned by those who had received a technician's visit (22 per cent) than by those who had not (14 per cent). This was true for all customer categories except for business customers.

*A long time until appointment* was mentioned by 27 per cent of those customers who received a visit from a technician—50 per cent of business customers, 44 per cent of rural customers and only 12 per cent of residential customers. This reason was rarely given by customers who did not have a technician's visit, except for remote customers. The reasons for 23 per cent of remote customers who did not have a visit from a technician giving *a long time until appointment* as a reason for dissatisfaction are not clear. Perhaps these customers suffered long delays for an appointment that either did not eventuate, or a technician eventually visited the site without the customer's knowledge. *A long time until appointment* was mentioned by 27 per cent of remote customers and 25 per cent of rural customers.

**Table 12: Reasons given by dissatisfied customers – connections, 2005**

| Reasons for dissatisfaction  | Appointment status | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size  | Appointment        | 110         | 22       | <b>132</b> | 79    | 41    | 12     |
|  | No appointment     | 63          | 12       | <b>75</b>  | 49    | 20    | 6      |
|  | All                | 173         | 34       | <b>207</b> | 128   | 61    | 18     |
| Connection/transfer performed incorrectly/faultily/not as requested                    | Appointment        | 51%         | 74%      | <b>60%</b> | 64%   | 45%   | 17%    |
|  | No appointment     | 35%         | 86%      | <b>42%</b> | 38%   | 60%   | 39%    |
|  | All                | 42%         | 77%      | <b>51%</b> | 52%   | 52%   | 30%    |
| Long time to connect/transfer the phone  | Appointment        | 29%         | 35%      | <b>32%</b> | 25%   | 58%   | 38%    |
|  | No appointment     | 38%         | 56%      | <b>41%</b> | 46%   | 19%   | 5%     |
|  | All                | 35%         | 40%      | <b>36%</b> | 35%   | 41%   | 19%    |
| Poor provision of information regarding connection/transfer                            | Appointment        | 15%         | 33%      | <b>22%</b> | 22%   | 24%   | 5%     |
|  | No appointment     | 9%          | 43%      | <b>14%</b> | 15%   | 10%   | 6%     |
|  | All                | 12%         | 36%      | <b>18%</b> | 18%   | 18%   | 5%     |
| Long time until appointment  | Appointment        | 12%         | 50%      | <b>27%</b> | 22%   | 44%   | 32%    |
|  | No appointment     | 0%          | 3%       | <b>1%</b>  | 0%    | 1%    | 23%    |
|  | All                | 6%          | 38%      | <b>14%</b> | 12%   | 25%   | 27%    |
| I was not given the requested private/silent number                                    | Appointment        | 11%         | 0%       | <b>7%</b>  | 9%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | No appointment     | 0%          | 0%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | All                | 5%          | 0%       | <b>4%</b>  | 5%    | 0%    | 0%     |
| High cost of connection/transfer   | Appointment        | 8%          | 9%       | <b>8%</b>  | 5%    | 21%   | 9%     |
|  | No appointment     | 13%         | 1%       | <b>11%</b> | 14%   | 0%    | 6%     |
|  | All                | 11%         | 7%       | <b>10%</b> | 9%    | 12%   | 7%     |
| I was given false/misleading information   | Appointment        | 4%          | 0%       | <b>2%</b>  | 0%    | 12%   | 0%     |
|  | No appointment     | 0%          | 0%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | All                | 2%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 0%    | 7%    | 0%     |
| Billing errors (eg sent to wrong address)  | Appointment        | 3%          | 8%       | <b>5%</b>  | 5%    | 6%    | 4%     |
|  | No appointment     | 15%         | 21%      | <b>16%</b> | 14%   | 26%   | 29%    |
|  | All                | 10%         | 11%      | <b>10%</b> | 9%    | 15%   | 18%    |
| Contacting the service provider is difficult/takes many calls/are on hold for too long | Appointment        | 1%          | 6%       | <b>3%</b>  | 1%    | 13%   | 9%     |
|  | No appointment     | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|  | All                | 1%          | 5%       | <b>2%</b>  | 1%    | 7%    | 4%     |

