

Patient Satisfaction At Dhiraj Hospital Outpatient Department (Opd): A Cross-Sectional Study



Management

KEYWORDS : OPD, patient satisfaction, Hospital

Dr. Wadhwa M

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Healthcare Management, Department of Management, Sumandeep Vidyapeeth Vadodara

Saiyed S

PG Student, Dept. of Healthcare Management, Department of Management, Sumandeep Vidyapeeth Vadodara

ABSTRACT

Problem/Purpose: The objective of the research study is determining satisfaction level of OPD at Dhiraj Hospital because satisfaction leads to revisit and reference to friends and relatives.

Methodology: This is questionnaire based cross-sectional study. The study is carried out on a sample of 133 patients among those visiting OPD at Dhiraj Hospital.

Findings: The findings suggest that minimum satisfaction score was 25 while the maximum was 48. The rate of satisfaction of the patients at the outdoor patient department is higher than the respondents who were dissatisfied.

Conclusion: Patients receiving each hospital service are responsible for conveying good image of the hospital; therefore, securing high satisfaction of patients attending the hospital is equally important for a hospital.

INTRODUCTION

Patient satisfaction is a highly desirable outcome of clinical care in the hospital. A patient's expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is a judgment on the quality of hospital care. Patient satisfaction is an indicator that should be indispensable to the assessment of the quality of care in hospitals. The truth about patient satisfaction surveys is that they can help you identify ways of improving your practice. "Unless a physician is not interested at all in information, a patient satisfaction survey can be useful," says John Rollet, MD, a family physician in Chatham, Ill., whose group practice recently conducted its first survey. What's more, he says, "it shows your staff and the community that you're interested in quality. It demonstrates that you are looking for ways to improve."

Dhiraj Hospital at a Glance: It was established in the year 2008 with the motto Excellency in service education and research. It has emerged as one of the largest Trust Hospital in Gujarat in terms of occupancy. It is 1275 bedded hospital which offers General ward, Specialty and super specialty services along with State of art Retina and Matsama Heart Center'.

Outpatient is patients who are not hospitalized for 24 hours or more but who visits hospital or associated facility for diagnosis or treatment. OPD services are important in the hospital as it helps both patient and hospital.

Objectives of the Study:

The objective of the research study is determining satisfaction level of the OPD at Dhiraj Hospital because satisfaction leads to revisit and reference to friends and relatives.

To identify the most and least satisfied area for further necessary improvements at Dhiraj Hospital OPD.

METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study is cross-sectional and questionnaire based study. Section 1 of questionnaire includes demographic data; Section 2 focuses on factors related to satisfaction with various services at the facility on a 5 point likert scale.

Target Population

OPD patients were included in the study in order to minimize the chances of recall bias, which might affect their rating of satisfaction.

Sample Size

Sample size taken was 133.

e- Chance of error, 5% at 95% confidence Interval

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

n: sample size.

N: population

Sampling Techniques

Convenience sampling technique.

Statistical Tools

The data obtained was analyzed with SPSS 20.0 using descriptive statistics.

RESULTS

The results show satisfaction level of patients towards various parameters involved in the hospital.

It can be seen from **table 1** that out of 133 patients 64 is satisfied with the hospital infrastructure. Percentage of patients highly satisfied is 34.5%.

Table .1 Showing satisfaction level of patients towards the hospital infrastructure.

Age Groups	HOSPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE				Total
	Highly Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	1	9	22	17	49
30-40	0	3	13	11	27
40-50	0	8	18	9	35
50-above	0	2	11	9	22
	1	22	64	46	133

It can be seen from **table 2** that out of 133 patients 42 are satisfied with the hospital infrastructure. Percentage of patients highly satisfied is 27 %.

Table 2. Showing satisfaction level of patients in the hospital Public utilities

Age groups	PUBLIC UTILITIES					Total
	Highly Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	0	4	18	11	16	49
30-40	1	4	10	9	3	27
40-50	0	3	11	9	12	29
50-above	0	8	3	6	5	22
	1	19	42	35	36	133

It can be seen from **table 3** that out of 133 patients 52 are satisfied with the admission counter. Percentage of patients averagely satisfied is 30 % while patient who were dissatisfied with public utilities of the hospital are 7.5%.

Table 3 Showing satisfaction level of patients at the admission counter

Age groups	ADMISSION COUNTER				Total
	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	2	10	29	8	49
30-40	3	8	7	9	27
40-50	3	15	8	9	34
50-above	2	7	8	5	22
	10	40	52	31	133

It can be seen from **table 4** that out of 133 patients 61 are satisfied with service provided at the hospital. Percentage of patients who were dissatisfied is hardly 2.2%.

Table 4 Showing satisfaction level of services provided at the hospital received by the patients.

Age groups	SERVICE PROVIDER				Total
	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	0	5	28	16	49
30-40	2	1	9	15	27
40-50	0	6	14	15	35
50-above	1	2	10	9	22
	3	14	61	55	133

It can be seen from **table 5** that out of 133 patients 83 are highly satisfied which accounts to 61 % with seating arrangement of the hospital.

Table 5 Showing satisfaction level of patients at the hospital regarding seating arrangement.

Age group	SEATING ARRANGEMENT				Total
	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	1	4	13	31	49
30-40	0	2	7	18	27
40-50	1	3	11	20	35
50-above	1	1	6	14	22
	3	10	37	83	133

It can be seen from **table 6** that out of 133 patients 53 are satisfied with waiting time of the doctor. Patient who was highly dissatisfied with time of waiting of the doctors of hospital are 6.7%.

