



Patient Satisfaction: A study in General and Private Wards of a Multispecialty Hospital

Authors

Sucharitha Suresh¹, Sweeta D' Cunha², Dr. Rashmi Kodikal³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Hospital Administration, Father Muller Medical College, Mangalore, Karnataka, India

& Research Scholar: REVA University, Bangalore Ph: 9449991150

Email: sureshsuchal@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, Department of Hospital Administration, Father Muller Medical College, Mangalore & Research Scholar: REVA University, Bangalore

³Professor, Centre for Management Studies and Research, P.A. College of Engineering, Mangalore, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Patient satisfaction is an important measure of the quality of care provided by health care organisations. It is not only important for gaining insights into the perception of the patient's on the delivery of the health care service, but also a key outcome of care. The present study was undertaken to identify the factors in which the patients are satisfied in the present healthcare delivery at private and general wards and compare the same. The present study was a cross sectional study, data was collected from 100 patients each from general ward & private wards. Result showed that Patients' were satisfied and willing to recommend this Hospital to others because of the quality of service shown by the Hospital.

In particular, Patients of private ward were more satisfied than general wards regarding Timeliness of the treatment, regular evaluation by doctor, availability of doctor in case of emergencies, explanation given by doctor regarding tests, health advice given by doctor, behavior of the nurses, facilities in the rooms ($p < 0.05$). There is no significant difference in the satisfaction level of private & general ward patients regarding discussing ailment with doctor, listening ability of doctor, sympathy & attentiveness of nurses, getting medicines on time, availability of nurses ($p > 0.05$). Regarding other facilities, patients of private ward were more satisfied than general wards in the area of registration, food services, visiting hours, security services, facilities to attendants ($p < 0.05$). There is no significant difference in the satisfaction level of private & general ward patients regarding bed & surroundings in the room, helpful housekeeping staff, changing bed linen, cleanliness of the room, diagnostic services ($p > 0.05$).

Key words: Patients, Satisfaction, Patient care.

Introduction

Patients, the only reason for a hospital's existence, need services, which are reasonably accessible and readily available at all times. It is the

responsibility of the hospital administrators to keep the patient and his attendants in satisfied state. Patient satisfaction is the real testimony to the efficiency and effectiveness of hospital's

administration. Though the patient's are not technically qualified to measure the services of the hospital, they can express the satisfaction on the basis of service they received and the way they were treated and cared for, by the hospital staff.

Health care scenario is fast changing all over the world. Economic, political, social, environmental, and cultural factors influence the peoples need for health care and the delivery of health service. Emphasis is placed on providing quality services at the lowest possible cost, leading to a variety of alternatives to hospital care. This change in health care scene presents both opportunity and challenge for the health care professionals and the administrators. Consumerism is also affecting the health care sector. It can help authorities to advance from considering individual members of their public (patients) as passive clients or recipients of service, who get what they are given for which they must be thankful-to thinking of them as customers with legitimate rights and preference as well as responsibilities.(August)1

Patients, as noted by Tomes 2, are passive receivers of treatment determined by professionals and, therefore, are not in a position to understand the technical and medical aspects of care. Thus, the inability of patients to make judgments on the technical competency of the hospital and its staff have limited most patient satisfaction research to the functional quality of care, that is, the manner in which medical care is delivered to them.

Satisfaction with care has already been established as an important influence determining whether a person seeks medical advice, complies with treatment and maintains a continuing relationship with a practitioner. It has been seen that even when patients report high levels of satisfaction, studies have shown how the volume of comment was a more sensitive indicator. Human satisfaction is a complex concept that is related to a number of factors including life style, past experiences, future expectations and the value of both individual and society. Because satisfaction is a derived concept, it is important to find out the sources of dissatisfaction. In addition to different preferences about the hospital aspects of care,

technical expertise of doctors, communication of information and mutual trust and barriers of communication between doctors and patients need to be studied (Verma and Sarma)³

Thus, in the present day context, evaluation of hospital services from patient's point of view is becoming increasingly important component of health care delivery. A public sector tertiary care hospital in Delhi metropolis has an ongoing system of eliciting patient's opinions on hospital service in special wards with the help of exit proformas which were designed and implemented 20 years back. Information generated from these proformas is sent to middle and senior level management, but is used or analysed only when there are complaints or deviations from normal working. It has become more or less a ritual instead of being a tool for improving operational efficiency.

