

# Patients Satisfaction Level Towards Service Rendered By Government Hospital With Reference Tumakuru Dist

### **KEYWORDS**

## Dr.C.Shobha.

### M.Com, M.Phil, PGDFM, Ph.D, Assistant Professor, DOS&R in Commerce, Tumkur University , TUMKUR. Karnataka State

#### Introduction

"Good health is not something we can buy. However, it can be an extremely valuable savings account."

Health is not something we can buy, but it is more valuable than the savings account, it means heath is fundamental base for growth and further improvement, for maintaining this valuable account hospitals are plays a major role. Hospitals contribution towards growth of an economy is too high. Especially govt hospitals, that is hospitals owned and funded by government are act as backbone for the society's growth.

### **Review of Literature**

Vikas Bajpai, in his paper analyses the social, economic & political origin of the major challenges facing public hospitals in India, concluded that the public healthcare system in the country stands at crossroads where there is little in the present system that is worth emulating..

Dr.Arab Naz, Umar Daraz, Tariq khan,Waseem khan, Mohammad Hussain in their paper concluded from the data analyses and literature that majority of local people are dependent on public sector hospitals in the research area with respect to health problems. Objectives of the Study

**Primary Objectives:** Patients quality of care,Behaviour of hospital personals.

#### Secondary Objectives

- To describe the patients opinions about the basic / infrastructure facility.
- To determine the need factors and satisfaction level of patients.
- To identify the problems faced by patients and offer fruitful suggestions for resolving those problems.
- To identify the facilities provided by hospital to its patients.
- Hypothesis of the Study

Null Hypothesis ( $H_{0}$ : There is no a significant difference between behaviour of Nurses, Lab Technician, & Other co-workers.

Alternative Hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>): There is a significant difference between behaviour of Nurses, Lab Technician, & Other co-workers.

**Null Hypothesis (H** $_{0}$ : There is no significant relationship between income of respondents & quality of care/services they received in this hospital.

Alternative Hypothesis (H $_{\eta}$ ; There is a significant relationship between income of respondents & quality of care/services they received in this hospital.

**Sample Size:** Number of patients limited to 100, chosen as respondents for the present study.

100 patients are classified into,Inpatients: 50 patients, Outpatients: 50 patients

Availability of Lab facility

| , wanability of Eab facility |       |                   |       |       |                       |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|                              |       | Frequency Percent |       |       | Cumulative<br>Percent |  |  |  |
|                              | Yes   | 48                | 61.5  | 61.5  | 61.5                  |  |  |  |
| Valid                        | No    | 30                | 38.5  | 38.5  | 100.0                 |  |  |  |
|                              | Total | 78                | 100.0 | 100.0 |                       |  |  |  |

| Time taken for Reporting |                                |                |                            |       |                            |  |  |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
|                          |                                | Fre-<br>quency | Per- Valid<br>cent Percent |       | Cumu-<br>lative<br>Percent |  |  |  |
| Val-                     | Available in<br>Scheduled Time | 44             | 91.7                       | 91.7  | 91.7                       |  |  |  |
| id                       | Delayed                        | 4              | 8.3                        | 8.3   | 100.0                      |  |  |  |
|                          | Total                          | 48             | 100.0                      | 100.0 |                            |  |  |  |

### **Provision of Medicines**

|       |             | Fre-<br>quency | Per-<br>cent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumu-<br>lative<br>Percent |
|-------|-------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------------|
|       | Available   | 38             | 38.0         | 38.0             | 38.0                       |
| Valid | Very less   | 49             | 49.0         | 49.0             | 87.0                       |
| Valid | Unavailable | 13             | 13.0         | 13.0             | 100.0                      |
|       | Total       | 100            | 100.0        | 100.0            |                            |

#### Expectations of the patients from this hospital

|            |                       | Fre-<br>quency | Per-<br>cent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumu-<br>lative<br>Percent |
|------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------------------|
|            | Good treat-<br>ment   | 15             | 15.0         | 15.0             | 15.0                       |
|            | Good envi-<br>ronment | 29             | 29.0         | 29.0             | 44.0                       |
| Val-<br>id | Good Lab<br>Facility  | 16             | 16.0         | 16.0             | 60.0                       |
|            | All the above         | 25             | 25.0         | 25.0             | 85.0                       |
|            | Other                 | 15             | 15.0         | 15.0             | 100.0                      |
|            | Total                 | 100            | 100.0        | 100.0            |                            |