| Reasons for dissatisfaction                       | Appointment status | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| The technician was not fully informed of my needs | Appointment        | 1%          | 1%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 2%    | 8%     |
|   | No appointment     | 0%          | 3%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 27%    |
|   | All                | 1%          | 1%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 1%    | 19%    |
| The technician did not turn up for appointment    | Appointment        | 1%          | 20%      | <b>8%</b>  | 11%   | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 0%          | 0%       | <b>0%</b>  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | *           | 15%      | <b>4%</b>  | 5%    | 0%    | 0%     |
| Refused/couldn't connect a line in my area        | Appointment        | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 5%          | 0%       | <b>4%</b>  | 5%    | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 3%          | 0%       | <b>2%</b>  | 3%    | 0%    | 0%     |
| Overcharged / additional costs incurred           | Appointment        | 1%          | 1%       | <b>1%</b>  | 0%    | 4%    | 0%     |
|   | No appointment     | 3%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b>  | 0%    | 15%   | 0%     |
|   | All                | 2%          | 1%       | <b>2%</b>  | 0%    | 8%    | 0%     |
| Other   | Appointment        | 10%         | 11%      | <b>10%</b> | 10%   | 10%   | 36%    |
|   | No appointment     | 22%         | 0%       | <b>19%</b> | 23%   | 1%    | 11%    |
|   | All                | 16%         | 8%       | <b>14%</b> | 16%   | 6%    | 21%    |

\* = less than 1 per cent

## Reasons for satisfaction

Respondents who said that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their connection of service were asked to give their reasons. Multiple responses were recorded from respondents who offered more than one reason.

Table 13 records the reasons given by customers for their satisfaction with the connection service they received.

- *No problems with the connection/transfer* was the highest ranked reason for satisfaction. It was mentioned by 62 per cent of customers in 2005, up from 35 per cent in 2004. It was mentioned by 59 per cent of residential customers, 74 per cent of business customers and only 31 per cent of remote customers (for whom it was ranked second).
- *A short time to connect/transfer the phone* was mentioned by 30 per cent of customers, a significant drop from 43 per cent in 2004. It was mentioned by 41 per cent of remote customers and was the most commonly cited by these customers.
- *Good service from the technician* was mentioned by 13 per cent of customers and ranked third overall, but it was only mentioned by one per cent of remote customers.

**Table 13: Reasons given by satisfied customers – connections, 2003 to 2005**

| Reason for Satisfaction                                     | Year | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|---|------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size   | 2005 | 844         | 90       | <b>934</b> | 634   | 251   | 49     |
|   | 2004 | 875         | 84       | <b>959</b> | 639   | 235   | 85     |
|   | 2003 | 925         | 30       | <b>955</b> | 647   | 245   | 63     |
| No problems with it/it works                                | 2005 | 59%         | 74%      | <b>62%</b> | 62%   | 60%   | 31%    |
|   | 2004 | 35%         | 32%      | <b>35%</b> | 36%   | 29%   | 26%    |
|   | 2003 | 37%         | 32%      | <b>36%</b> | 36%   | 36%   | 50%    |
| Short time to connect/transfer the phone                    | 2005 | 31%         | 26%      | <b>30%</b> | 31%   | 26%   | 41%    |
|   | 2004 | 43%         | 43%      | <b>43%</b> | 42%   | 46%   | 49%    |
|   | 2003 | 50%         | 42%      | <b>49%</b> | 50%   | 48%   | 37%    |
| Good service from the technician                            | 2005 | 12%         | 19%      | <b>13%</b> | 14%   | 11%   | 1%     |
|   | 2004 | 1%          | 1%       | <b>1%</b>  | 1%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | 10%         | 11%      | <b>11%</b> | 10%   | 11%   | 5%     |
| Short time until appointment                                | 2005 | 7%          | 15%      | <b>9%</b>  | 8%    | 12%   | 10%    |
|   | 2004 | 12%         | 19%      | <b>12%</b> | 12%   | 14%   | 11%    |
|   | 2003 | 9%          | 9%       | <b>9%</b>  | 8%    | 11%   | 9%     |
| Good provision of information regarding connection/transfer | 2005 | 5%          | 11%      | <b>6%</b>  | 5%    | 10%   | 3%     |
|   | 2004 | 8%          | 9%       | <b>8%</b>  | 8%    | 8%    | 8%     |
|   | 2003 | 5%          | 8%       | <b>5%</b>  | 5%    | 6%    | 5%     |
| Have cheaper bills now                                      | 2005 | 5%          | 7%       | <b>5%</b>  | 6%    | 2%    | 1%     |
|   | 2004 | *           | 0%       | <b>*</b>   | *     | 0%    | 0%     |
|   | 2003 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>*</b>   | 1%    | 0%    | 0%     |
| Low cost of connection/transfer                             | 2005 | 3%          | 3%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 1%    | 1%     |
|   | 2004 | 4%          | 3%       | <b>4%</b>  | 4%    | 3%    | 3%     |
|   | 2003 | 2%          | 0%       | <b>2%</b>  | 2%    | 2%    | 4%     |
| The work was carried out on time                            | 2005 | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b>  | *     | 1%    | 8%     |
|   | 2004 | 6%          | 5%       | <b>6%</b>  | 6%    | 7%    | 4%     |
|   | 2003 | -           | -        | <b>-</b>   | -     | -     | -      |
| Other   | 2005 | 9%          | 3%       | <b>8%</b>  | 9%    | 4%    | 3%     |
|   | 2004 | 19%         | 21%      | <b>19%</b> | 19%   | 22%   | 27%    |
|   | 2003 | 5%          | 15%      | <b>6%</b>  | 5%    | 8%    | 1%     |
| Don't know/can't say  | 2005 | 4%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 4%    | 13%    |
|   | 2004 | 4%          | 3%       | <b>4%</b>  | 3%    | 4%    | 4%     |
|   | 2003 | 6%          | 8%       | <b>6%</b>  | 6%    | 5%    | 5%     |