According to Sun⁴Patient satisfaction — the subjective experiences of patients using the healthcare system — correlates with improved medical compliance, decreased utilization of medical services, less malpractice litigation, and greater willingness to return to the healthcare provider. Accordingly, quantitative measurement of patient complaints is a comparative measure of service quality, and several authorities believe that quality-assurance measures should include patient satisfaction and an analysis of patient complaints. Complaints may arise from poor quality of service or unmet patient expectations. Some complaints appear minor, but many relate to more serious events and lead to remedial action or compensation. Analysis of the nature of complaints is important to identify problems and assist in their elimination. For quality-assurance purposes, individual hospitals may analyse and act on the complaints they receive.

According to Olusina⁵, patient satisfaction has been proposed as a simple measure of the quality of care. The study aimed to assess how satisfied the patients and staff in an acute admission psychiatric unit were with experiences in the ward, including the physical environment, freedom, comfort, attitudes of staff towards

patients, access to staff, and duration of hospitalization. Highest satisfaction for patients and staff were for items on staff-patient relationship. Barely satisfactory items for patients included the time spent with doctors. Patients had a higher positive appraisal of the adequacy of physical facilities than staff, while staff had a more positive appraisal of their relationship with patients. There were no significant differences in satisfaction among diagnostic groups. The logical and discriminating manner in which patients assessed satisfaction supports the impression that they can be relied upon to make objective appraisal of the process of care, and that patient satisfaction is a valid index of the quality of care.

The patient satisfaction depends on three elemental issues of health care system. These are: perception of patients regarding quality health care service, good health care providers and good health care organization. A study conducted has revealed that satisfaction with hospital experience was driven by dignity and respect, speed and efficiency, comfort, information and communication and emotional support. During 2004 and 2005, a focus group interview was conducted to find out how patients perceive the quality of health care and it was observed that patients, usually, preferred four qualities of health care services viz. doctor communication skill, responsiveness of hospital staff, comfort and cleanliness of the hospital environment and communication of nursing staff. (Safavi) 6.

Binsalih et.al⁷, conducted a study to assess satisfaction among inpatients and the impact of demographics on satisfaction levels. The tool included questions on demographics, communication skills, hospital environment, and the patients' overall evaluation of the hospital. Inpatients from acute wards of five different specialties who stayed for at least 2 days were enrolled. There were 988 respondents with a mean age of 39.1 years (25.9%) and the mean length of stay (LOS) of 10.0 days (24.1%). Illiteracy rate was 42.4%, and 43.1% were male. The overall satisfaction scores-out of five-were 4.3 (0.6%) for communication with nurses, 4.4 (0.4%) for

communication with doctors, and 4.1 (0.3%) for hospital environment. 98.9% of the patients would recommend the hospital to their family and friends. The lowest score was for the "room environment" (3.99, 0.8%) and the highest for overall services of the hospital (4.7, 0.5%).

A Comparative study conducted by Chaudhury, Mahmood and Valente⁸ pointed out that, In comparing single- versus double-occupancy rooms, it is evident that nurses clearly favour single- occupancy rooms. For instance, 84 percent of the respondents rated room flexibility as high or very high in single- occupancy rooms, whereas only 40 percent of nurses felt double-occupancy rooms are moderately flexible. In terms of flexibility in private rooms, one respondent stated that, "lots of room, private conversations in person and on phone, stays in room." Interaction with family members and flexibility for accommodating family members both got high scores (high or very high) in private rooms, whereas in double-occupancy rooms, interaction with family members was considered low (33 percent) or moderate (47 percent) and flexibility for accommodating family members was considered low (48 percent). Although interaction with family members is greater in single-occupancy rooms, interaction with other patients is greater in double-occupancy rooms. According to one respondent, single rooms are more helpful as there is "more privacy, room for ambulation within room." Other factors such as the quality of patient monitoring, patient's comfort level, patient's recovery rate, and scope for patient surveillance were all rated higher in private rooms compared to double occupancy rooms.

Mpinga & Chastonay⁹ mention that measuring patient satisfaction is not an easy task. It requires a) a clear definition of the objectives; b) the identification of the target populations; c) well defined tools and ways to collect the data; d) a strategy for analyzing the data and its utilization. It can focus on the process and/or the results of care. It also allows patients to evaluate received services and treatments. Finally measuring patient satisfaction allows the identification of possible

problems and suggests ways of improving the quality of care or public health interventions.