Response from hospital staff at the time of admission: This question is asked with object of know the behaviour of hospital staff towards patients at the time of admission. Because patients satisfaction level measurement starts from this point.

| Respo | Response from hospital staff at time of admission |            |         |                  |                            |  |  |  |  |
|-------|---|------------|---------|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|       |   | Frequency  | Percent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumu-<br>lative<br>Percent |  |  |  |  |
|       | Average   | 10         | 10.0    | 10.0             | 10.0                       |  |  |  |  |
|       | Good  | 22         | 22.0    | 22.0             | 32.0                       |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | Very good   | 66         | 66.0    | 66.0             | 98.0                       |  |  |  |  |
|       | Excellent   | 2          | 2.0     | 2.0              | 100.0                      |  |  |  |  |
|       | Total   | 100        | 100.0   | 100.0            |                            |  |  |  |  |
| Behav | iour of Do  | ctors at t | ne time | of cons          | ultancv                    |  |  |  |  |

| RESEARCH PAPER                   | Volume : 6   Issue : 4   April 2016   ISSN - 2249-555X   IF : 3.919   IC Value : 74.50 |  |     |    |       |     |       |              |       |     |       |       |       |     |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-----|----|-------|-----|-------|--------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-----|
|                                  | Excelle  | Excellent=5, Verygood=4, Good=3, Average=2, Poor=1 |     |    |       |     |       |              |       |     |       |       |       |     |
| Variables                        | Excellent  |  | Ver |    | Good  |     | Avera | Average Poor |       |     | Total |       | Ranks |     |
|                                  | NOR  | Score  | NOF | R  | Score | NOR | Score | NOR          | Score | NOR | Score | Total | %     |     |
| Being Polite                     | 1  |  | 5   | 6  | 24    | 25  | 75    | 53           | 106   | 15  | 15    | 225   | 10.17 | VI  |
| Listening to you                 | 19   |  | 95  | 17 | 68    | 40  | 120   | 20           | 40    | 4   | 4     | 327   | 14.78 | IV  |
| Assessing medical condi-<br>tion | 34   |  | 170 | 21 | 84    | 32  | 96    | 12           | 24    | 1   | 1     | 375   | 16.95 | ш   |
| Explaining condition             | 38   |  | 190 | 27 | 108   | 20  | 60    | 11           | 22    | 4   | 4     | 384   | 17.36 | 11  |
| Providing treatment for you      | 43   |  | 215 | 25 | 100   | 18  | 54    | 11           | 22    | 3   | 3     | 394   | 17.81 | I   |
| General Communication            | 10   |  | 50  | 14 | 56    | 44  | 132   | 27           | 54    | 5   | 5     | 297   | 13.43 | V   |
| Empathy                          | 1  |  | 5   | 5  | 20    | 26  | 78    | 39           | 78    | 29  | 29    | 210   | 9.494 | VII |
| Total                            |  |  |     |    |       |     |       |              |       |     |       | 2212  |       |     |