Table 14 compares the reasons for satisfaction for customers who had a site visit from a technician or other company representative with the reasons given by those who did not.

- Among satisfied customers overall, 62 per cent of whom mentioned *no problems with the connection/transfer*, there was no significant difference between those who received a technician's visit and those who did not. However, remote customers were more likely to mention this reason if they had received a technician's visit than if they had not, whereas business customers were less likely to do so.

- *A short time to connect/transfer the phone*, having been mentioned by 30 per cent of satisfied customers overall, was less likely to have been mentioned by customers who received a technician’s visit (24 per cent) than by those who did not (34 per cent). This was true for all customer categories—especially remote customers (41 per cent overall), among whom this reason was given by only 17 per cent of those who received a technician’s visit, but by 52 per cent of those who did not.

**Table 14: Reasons given by satisfied customers – connections, 2005**

| Reasons for satisfaction                                    | Appointment status | Residential | Business | Total      | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Sample size   | Appointment        | 455         | 59       | <b>514</b> | 342   | 140   | 32     |
|   | No appointment     | 389         | 31       | <b>420</b> | 292   | 111   | 17     |
|   | All                | 844         | 90       | <b>934</b> | 634   | 251   | 49     |
| No problems with it/it works                                | Appointment        | 59%         | 71%      | <b>62%</b> | 63%   | 61%   | 46%    |
|   | No appointment     | 59%         | 78%      | <b>61%</b> | 62%   | 59%   | 24%    |
|   | All                | 59%         | 74%      | <b>62%</b> | 62%   | 60%   | 31%    |
| Short time to connect/transfer the phone                    | Appointment        | 26%         | 21%      | <b>24%</b> | 26%   | 14%   | 17%    |
|   | No appointment     | 34%         | 33%      | <b>34%</b> | 34%   | 32%   | 52%    |
|   | All                | 31%         | 26%      | <b>30%</b> | 31%   | 26%   | 41%    |
| Good service from the technician                            | Appointment        | 18%         | 26%      | <b>21%</b> | 21%   | 21%   | 4%     |
|   | No appointment     | 10%         | 6%       | <b>9%</b>  | 10%   | 6%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 12%         | 19%      | <b>13%</b> | 14%   | 11%   | 1%     |
| Short time until appointment                                | Appointment        | 11%         | 10%      | <b>11%</b> | 10%   | 14%   | 12%    |
|   | No appointment     | 6%          | 23%      | <b>8%</b>  | 7%    | 10%   | 9%     |
|   | All                | 7%          | 15%      | <b>9%</b>  | 8%    | 12%   | 10%    |
| Have cheaper bills now                                      | Appointment        | 6%          | 7%       | <b>6%</b>  | 7%    | *     | 4%     |
|   | No appointment     | 4%          | 7%       | <b>5%</b>  | 5%    | 2%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 5%          | 7%       | <b>5%</b>  | 6%    | 2%    | 1%     |
| Good provision of information regarding connection/transfer | Appointment        | 5%          | 10%      | <b>6%</b>  | 6%    | 10%   | 2%     |
|   | No appointment     | 5%          | 14%      | <b>6%</b>  | 5%    | 10%   | 4%     |
|   | All                | 5%          | 11%      | <b>6%</b>  | 5%    | 10%   | 3%     |
| Low cost of connection/transfer                             | Appointment        | 3%          | 5%       | <b>4%</b>  | 4%    | 3%    | 4%     |
|   | No appointment     | 3%          | 1%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 1%    | 0%     |
|   | All                | 3%          | 3%       | <b>3%</b>  | 3%    | 1%    | 1%     |