The present study is taken up to focus on the factors that determine the satisfaction of patients in general ward & private ward of a multi specialty hospital. The following objectives have been considered.

1. To assess the level of patients' satisfaction admitted in the private wards and the general wards.
2. To compare the same between patients admitted in the private and general wards

Research Methodology

The research approach adopted in the study was a descriptive cross sectional one. The study was conducted in a tertiary care, multi specialty teaching hospital. Sample consisted of 100 patients from general wards and 100 patients from private wards during the data collection period. The sample was selected adopting a purposive sampling technique based on the availability of patients and included those patients who have availed the services of the Hospital for more than 4 days and who are willing to participate.

Data was collected using a structured questionnaire. The 1st part of the questionnaire

consisted of demographic information of the respondents and 2nd part consisted of items to measure satisfaction of the respondents on various factors. Level of satisfaction was measured on 3 point rating scale. Overall satisfaction was derived by averaging responses of all the items. Mean, standard deviation & mean (%) was calculated. Mean (%) was used to assess the level of satisfaction and was done on basis of classification as follows

Above 90% - Fully satisfied(FS)

60% -89% - Satisfied(S)

40% -59% - Moderately Satisfied(MS)

Below 40% - Not Satisfied(NS)

Mannwhitney test was used to compare the level of satisfaction between private & general ward patients. Pilot study was conducted to test the reliability of the tool. It observed that Cronbach alpha was 0.813, tool was reliable.

Results

The results of the study include the findings of a survey to assess the level of satisfaction of patients admitted in the General wards & Private wards of a selected ward and their demographic details.

1. Demographic details

Table no. 1: Distribution of patients according to demographic variables

Demographic variables		Ward		Total (n=200)
		Private ward(n=100)	General ward (n=100)	
Gender	Male	58	46	104(52%)
	Female	42	54	96(48%)
Age	20-30	16	24	40(20%)
	30-40	18	16	34(17%)
	40-50	18	20	38(19%)
	50-60	24	20	44(22%)
	60-70	24	20	44(22%)
Marital Status	Single	16	22	38(19%)
	Married	70	66	136(68%)

	Widow	14	12	26(13%)
Occupation	Business	12	6	18(9%)
	House wife	20	26	46(23%)
	Geriatrics	18	18	36(18%)
	Studying	10	12	22(11%)
	Employed	40	38	78(39%)

From the table no 1, it is seen that 58% of patients were male & remaining (42%) were female. 68% were married. Age wise, there was almost equal distribution in various age groups. 39% were employed, 23% were housewives, 9% were in business & rest of them were geriatric & student group.

2. Assessment of patient satisfaction in the Private Wards

This section deals with the satisfaction of patients in 2 areas

- Patient care and
- Other facilities

Table2: Item wise assessment of satisfaction in the area of Patient Care in the private ward

Items	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Remark
Timeliness of the treatment	2.96 \pm 0.19	98.6	FS
Regularevaluation by the doctor	2.62 \pm 0.56	87.3	S
Discussion of the ailment with the doctor	2.24 \pm 0.71	74.6	S
The listeningability of the doctor	2.62 \pm 0.60	87.3	S
Availability of the doctor in case of emergency	2.88 \pm 0.43	96.0	FS
The explanation of the doctor about tests	2.50 \pm 0.70	83.3	S
The advice given by the doctor about staying healthy	2.08 \pm 0.80	69.3	S
The sympathy and attentiveness of nurses	2.84 \pm 0.37	94.6	FS
Getting medicines timely	2.88 \pm 0.32	96.0	FS
The behaviour of the nurses	2.64 \pm 0.48	88.0	S
The availability of nurses	2.88 \pm 0.32	96.0	FS
The facilities in the rooms	2.80 \pm 0.40	93.3	FS
Concessions recieved during treatment	NA		
Any extra expenses incurred for a single room.	2.72 \pm 0.60	90.6	FS

*FS= Fully Satisfied; *S= Satisfied; *NA=Not Applicable

Table- 2 shows that private ward patients were fully satisfied with the time of starting the treatment (mean %:98.6), the availability of the doctor in case of emergency (mean % 96), the sympathy and attentiveness of nurses (mean %: 94.6), getting medicines timely (mean %: 96), the availability of the nurses(mean %: 96), the facilities in the rooms(mean %: 93.3), the expenses incurred for a single room(mean %: 90.6).