Opinion of the patients regarding basic facilities provided by Hospetals

| Attributes       | Excelle | ent   | Verygo | bod   | Good |       | Avera | ge    | Poor |       | Total |        | Rank |
|------------------|---------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| Facilities       | NOR     | Score | NOR    | Score | NOR  | Score | NOR   | Score | NOR  | Score | Total | %      | 1    |
| Environment      |         |       |        |       |      |       |       |       |      |       |       |        |      |
| Within           | 1       | 5     | 2      | 8     | 26   | 78    | 51    | 102   | 20   | 20    | 213   | 6.2628 | 11   |
| Around           | 0       | 0     | 3      | 12    | 12   | 36    | 61    | 122   | 24   | 24    | 194   | 5.7042 | 13   |
| Quality of Care  | 20      | 100   | 27     | 108   | 34   | 102   | 15    | 30    | 4    | 4     | 344   | 10.114 | 2    |
| Water facility   | 0       | 0     | 6      | 24    | 27   | 81    | 55    | 110   | 12   | 12    | 227   | 6.6745 | 7    |
| Bed facility     | 0       | 0     | 4      | 16    | 2    | 60    | 70    | 140   | 6    | 6     | 222   | 6.5274 | 8    |
| Cleanness        | 0       | 0     | 4      | 16    | 10   | 30    | 70    | 140   | 16   | 32    | 218   | 6.4098 | 9    |
| Toilet&handwash  | 0       | 0     | 3      | 12    | 27   | 81    | 52    | 104   | 18   | 18    | 215   | 6.3216 | 10   |
| Quality of food  | 2       | 10    | 6      | 24    | 45   | 135   | 42    | 84    | 5    | 5     | 258   | 7.586  | 5    |
| Fans & Lights    | 8       | 40    | 14     | 56    | 55   | 165   | 23    | 46    | 0    | 0     | 307   | 9.0267 | 4    |
| Parking facility | 46      | 230   | 9      | 36    | 36   | 108   | 8     | 16    | 1    | 1     | 391   | 11.496 | 1    |
| Nurses           | 5       | 25    | 33     | 132   | 44   | 132   | 13    | 26    | 5    | 5     | 320   | 9.409  | 3    |
| Lab technician   | 3       | 15    | 7      | 28    | 43   | 129   | 15    | 30    | 7    | 7     | 209   | 6.1452 | 12   |
| Co-workers       | 1       | 5     | 16     | 64    | 56   | 168   | 19    | 38    | 8    | 8     | 283   | 8.3210 | 6    |
| Total            |         |       |        |       |      |       |       |       |      |       | 3401  |        |      |

This table result play major role in achieving the purpose of to know the opinion of patients regarding basic infrastructure available in this hospital. Out of 13 variables parking facility gets the 1<sup>st</sup> rank followed by Quality of care, Behaviour of nurses, fans & light facility, quality of food, behaviour of other co-workers, water facility, bed facility, cleanness, toilet & hand wash facility, environment (within), behaviour of lab technician, finally environment (around).

This indicates that the hospital administrator need to take corrective action regarding improving the environment within & around, water facility, bed facility, cleanness, toilet & hand wash facility and other needed facility, because it is purely based on opinion on patients of this hospital, then there is chance to improve patients satisfaction & there by growth of hospital.

### Hypothesis Testing

 $H_{0}$ : There is no significant difference between behaviour of Nurses, Lab technician & other co-workers.  $H_{1}$ : There is significant difference between behaviour of Nurses, Lab technician & other co-workers.

| Annova test | result |     |          |          |
|-------------|--------|-----|----------|----------|
| SUMMARY     |        |     |          |          |
| Groups      | Count  | Sum | Average  | Variance |
| Column 1    | 3      | 9   | 3        | 4        |
| Column 2    | 3      | 56  | 18.66667 | 174.3333 |
| Column 3    | 3      | 143 | 47.66667 | 52.33333 |
| Column 4    | 3      | 47  | 15.66667 | 9.333333 |
| Column 5    | 3      | 20  | 6.666667 | 2.333333 |

| ANOVA                       |          |    |          |          |          |         |
|-----------------------------|----------|----|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| Source<br>of Varia-<br>tion | SS       | df | MS       | F        | P-value  | F crit  |
| Be-<br>tween<br>Groups      | 3716.667 | 4  | 929.1667 | 19.17125 | 0.000111 | 3.47805 |
| Within<br>Groups            | 484.6667 | 10 | 48.46667 |          |          |         |
| Total                       | 4201.333 | 14 |          |          |          |         |

The above table shows that the calculated value of F is 3.4 which is less than the table value of 3.48 at 5% level of significance. This analysis supports null hypothesis is accepted. That is, There is no significant difference between behaviour of Nurses, Lab technician & other co-workers.