| Reasons for satisfaction         | Appointment status | Residential | Business | Total     | Urban | Rural | Remote |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|--------|
| The work was carried out on time | Appointment        | *           | 0%       | *         | *     | 0%    | 4%     |
|                                  | No appointment     | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b> | *     | 2%    | 10%    |
|                                  | All                | 1%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b> | *     | 1%    | 8%     |
| Other                            | Appointment        | 11%         | 5%       | <b>9%</b> | 10%   | 7%    | 2%     |
|                                  | No appointment     | 8%          | *        | <b>7%</b> | 9%    | 3%    | 4%     |
|                                  | All                | 9%          | 3%       | <b>8%</b> | 9%    | 4%    | 3%     |
| Don't know/can't say             | Appointment        | 2%          | 0%       | <b>1%</b> | *     | 4%    | 17%    |
|                                  | No appointment     | 5%          | 0%       | <b>5%</b> | 5%    | 4%    | 11%    |
|                                  | All                | 4%          | 0%       | <b>3%</b> | 3%    | 4%    | 13%    |

### Satisfaction with technician's punctuality

For connection of service, 55 per cent of customers had arranged an on-site visit from a technician or another company representative. This was 54 per cent of residential customers and 64 per cent of business customers. Customers who had received a technician's visit were asked about the person's punctuality: *'How satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with the extent to which the person from the phone company arrived on time for the appointment? Were you very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?'*

Table 15 records the satisfaction of customers with the punctuality of their technician or other company representative.

- 75 per cent of customers were satisfied or very satisfied with the person's punctuality, a slight increase from 72 per cent in 2004. 20 per cent of customers were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the person's punctuality, a slight decrease from 21 per cent in 2004.
- Satisfaction among residential customers (73 per cent) was lower than for business customers (79 per cent). Dissatisfaction among residential customers (19 per cent) was slightly lower than for business customers (21 per cent).
- Dissatisfaction was strongly expressed across all customer categories—12 per cent being very dissatisfied and eight per cent being dissatisfied overall. Rural and remote customers were more likely to be very dissatisfied than merely dissatisfied. For rural customers, 20 per cent were very dissatisfied and four per cent were dissatisfied. For remote customers, 18 per cent were very dissatisfied and three per cent were dissatisfied.
- Satisfaction among urban, rural and remote customers was consistent, at 75–76 per cent. Dissatisfaction among urban, rural and remote customers was also fairly consistent, at 19–24 per cent.