Patients were satisfied with the regular evaluation by the doctors (mean %: 87.3), sharing the ailment to the doctor (mean %: 74.6), the listening mentality of the doctor (mean %: 87.3), the explanation of the doctor about the texts (mean %: 83.3), the advice given by the doctor about staying healthy (mean % 69.3), the behavior of the nurses (mean %: 88).

Table 3: Item wise assessment of satisfaction in the area of Other Facilities of private ward

Items	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Remark
Registration	2.68 \pm 0.58	89	S
Bed and facilities in the room	2.68 \pm 0.71	89	S
Housekeeping staff were helpful	2.48 \pm 0.76	82	S
Services of changing bed linen, cleaning the room etc	2.68 \pm 0.55	89	S
Cleanliness of the room and surroundings	2.38 \pm 0.72	79	S
Food services	2.50 \pm 0.70	83	S
Visiting hours for relatives	NA		
Security services	2.90 \pm 0.36	96	FS
Diagnostic services	2.66 \pm 0.47	88	S
Facilities to the attendants	2.96 \pm 0.19	98	FS

*FS= Fully Satisfied; *S= Satisfied; *NA=Not Applicable

The patients were fully satisfied with only the security services (mean %: 96) & facilities provided to the attendants (mean %: 98). They were satisfied with registration, facilities in the room, housekeeping, service of changing bed linen, cleanliness, food service & diagnostic services.

3. Assessment of patient satisfaction in the General Wards

This section deals with the satisfaction of patients in 2 areas

- Patient care and
- Other facilities

Table 4: Item wise assessment of satisfaction in the area of Patient Care in the general ward

Items	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Remark
Timeliness of the treatment	2.78 \pm 0.58	92.6	FS
Regular evaluation by the doctor	2.46 \pm 0.67	82.0	S
Discussing the ailment with the doctor	2.20 \pm 0.78	73.3	S
Listening ability of the doctor	2.60 \pm 0.57	86.6	S
Availability of the doctor in case of emergency	2.76 \pm 0.47	92.0	FS
Explanation of the doctor about tests	2.30 \pm 0.78	76.6	S
Advice given by the doctor about staying healthy	1.66 \pm 0.79	53.3	MS
Sympathy and attentiveness of nurses	2.88 \pm 0.38	96.0	FS
Getting medicines timely	2.82 \pm 0.43	94.0	FS
Behavior of the nurses	2.36 \pm 0.52	78.6	S
Availability of nurses	2.80 \pm 0.45	93.3	FS
Facilities in the rooms	2.48 \pm 0.61	82.6	S
Concessions during treatment	2.46 \pm 0.64	82.0	S
Any extra expenses incurred for a single room.	NA		

*FS= Fully Satisfied; *S= Satisfied; *MS= Moderately Satisfied; *NA= Not Applicable.

Findings of the study (Table 4) shows that general ward patients were fully satisfied with the time of starting the treatment (% mean score 92.6), the availability of the doctor in case of emergency (mean %: 92), the sympathy and attentiveness of nurses mean %: 96), getting medicines timely mean %: 94) and the availability of the nurses mean %: 93.3).

Patients were satisfied with the regular evaluation by the doctor(mean %: 82), sharing the ailment to the doctor mean %: 73.3), the listening mentality of the doctor (mean %: 86.6), the explanation of the doctor about the tests mean %: 76.6), the behavior of the nurses mean %: 78.6), the facilities in the wards mean %: 82.6), the concessions during treatment mean %:

82). But Patients were moderately satisfied by the advice given by the doctor about staying healthy (mean %: 53.3).

Table 5: Item wise assessment of satisfaction in the area of Other Facilities in the general ward

Items	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Remark
Registration	2.46 \pm 0.78	82	S
Satisfied with the bed surroundings in the room	2.66 \pm 0.65	88	S
housekeeping helpful	2.50 \pm 0.64	83	S
Services of changing bed linen cleaning the room etc	2.74 \pm 0.52	91	FS
cleanliness of the room and surroundings	2.28 \pm 0.75	76	S
Food services	2.76 \pm 0.43	92	FS
Visiting hours	2.48 \pm 0.76	82	S
Security services	2.32 \pm 0.84	77	S
Diagnostic services	2.46 \pm 0.64	82	S
Facilities to the attenders	2.48 \pm 0.76	82	S

*FS= Fully Satisfied; *S= Satisfied

Satisfaction regarding other facilities (Table 5) shows that patients in the general wards were fully satisfied with the services of changing the bed linen, cleaning the room (mean%: 91) and food services (mean%: 92).