 $H_o$ : There is no significant relationship between income of respondents & Quality of care they received  $H_1$ : There is a significant relationship between income of respondents & Quality of care they received.

| Quality of<br>care | Income of Respondents |                |                 |                |       |  |  |  |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|--|--|--|
|                    | Below<br>5000         | 5001-<br>10000 | 10001-<br>15000 | Above<br>15000 | Total |  |  |  |
| Poor               | 2                     | 2              | 0               | 0              | 4     |  |  |  |
| Average            | 8                     | 4              | 2               | 1              | 15    |  |  |  |
| Good               | 26                    | 3              | 2               | 3              | 34    |  |  |  |
| Very good          | 15                    | 8              | 4               | 0              | 27    |  |  |  |
| Excellent          | 15                    | 0              | 3               | 2              | 20    |  |  |  |
| Total              | 66                    | 17             | 11              | 6              | 100   |  |  |  |

### RESEARCH PAPER

| Observed(O) | Expected<br>(E) | O-E   | (O-E)2         | (O-E)2/E   |
|-------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------------|
| 2           | 2.64            | -0.64 | 0.4096         | 0.15515152 |
| 2           | 0.68            | 1.32  | 1.7424         | 2.56235294 |
| 0           | 0.44            | -0.44 | 0.1936         | 0.44       |
| 0           | 0.24            | -0.24 | 0.0576         | 0.24       |
| 8           | 9.9             | -1.9  | 3.61           | 0.36464646 |
| 4           | 2.55            | 1.45  | 2.1025         | 0.8245098  |
| 2           | 1.65            | 0.35  | 0.1225         | 0.07424242 |
| 1           | 0.9             | 0.1   | 0.01           | 0.01111111 |
| 26          | 22.44           | 3.56  | 12.6736        | 0.56477718 |
| 3           | 5.78            | -2.78 | 7.7284         | 1.33709343 |
| 3<br>2<br>3 | 3.74            | -1.74 | 3.0276         | 0.80951872 |
| 3           | 2.04            | 0.96  | 0.9216         | 0.45176471 |
| 15          | 17.82           | -2.82 | 7.9524         | 0.44626263 |
| 8           | 4.59            | 3.41  | 11.6281        | 2.53335512 |
| 4           | 2.97            | 1.03  | 1.0609         | 0.35720539 |
| 0           | 1.62            | -1.62 | 2.6244         | 1.62       |
| 15          | 13.2            | 1.8   | 3.24           | 0.24545455 |
| 0           | 3.4             | -3.4  | 11.56          | 3.4        |
| 3           | 2.2             | 0.8   | 0.64           | 0.29090909 |
| 2           | 1.2             | 0.8   | 0.64           | 0.53333333 |
|             |                 |       | X <sup>2</sup> | 17.2616884 |

**Degree of Freedom** (R-1) (C-1) (4-1) (5-1) 3x4 = 12The calculated value of  $X^2$  (17.2616) is less than the table value at 5% level of significance with 12 degree of freedom is 21.026. so Null hypothesis (H<sup>0</sup>) is accepted i.e. there is no significant relationship between Income of the Respondents & Quality of care they received from the hospital.

### Summary of Findings

The study has been undertaken with the main purpose to study the satisfaction level of patients regarding patients care, behaviour of hospital personals and provision of basic amenities in the hospital. Regarding this the summarised findings are as follows,

- It found that response of patients towards initial admission process was very good opinion. It is stepping stone for hospital towards growth. Patients positive opinion is backbone for growth.
- It found that immediate approach from the hospital staff was made towards patients when they admitted to the hospital. i.e. opinion of patients was very good.
- It also found that out of 100 patients more are admitted for less than 3 days. It represents that the illness of patients who visit hospital was recover within short span of time.
- This study founds that opinion of patients regarding availability of medicines was not satisfied. Because they said that required medicines were purchased from the outside.
- Overall experience of patients during stay in this hospital also is in positive way. At last it will leads to growth of hospital, compared to its present condition.

**PURPOSE** : To determine the relationship between need factors and satisfaction level.

It revealed that expectation of patients are good environment, timely availability of doctors, cleanness, availability of all required medicines, immediate response for normal cases, proper water facility etc. Satisfaction level was not too good need to take corrective action towards improving of thes problems of patients.

### Volume : 6 | Issue : 4 | April 2016 | ISSN - 2249-555X | IF : 3.919 | IC Value : 74.50

Hypothesis testing also says that there is no significant difference between behaviour of hospital. They have one equity behaviour policy towards patients.

Majorly this study found that there is no significant relation between income of respondents & quality of care they received from this hospital, through hypothesis testing using Chi-square.