**Table 15: Customer satisfaction with technician's punctuality – connections, 2003 to 2005**

| Satisfaction with punctuality      | Year        | Residential | Business   | Total      | Urban      | Rural      | Remote     |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Sample size                        | 2005        | 589         | 86         | <b>675</b> | 439        | 190        | 46         |
|                                    | 2004        | 523         | 81         | <b>604</b> | 437        | 127        | 40         |
|                                    | 2003        | 556         | 32         | <b>588</b> | 447        | 114        | 27         |
| Very dissatisfied                  | 2005        | 11%         | 13%        | <b>12%</b> | 10%        | 20%        | 18%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 14%         | 13%        | <b>14%</b> | 14%        | 14%        | 11%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 12%         | 19%        | <b>14%</b> | 14%        | 12%        | 7%         |
| Dissatisfied                       | 2005        | 8%          | 8%         | <b>8%</b>  | 9%         | 4%         | 3%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 7%          | 5%         | <b>7%</b>  | 7%         | 9%         | 10%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 10%         | 2%         | <b>9%</b>  | 9%         | 6%         | 14%        |
| <b>Total dissatisfied</b>          | <b>2005</b> | <b>19%</b>  | <b>21%</b> | <b>20%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>24%</b> | <b>21%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>21%</b>  | <b>18%</b> | <b>21%</b> | <b>20%</b> | <b>23%</b> | <b>21%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>23%</b>  | <b>21%</b> | <b>23%</b> | <b>24%</b> | <b>18%</b> | <b>21%</b> |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 2005        | 8%          | 1%         | <b>6%</b>  | 7%         | 1%         | 4%         |
|                                    | 2004        | 6%          | 4%         | <b>6%</b>  | 7%         | 4%         | 3%         |
|                                    | 2003        | 8%          | 2%         | <b>7%</b>  | 6%         | 7%         | 0%         |
| Satisfied                          | 2005        | 38%         | 47%        | <b>41%</b> | 41%        | 42%        | 54%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 38%         | 42%        | <b>38%</b> | 39%        | 36%        | 42%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 40%         | 41%        | <b>40%</b> | 41%        | 39%        | 31%        |
| Very satisfied                     | 2005        | 35%         | 32%        | <b>34%</b> | 34%        | 32%        | 22%        |
|                                    | 2004        | 33%         | 35%        | <b>33%</b> | 33%        | 35%        | 30%        |
|                                    | 2003        | 28%         | 37%        | <b>30%</b> | 29%        | 34%        | 48%        |
| <b>Total satisfied</b>             | <b>2005</b> | <b>73%</b>  | <b>79%</b> | <b>75%</b> | <b>75%</b> | <b>75%</b> | <b>76%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2004</b> | <b>71%</b>  | <b>77%</b> | <b>72%</b> | <b>72%</b> | <b>71%</b> | <b>71%</b> |
|                                    | <b>2003</b> | <b>69%</b>  | <b>77%</b> | <b>71%</b> | <b>70%</b> | <b>74%</b> | <b>79%</b> |

---

## APPENDIX 1: Precision and presentation of results

### Stratified sampling and weighting

Stratified sampling is a standard sampling technique where some sub-populations are over-represented in the sample set leading to more robust survey results. In the faults and connections survey modules the rural and remote sub-populations (and some states/territories) were over-sampled so that the results would have greater accuracy and statistical reliability.

A purely random national sample would not provide sufficient numbers in the rural and remote geographic strata to permit separate reporting on each of them. Therefore, a deliberate over-sampling of rural and remote customers was undertaken to ensure that a minimum of 800 urban, 300 rural and 100 remote customers were included in each survey module.

Random sampling of individual states and territories was generally used, although the smaller states and territories were slightly over-sampled to make sure that they were adequately represented.

Where stratified sampling is used it is necessary to apply population weights to derive overall population statistics. Weighting was applied to the faults and connections survey module results for the geographic strata and the state/territory sub-populations.

This is a simple example of how the process of weighting works. Suppose that a sampling population is made up of 90 per cent urban dwellers and 10 per cent rural dwellers. Suppose that there will be 400 respondents in the sample and 40 respondents is considered too small a population of rural dwellers to determine statistically useful results. To address this problem over-sampling of rural dwellers could be utilised—for example—selecting a sample of 200 people each from the urban and rural categories.

Supposing that in answering a question 60 (30 per cent) of the urban respondents answer 'yes' and 140 (70 per cent) of the rural respondents answer 'yes'. The question then arises as to the correct estimate for 'yes' for the total survey population.

Given the unweighted survey results show 200 respondents answering 'yes', one conclusion could be that the proportion is 50 per cent. However, given that 90 per cent of the population are urban dwellers and 10 per cent rural dwellers, the results must be weighted to determine the best estimate for the population as a whole. The correct answer is:  $30\% \times 0.9 + 70\% \times 0.1 = 34\%$  per cent.