Patients were satisfied in the area of registration (mean%: 82), the bed and surroundings in the room (mean%: 88), the servants and sweepers (mean%: 83), the cleanliness of the rooms and surroundings (mean%: 76), the visiting hours (mean%: 82), the security services (mean%: 77) the medical services (mean%: 82) and with the facilities given to the attendants (mean%: 82).

4. Comparison of Patient satisfaction

This section deals with comparison of Patient satisfaction in the private wards & general wards in the area of

- Patient care
- Other facilities

Table 6: Comparison of satisfaction level in the area of Patient Care

Items	Private		General		Mannwhitney test Z value	P value
	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)		
Timeliness of the treatment	2.96 \pm 0.19	98.6	2.78 \pm 0.58	92.6	3.021	0.003**
Regular evaluation by the doctor	2.62 \pm 0.56	87.3	2.46 \pm 0.67	82.0	2.055	0.041*
Discussing the ailment with the doctor	2.24 \pm 0.71	74.6	2.2 \pm 0.78	73.3	0.431	0.667
Listening ability of the doctor	2.62 \pm 0.60	87.3	2.6 \pm 0.57	86.6	0.281	0.779
Availability of the doctor in case of emergency	2.88 \pm 0.43	96.0	2.76 \pm 0.47	92.0	2.144	0.033*
Explanation of the doctor about tests	2.50 \pm 0.70	83.3	2.3 \pm 0.78	76.6	2.165	0.031*
Advice given by the doctor about staying healthy	2.08 \pm 0.80	69.3	1.66 \pm 0.79	53.3	4.323	0.000**
Sympathy and attentiveness of nurses	2.84 \pm 0.37	94.6	2.88 \pm 0.38	96.0	0.867	0.387
Getting medicines timely	2.88 \pm 0.32	96.0	2.82 \pm 0.43	94.0	1.234	0.218
Behavior of the nurses	2.64 \pm 0.48	88.0	2.36 \pm 0.52	78.6	4.509	0.000**
Availability of nurses	2.88 \pm 0.32	96.0	2.8 \pm 0.45	93.3	1.588	0.113
Facilities in the rooms	2.80 \pm 0.40	93.3	2.48 \pm 0.61	82.6	4.757	0.000**

**p<0.01, H Significant

*p<0.05, significant

The primary function of a hospital is patient care. It is one of the yardsticks to measure the success of service that it produces. The effectiveness of the hospital relates to provision of good patient care as intended. The patient satisfaction is the real testimony to the efficiency of hospital administration.⁸ it is clear & evident from the table no 4 & 5, that patients were either satisfied or fully satisfied with the various care components & other service facilities. When attempt was made to compare the satisfaction level between the private ward & general ward it is surprising to observe that there are few areas of services where patients of general & private ward were not equally satisfied.

As seen in Table 6, patients of private ward are more satisfied than general wards regarding Timeliness of the treatment, regular evaluation by doctor, availability of doctor in case of emergencies, explanation given by doctor regarding tests, health advice given by doctor, behavior of the nurses, facilities in the rooms (p<0.05). There is no significant difference in the satisfaction level of private & general ward patients regarding discussing ailment with doctor, listening ability of doctor, sympathy & attentiveness of nurses, getting medicines on time, availability of nurses (p>0.05).

There is low score on the factor, advice given by doctor on staying healthy by both private ward

patients (mean % is 69.3) & general ward patients (mean % is 53.3). This is an area which needs to

be considered for improvement by the physicians.

Table 7: Comparison of satisfaction level in the area of other facilities

Other facilities Items	Private		General		Mannwhitney test Z value	
	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Mean \pm S.D	Mean (%)	Z value	p
Difficulty in Registration	2.68 \pm 0.58	89	2.46 \pm 0.78	82	2.496	0.013*
Bed and surroundings in the room	2.68 \pm 0.71	89	2.66 \pm 0.65	88	0.244	0.808
Servants and sweepers were helpful	2.48 \pm 0.76	82	2.5 \pm 0.64	83	0.239	0.811
Services of changing bed linen, cleaning the room etc	2.68 \pm 0.55	89	2.74 \pm 0.52	91	0.924	0.356
Cleanliness of the room and surroundings	2.38 \pm 0.72	79	2.28 \pm 0.75	76	1.103	0.271
Food services	2.50 \pm 0.70	83	2.76 \pm 0.43	92	3.968	0.000**
Visiting hours			2.48 \pm 0.76	82	32.604	0.000**
Security services	2.90 \pm 0.36	96	2.32 \pm 0.84	77	6.604	0.000**
Diagnostic services	2.66 \pm 0.47	88	2.46 \pm 0.64	82	0.031	0.975
Facilities to the attendants	2.96 \pm 0.19	98	2.48 \pm 0.76	82	6.215	0.000**