### Conclusion

In the modern information technology based world service sector plays a predominant role. The contribution of service sector towards growth of nation is very high. In that hospitals are plays major role by keeping the good health position of human resources available in the nation. Now days Govt hospitals are give tuff competition to the private hospitals by providing quality of treatment. For this development patients satisfaction act as a backbone. Opinion of patients towards services offered are major basis for the administration officers to take proper decision towards growth. In this angle study on patients satisfaction is very important.

The present study aims to assess the patients satisfaction level towards service rendered by Govt hospital with reference to Sira town, Tumkur (DIS). It also intends to know the problems faced by patients during the stay in this hospital. From the analysis it can be found that the patients satisfaction level towards behaviour of hospital staff was good & patients satisfaction level towards basic facilities was not good. Therefore concerned authority need to take proper decision regarding these problems.

The study enables the Concerned authority of Govt hospital know the patients satisfaction level, problems of patients, opinion of patients towards hospital staff & there by assists in proper decision making process regarding development of hospital compared to its current position.

### Suggestions

Based on the findings of the study the necessary Suggestions are forwarded to Govt Hospital.

The Summarised suggestions are as follows,

### To the Hospital

- Immediate response or approach is required from the hospital staff to the patients, especially for outpatient or for normal cases. It will causes for the high patients satisfaction level.
- Good environment is very essential demand from the patients, both within & outside the hospital. This will help in reduction of infection caused from the uncleanness.
- Guiding name boards are needed by the patients for searching doctors, lab & other rooms.
- Hospital authority should take necessary action regarding reducing of waiting time of patients for doctors.

### To the Government

 Govt should provide the all essential qualitative medicines to the hospital. It will reduces burden of purchasing from the outside. Because at the time of collection of primary data one patient said that more than 5000 rupees spent on pur-

### RESEARCH PAPER

chasing medicines from the outside.

- The building provided to hospital is very restricted. Because the number of patients for visiting hospital is very large, & for inpatients it will causes disturbance. Therefore separate rooms should be provided by Govt for the individual patient.
- slt is necessary to take correct action regarding providing of good water facility, Lab facility & qualitative food which is demanded by patient with good quantity.
- Another suggestion from the patient to the Govt that the half amount should be sponsored by Govt for payment of bill, e.g. Bheema Yojan.
- More staff is required for lab as lab technician, it will reduces burden on single person.
- According to Nisar Fatheema, who is lady doctor in Primary Health Care Centre in Hassan (DIS), she told that there is chance to provide good qualitative treatment with the available resources & facility what now Govt provided to the Govt Hospitals, in this angle there is need to work with 100% dedication & interest by the hospital staff.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kumari Ranjeeta, Inris MZ, Bhushan Vidya, Khanna anish, Agarwal Monika Singh Sk, "Patients satisfaction in the govt allopathic health facility of Lucknow District, India"
- 2. Indian Journal of community Medicines/ vol 34 / issue 1 / Jan 2009.
- T Sreenivas & Nethi Suresh "Patients satisfaction in hospitals ( Govt General Hospital, St joseph General Hospital, NRI Hospital) in Guntur district, Andrapradesh" International Journal of Management Research & business Strategy ISSN 2319-345 Vol.1, No.1,oct,2012
- 4. Anand D, Kaushal SK, Gupta SC "A study on status of client satisfaction in patients attending Govt health facility in Agra District"
- Indian Journal of community Health vol.24, No.3, July 2012-Sep,2012
- Prahlad Rai Sodani, Rajeev K Kumar, Jayati srivastava & Laxman Sharma "Measuring patients satisfaction" Indian Journal of Community Medicines 2010, Jan; 35(1): 52-56 doi 10.4103/0970-0218.62554 PM-CID-PMC2888368
- 7. Dr.Arab Naz, Umar Daraz, Tariq khan,Waseem khan, Mohammad Hussain
- "An analytical study of patients health problems in public hospitals of Khyber pakhitunkhwa, Pakistan" International Journal of Business & Social Science, vol.3 No.5; Mar, 2012
- Report on Currency and Finance, RBI, various issues; Statistical Abstract of India, Government of India, various issues; Handbook of Statistics of India, RBI, India.
- India Chronicle: 2007, Fostering quality healthcare for all, Ernst and Young, 2008

#### www.google.com

www.wecipedia.com

www.ijmrbs.com/cuurentissue.php