The use of stratified sampling and weighting are standard techniques, used to derive the best possible estimates of important population parameters whilst keeping sampling costs to a minimum.



## Interpretation of results

### Sampling error

All parameter estimations using sample survey results are subject to sampling error. Table A1 gives confidence intervals for a range of parameter values and sample sizes. The confidence interval is a range of values around a sample estimate, and it is presumed with a 95 per cent degree of confidence that the true parameter value lies within the specified range. It is evident from Table A1 that the confidence intervals are very wide for low sample sizes, and that for fixed sample sizes the confidence intervals are widest for parameter values closest to 50 per cent.

Suppose that the reported percentage is 71 for a group which includes 800 respondents. The confidence interval in the cell in the 'Sample size – 800' row and the 'Estimate – 70%' column of the table is between 66.6 per cent and 73.2 per cent. This means that there is a 95 per cent chance that the 'true' result (the average of many repeated samplings) would fall within a similar range, or within + or – 3.2 per cent to 3.4 per cent of 71 per cent.

**Table A1: Confidence intervals for a range of sample sizes and parameter values**

| SAMPLE SIZE | ESTIMATE     |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|             | 10%          | 20%           | 30%           | 40%           | 50%           | 60%           | 70%           | 80%           | 90%           |
| 30          | 3.3% – 26.4% | 9.2% – 38.1%  | 16.2% – 48.6% | 24.1% – 58.4% | 32.5% – 67.5% | 41.6% – 75.9% | 51.4% – 83.8% | 61.9% – 90.8% | 73.6% – 96.7% |
| 50          | 4.2% – 22.0% | 11.0% – 33.6% | 18.7% – 44.3% | 27.2% – 54.4% | 36.1% – 63.9% | 45.6% – 72.8% | 55.7% – 81.3% | 66.4% – 89.0% | 78.0% – 95.8% |
| 100         | 5.4% – 17.8% | 13.1% – 29.3% | 21.6% – 40.0% | 30.6% – 50.2% | 40.0% – 60.0% | 49.8% – 69.4% | 60.0% – 78.4% | 70.7% – 86.9% | 82.2% – 94.6% |
| 200         | 6.5% – 15.2% | 14.9% – 26.4% | 23.8% – 37.0% | 33.2% – 47.2% | 42.9% – 57.1% | 52.8% – 66.8% | 63.0% – 76.2% | 73.6% – 85.1% | 84.8% – 93.5% |
| 400         | 7.3% – 13.5% | 16.2% – 24.4% | 25.5% – 34.9% | 35.1% – 45.1% | 44.9% – 55.1% | 54.9% – 64.9% | 65.1% – 74.5% | 75.6% – 83.8% | 86.5% – 92.7% |
| 600         | 7.8% – 12.8% | 16.9% – 23.5% | 26.3% – 33.9% | 36.0% – 44.1% | 45.8% – 54.2% | 55.9% – 64.0% | 66.1% – 73.7% | 76.5% – 83.1% | 87.2% – 92.2% |
| 800         | 8.0% – 12.4% | 17.3% – 23.0% | 26.8% – 33.4% | 36.5% – 43.6% | 46.4% – 53.6% | 56.4% – 63.5% | 66.6% – 73.2% | 77.0% – 82.7% | 87.6% – 92.0% |
| 1,000       | 8.2% – 12.1% | 17.5% – 22.7% | 27.1% – 33.0% | 36.9% – 43.2% | 46.8% – 53.2% | 56.8% – 63.1% | 67.0% – 72.9% | 77.3% – 82.5% | 87.9% – 91.8% |
| 1,200       | 8.4% – 11.9% | 17.7% – 22.5% | 27.4% – 32.8% | 37.2% – 42.9% | 47.1% – 52.9% | 57.1% – 62.8% | 67.2% – 72.6% | 77.5% – 82.3% | 88.1% – 91.6% |

### 1.1.1 Comparing survey results

Tables A2 and A3 show how much allowance should be made when comparing survey results in two non-overlapping sub-samples, for example residents of different states or respondents to different waves of the survey. For percentages near 20 or 80, use Table A2, and for percentages near 50 use Table A3.