**p<0.01, H Significant *p<0.05, significant

The efficient care is possible only when facilities are provided in the best way. The physical factors are location, layout, sufficient ventilation, good light, clean environment, seating arrangements, and good enquiry services, parking facilities, adequate toilets, drinking water facilities and sign boards. Supplies and equipments should be always in proper working condition. The physical facilities of the hospital should be such, the patient's and their relatives feel secure and comfortable with in and around the hospital

As seen in Table 7, regarding other facilities, patients of private ward are more satisfied than general wards in the area of registration, food services, visiting hours, security services, facilities to attendants (p<0.05). There is no significant difference in the satisfaction level of private & general ward patients regarding bed &

surroundings in the room, helpful housekeeping staff, changing bed linen, cleanliness of the room, diagnostic services (p>0.05).

In a study of Patient satisfaction with the hospital services conducted at a large teaching hospital in New Delhi, in 1997, ¹⁰ it was observed that cleanliness of toilets was one of five major dissatisfiers among the patients, besides quality of food, explanation of procedure, information about illness and treatment and linen. In another study he stated that costing of housekeeping services at a large teaching hospital in Delhi in 1997, the dissatisfaction with the toilets cleanliness was maximum. Whereas this study reveals that patients are satisfied towards the services like changing the bed linen and sanitation, helpfulness of housekeeping staff, cleanliness of room & surroundings . This

implies that the house keeping department of the hospital is doing fairly good.

Good functioning of the security department will satisfy the patient's and their relatives. Theft control, visitors' control, will help the proper functioning of hospital. It is observed here that the patients were satisfied regarding security services of the hospital. So this study states that the hospital gives priority to the safety of the

patients, attendants and their belongings.

The general ward patients are less satisfied compared to private ward patients regarding the visiting hours of the hospital. As there is no restriction to the private ward patients regarding the visiting to the patients so they are completely satisfied with the same.

5. Assessment & Comparison of overall level of satisfaction among Private ward and General ward patients.

Table 8: Overall Comparative level of satisfaction among Private ward and General ward patients.

		Mean \pm S.D.	Mean (%)	Mann-Whitney Test	p value
Patient care	Private ward	2.37 \pm 0.25	79.2	2.044	0.041*
	General ward	2.26 \pm 0.32	75.3		
Other facilities	Private ward	2.66 \pm 0.30	88.5	1.458	0.145
	General Ward	2.51 \pm 0.38	83.8		
Over all	Private ward	2.48 \pm 0.24	82.7	2.380	0.017*
	General ward	2.36 \pm 0.29	78.7		

**p<0.01, H Significant *p<0.05, significant

There is a significant difference between private ward and general ward patients' satisfaction level in the area of patient care. Private ward patients were more satisfied compared to general ward patients. $p=0.041<0.05$. There is no significant difference between private and general ward patients satisfaction level with respect to other facilities, $p=0.145>0.05$.

Further when the overall satisfaction level (Patient care and other facilities level of satisfaction score together) was compared, it was found that there was a significant difference between the level of satisfaction between the general ward and private ward patients, which implied that the private ward patients were more satisfied than the general ward patients. $p=0.017<0.05$.

6. Opinion of the respondents regarding visiting the hospital & future intentions

Table 9: Opinion of the respondents regarding visiting the hospital & future intentions

		Ward		Total (n=200)
		Private ward(n=100)	General ward (n=100)	
visiting this Hospital	For the first time	24	38	62(31%)
	For some specific illness	26	20	46(23%)
	For all illness	50	42	92(46%)
You come to this Hospital because	Near to the house	34	36	70(35%)
	Prefer a private Hospital	12	8	20(10%)
	Satisfied with care	54	56	110(55%)
Do you prefer this Hospital again if necessary	Yes	94	74	168(84%)
	Sometimes	6	20	26(13%)
	No	0	6	6(3%)
Do you recommend this Hospital to relatives, friends	Yes	82	72	154(77%)
	Sometimes	18	22	40(20%)
	No	0	6	6(3%)

50% of the private ward and 42% of the general ward patients visited this hospital regularly for all the illnesses, and 24% of the private ward and 38% of the general ward patients visited this hospital for the first time.