Table 6 Showing satisfaction levels of patients at the hospital regarding waiting time see the doctor.

Age group	WAITING TIME DOCTOR				Total
	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	1	11	19	16	41
30-40	1	8	15	3	21
40-50	4	9	12	10	35
50-above	3	5	7	7	22
	9	33	53	37	133

It can be seen from **table 7** that out of 133 patients 60 are highly satisfied with seeing different doctors. Percentage of patients who are average satisfied is 14.2 %.

Table 7 Showing satisfaction level of patients at the hospital seeing different doctors.

Age group	SEEINGDIFFERENT DOCTORS				Total
	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	1	6	25	18	50
30-40	1	4	7	15	27
40-50	1	6	12	18	37
50-above	0	3	10	9	23
	3	19	54	60	133

It can be seen from **table 8** that out of 133 patients 72 are highly satisfied with service regarding the physician. Percentage of patients satisfied is 30%.

Table 8 Showing satisfaction level of patients at the hospital regarding physician's service.

Age group	PHYSICIAN SERVICE				Total
	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	0	9	16	24	49
30-40	1	1	9	16	27
40-50	1	6	10	18	35
50-above	0	2	6	14	22
	2	9	41	72	133

It can be seen from **table 9** that out of 133 patients 73 are highly satisfied which accounts to 54.8% with the service of staff provided at the hospital.

Table 9 Showing satisfaction level of the patients at hospital regarding service of the staff.

Age group	SERVICE OF STAFF					Total
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
18-30	1	2	7	14	25	49
30-40	0	2	5	13	16	36
40-50	0	5	2	10	18	36
50-above	1	2	3	2	14	22
	2	11	12	39	73	133

The mean score of the satisfaction was 41.3083. Minimum satisfaction score was 25 while the maximum was 48.

Table 10 showing overall satisfaction score of patients towards Out door patient department at Dhiraj General Hospital

Age group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
-----------	---	---------	---------	------	----------------

	133	25.00	48.00	41.3083	3.84979
--	-----	-------	-------	---------	---------

Discussion

Overall respondents in hospital based study perceived quality of care at the hospital OPD with mean score of 41.30 out of 50 falling under the category of highly satisfaction. This concurs with other studies done in Tanzania (Urassa et al., 2002);³ and elsewhere (Haddad et al., 1998a4; Schneider & Palmer, 20025; Baltussen & Ye, 20056).

It was observed that 45% patients are highly satisfied with seeing different doctors at OPD. The study revealed that minimum number of patients is satisfied with long waiting time at the OPD. This was also similar to findings of the study by Muhondwa EPY et al that also found that most patients had to wait up to one hour to be called into consultation room in Tanzania.⁷

The concern about relationship between age groups and level of satisfaction has also been studied. Some previous researchers have suggested that the older respondents seem to give more scores to service providers since they have been going through the social services all their lives. (Doborah L, 1997)⁸

Wiadnyana, IGP. et.al, 1995 concluded that more and more enthusiastic belief that age groups are significant elements to predict a high level of satisfaction has been repeated over the times. The elderly tends to be more satisfied than youngsters when received the same services.⁹

Limitations of the Study: Convenience sampling technique adopted for study restricts representation of all patients of the University Hospital, and may affect the generalization of the study findings.

Recommendations:

1. Community participation activities of clinical staffs should be increasingly implemented to get to know more and more patients' expectation and opinions about the hospital services
2. Getting daily feedback from patients such as creating feedback box, patient information center, and hospital official website should be enhanced.
3. Periodical study focusing on patients' satisfaction in the hospital should be implemented to keep up with change of the phenomena.

CONCLUSION

Hospital is recognized as a social institute and patient is the only reason for its existence, the hospital must strive for patient oriented services. Although only a small proportion of

patients expressed dissatisfaction with these aspects of the services provided, they are significant in that they constitute a call for action by the Dhiraj Hospital management to encourage the health personnel to embrace a new staff patient relationship ethos, in which patient is viewed as a customer. Patients receiving hospital service are responsible for conveying good image of the hospital; therefore, securing high satisfaction of patients attending the hospital is equally important for a hospital management team.

REFERENCE

1. White B. (1999) Measuring Patient Satisfaction: How to Do It and Why to Bother. *FamPractManag.* 6(1):40-44. | 2. Gadallah M et al (2003) Patient satisfaction with primary health care services in two districts in Lower and Upper Egypt. *Comparative Study. East Mediterr Health J.* 9:422-30. | 3. Urassa, D et al (2002) Quality assessment of the antenatal program for anaemia in rural Tanzania. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care.* 14: 441- 448. | 4. Haddad et al (1998) what does quality mean? Community perception of primary health care services in Guinea. *SocialScience & Medicine.* 47, 381-394 | 5. Schneider et al (2002) Getting to the truth? Researching user views of primary health care. *Health Policy and Planning.* 17: 32-41. | 6. Baltussen et al (2006) Quality of care of modern health services as perceived by users and non-users in Burkina Faso. *International Journal for Quality in HealthCare* 18: 30-34. | 7. Muhondwa EPY et al (2008) Patient Satisfaction At The Muhimbili National Hospital In Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. *East African Journal of Public Health.* 5(2):67-74 | 8. Doborah L. (1997) Consumerism reflexivity and the medical encounter. *SocSciMed.* 45(3): 373-81. | 9. Wiadnyana, IGP et al. (1995) Total quality Management experience at primary health care level, paper at Asean workshop seminar in Indonesia. |