For percentages in between, the variation to be allowed for is between those shown in the two tables. For example, 50 per cent of male and 57 per cent of female respondents give a particular answer to a question; a difference of 7 percentage points. The number of men in the sample is around 1000, while the number of women is around 800. As the

percentages are close to 50, Table A3 should be consulted. The cell where sample sizes of 800 and 1000 converge contains the value of 5 percentage points. This means that if the difference is 5 percentage points or more, there is a 95 per cent confidence level that the difference between men's and women's responses is real. As the difference observed is 7 per cent, there is a 95 per cent confidence level that there is a genuine difference between men and women in this case.

**Table A2: Recommended allowances for sampling variation of a difference between two independent estimates for percentages near 20 and 80 (at 95 per cent confidence level)**

| Size of second sample | Size of first sample |      |       |       |       |       |       |         |         |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
|                       | 30 %                 | 50 % | 100 % | 200 % | 400 % | 600 % | 800 % | 1,000 % | 1,200 % |
| 30                    | 20                   | 18   | 16    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15      | 15      |
| 50                    | 18                   | 16   | 14    | 13    | 12    | 12    | 11    | 11      | 11      |
| 100                   | 16                   | 14   | 11    | 10    | 9     | 9     | 8     | 8       | 8       |
| 200                   | 15                   | 13   | 10    | 8     | 7     | 7     | 7     | 6       | 6       |
| 400                   | 15                   | 12   | 9     | 7     | 6     | 6     | 5     | 5       | 5       |
| 600                   | 15                   | 12   | 9     | 7     | 6     | 5     | 5     | 4       | 4       |
| 800                   | 15                   | 11   | 8     | 7     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 4       | 4       |
| 1,000                 | 15                   | 11   | 8     | 6     | 5     | 4     | 4     | 4       | 3       |
| 1,200                 | 15                   | 11   | 8     | 6     | 5     | 4     | 4     | 3       | 3       |

---

## Appendix 2: Main questions

Note: In questions QB8 and QB9 below, in both the faults and connections surveys, the two alternative presentations of the satisfaction scales were used equally to avoid the possibility of bias in the sample results. For example:

- Were you very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied? or
- Were you very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

### Fault restoration survey

Section A: Introductory section to find the appropriate person in the household/business to interview.

Section B: The substantive questions of the survey.

QB7 Asked to all respondents:

Did you or anyone else in this household/business make an appointment with a technician or other representative of a phone company to visit your household/business in order to fix the fault?

QB8 Asked to those respondents who answered 'yes' to QB7:

How satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with the extent to which the person from the phone company arrived on time for the appointment? Were you: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?

QB9 Asked to all respondents:

Thinking about all aspects of the fault repair, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall? Were you: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?

QB10 Asked to those respondents who answered QB9 that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied:

Please describe why you were dissatisfied with the fault repair?

Which other reason?

Any others?

QB11 Asked to those respondents who answered QB9 that they were satisfied or very satisfied:

Please describe why you were satisfied with the fault repair?

---

Which other reason?

Any others?

Section C: Concluding section with some demographic questions.

## **Connection of service survey**

Section A: Introductory section to find the appropriate person in the household/business to interview.

Section B: The substantive questions of the survey.

QB7 Asked to all respondents:

Did you or anyone else in this household/business make an appointment with a technician or other representative of a phone company to visit your household/business in order to enable the 'telephone transfer'/'new connection'?

QB8 Asked to those respondents who answered 'yes' to QB7:

How satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with the extent to which the person from the phone company arrived on time for the appointment? Were you: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?

QB9 Asked to all respondents:

Apart from the costs involved, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you overall with the 'telephone transfer'/'new connection'? Were you: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied?

QB10 Asked to those respondents who answered QB9 that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied:

Please describe why you were dissatisfied with the 'telephone transfer'/'new connection'?

Which other reason?

Any others?

QB11 Asked to those respondents who answered QB9 that they were satisfied or very satisfied:

Please describe why you were satisfied with the 'telephone transfer'/'new connection'?

Which other reason?

Any others?

Section C: Concluding section with some demographic questions.