50% of the private ward patients and 42% of the general ward patients preferred this hospital because they were satisfied with the care, 34% of the private ward patients and 36% of the general ward patients were visiting this hospital because it is near to their house.

94% of the private ward patients and 74% of the general ward patients were willing to visit again if necessary. Paine¹¹ stated that every human being carries a particular set of thoughts, feelings and needs. By getting to know the patients a little more to get their views on the care one ought to come closer to what the patients consider as a good care.

Levin¹² accentuated that the medical team becomes the lifeline of the patient, and as such

need to know exactly what the perceptions of the patients are. Feedback from patients, their families and the medical team initiates changes in clinical practice. When quality service is provided it is experienced that the patient will advise family and friends to use the same facility. Based on this study it is clear that 82% of the private wards patients and 72% of the general wards patients were willing to recommend this hospital to others. Therefore it is certain that they experienced the care and concern more in this hospital.

Conclusion

In this study, an effort has been made to assess the patient satisfaction in the private wards and general wards, so as to improve the performance of the hospital. A brief analysis is made about the factors, which are closely related to the hospital services in order to assess the satisfaction of the patients'. The most important factor is Patient care; it includes the service, behavior of the staff. In absence of adequacy of this factor excellent facilities are not likely to produce the desired results. Patients' feedbacks are essential in order to measure performance and to make healthcare professionals more aware of aspects enhancing users' satisfaction. Mainly, they have to remember that more satisfied patients are more they are likely to respond to treatments and to get better health outcomes. The other facilities of the hospital are also an influencing factor on patient satisfaction. Availability of facilities and proper utilization of hospital resources give satisfaction to the patient.

The present study, patients of general ward & private ward were satisfied with patient care components & other facilities provided in the hospital. In the aspect of physician giving health advice to patients, both the ward patients were less satisfied. Further, private ward patients were more satisfied some of the services. Satisfaction survey is thus one of the prime responsibilities of the hospital to measure the level of satisfaction and try to find out the ways and means for improving satisfaction of their patients.

References

1. August JM. Mapping change in health care: pathways for nursing..Seminars for Nurse Managers 1995, 3(2):67-71
2. Tomes, A.E. Service quality in hospital care: The development of an inpatient questionnaire; International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance. 1995; 8(3): pp. 25-33
3. Verma Aarti, Sarma R.K. Evaluation of the "Exit Proformas" in use at Special Wards of a Public Sector Tertiary Care Hospital; Journal of the Academy of Hospital Administration. 2000; 12(1): pp.1-6.
4. Sun B.C., Adams J., Orav EJ. Determinants of patient satisfaction and willingness to return with emergency care; Ann Emerg Med. 2000; 35: pp. 426-434.
5. Olusina AK, Ohaeri JU, Olatawura MO. Patient and staff satisfaction with the quality of in-patient psychiatric care in a Nigerian general hospital. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2002 Jun;37(6):283-8.
6. Safavi, K. (2006). Patient-centered pay for performance: Are we missing the target? Journal of Healthcare Management. 51(4): 215-218.
7. Binsalih SA, Waness AO, Tamim HM, Harakati MS, Al Sayyari AA. Inpatients' care experience and satisfaction study. J Family Community Med. 2011 Sep;18(3):111-7.
8. Chaudhury Habib, Mahmood Atiya and Valente Maria. Pilot Study on Comparative Assessment of Patient Care Issues in Single and Multiple Occupancy Patient Rooms; Simon Fraser University, Oregon, November 20, 2003; pp.14-15
9. Mpinga Emmanuel Kabengele & Chastonay Philippe Patient Satisfaction Studies and the Monitoring of the Right to Health: Some Thoughts Based on a Review of the Literature Global Journal of Health Science April 2011 Vol. 3, No. 1;

10. Shakti, Gupta K. Cleanliness procedures of medium & small hospitals are flawed: Study; Express Pharma pulse. September 29, 2005.
11. Paine Lislle. Giving patients what they want. Journal of Hospital Management International. 1989; pp. 340-41.
12. Levin, R.F. Heart mates a survival guide for the cardiac spouse; Simon & Schuster, New York: 1987; p16