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ABSTRACT

Background: There is a need of quality health services in developing countries like India. Uneducated patients are transformed into educated clients and demands for better services. It is important to measure satisfaction of the patients towards catered health services for betterment of the institute as well as community. The objective of the study was to know the satisfaction of patients attending the OPD of Rural health training centre and urban health training centre of a medical college.

Methods: A cross-sectional survey was conducted among people attending the OPD of RHTC and UHTC of a Medical college and they were interviewed by using patient satisfaction survey form.

Results: Overall satisfaction was 98% participants in RHTC and 99% in UHTC were satisfied. Almost all patients were satisfied with the behaviour of the doctor, paramedical staff and class 3 workers at RHTC and UHTC (100% in RHTC and 98.5% in UHTC).

Conclusions: Overall patient satisfaction was good but based on the statistics; areas which had a void can be corrected by implementing the suggestions given by respondents.
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INTRODUCTION

Health care services differ widely from country to country which must be relevant to local health problems, needs and attitudes as well as the available resources. It should be comprehensive, accessible, acceptable, provide scope for community participation and available at a cost the community and country can afford.¹

Rural health training centre and urban health training centre are the service delivery centres attached to Community Medicine Department of a Medical College. Basically they are learning centres for the interns and postgraduate students especially for the subject Community Medicine. They are also used as platforms for implementing the various national health programs. RHTCs are placed in rural area while UHTCs are placed in urban slums. They provide scope for the operational research for the community. These centers also provide medical care as well as specialist care to the community.² ³

Client (patient) satisfaction is an important factor which determines the success of health care facility. Nowadays it is a part of quality control. It is easier to evaluate the patient’s satisfaction towards the services provided than to evaluate the quality of medical services that they receive.

Since long time patients perceptions regarding health care system have been ignored by health care managers especially in the developing countries like India. Patients
carry certain expectations before their visit and the resultant satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the outcome of their actual experience.\textsuperscript{4-6}

More than 5 years have passed since starting of RHTC and UHTC of the GMERS Medical College, Gandhinagar. So, apart from training of the interns it is essential to know whether community is benefitted since the establishment of these centres or not. Keeping this in mind the present study was conducted to know the satisfaction among the patients attending RHTC and UHTC.

**METHODS**

**Study type, study setting and study duration**

A cross sectional survey was carried out in Urban Health training Centre (UHTC) and Rural Health Training Centre (RHTC) attached with a Medical college in Gujarat. Data were collected from June 2017 to September 2017.

**Study participants**

Patients aged 18 or more who came to seek the treatment at UHTC and RHTC. Non-cooperative participants were excluded from the study.

**Sample size and sampling**

Sample size of 113 was calculated from hypothesis testing method using following assumptions: 95% confidence intervals, 92% satisfaction level among participants based on previous study\textsuperscript{1}, 5% error. Calculated sample size was inflated with 10% of non-response rate. At RHTC 132 participants were surveyed and 133 patients were surveyed at UHTC. Participants were acquired conveniently during the morning hours of morning OPD when patient load is comparatively large.

**Study tool**

Predesigned and structured questionnaire was applied for the survey. Pilot testing was done among 10% of the participants and with the help of experts necessary changes were done in the questionnaire.

**Data analysis**

Data were entered and analysed through Epi info version 7. For continuous variables mean and standard deviation were calculated and for categorical variables percentage were calculated.

**RESULTS**

Present study was conducted to know the perceptions about the RHTC and UHTC among the patients and to know the satisfaction regarding the services they get.

### Table 1: Socio demographic details.

| Variables          | RHTC (n=132) | UHTC (n=133) |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| **Age groups**     |              |              |
| <20 years          | 17 (12.88)   | 12 (09.02)   |
| 20-39 years        | 38 (28.79)   | 34 (25.56)   |
| 40-59 years        | 45 (34.09)   | 53 (39.86)   |
| ≥ 60 years         | 32 (24.24)   | 34 (25.56)   |
| **Gender**         |              |              |
| Male               | 56 (42.42)   | 60 (45.11)   |
| Female             | 76 (57.58)   | 73 (54.89)   |
| **Marital Status** |              |              |
| Married            | 82 (62.12)   | 86 (64.66)   |
| Unmarried          | 24 (18.18)   | 15 (11.28)   |
| Widow/divorced/separated | 17 (12.88) | 22 (16.54) |
| Not applicable     | 09 (06.82)   | 10 (07.52)   |
| **Education**      |              |              |
| Illiterate/just literate | 17 (12.88) | 09 (06.77) |
| Primary            | 56 (42.42)   | 60 (45.11)   |
| Secondary/higher secondary | 48 (36.36) | 29 (21.80) |
| Graduate/post graduates | 11 (08.34) | 35 (26.32) |

Illiterate patients were 12.88% at RHTC and 06.77% at the UHTC.

### Table 2: Reasons for choosing the centre for the health services.

| Source of information about UHTC/RHTC                         | RHTC (n=132) | UHTC (n=133) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Hospital staff                                               | 16 (12.12)   | 12 (09.02)   |
| Friends/Relatives                                            | 28 (21.22)   | 22 (16.54)   |
| Other patients                                               | 73 (55.30)   | 85 (63.91)   |
| Others                                                       | 15 (11.36)   | 14 (10.53)   |

Auto rickshaw                                               | 08 (06.06)   | 002 (01.50)   |

(Walking)                                                    | 86 (65.15)   | 122 (91.73)   |

| Own vehicle                                                  | 38 (28.79)   | 009 (06.77)   |

| Auto rickshaw                                               | 08 (06.06)   | 002 (01.50)   |

| Time given during consultation                              |              |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Waiting period b/w arrival centre and attended by doctor     |              |              |
| <15 min                                                      | 32 (24.24)   | 29 (21.80)   |
| 15-30 min                                                   | 78 (59.09)   | 68 (51.13)   |
| >30 min                                                     | 22 (16.67)   | 36 (27.07)   |

| Time given during consultation                              |              |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Waiting period b/w arrival centre and attended by doctor     |              |              |
| <5 min                                                      | 58 (43.94)   | 69 (51.88)   |
| 5-10 min                                                   | 30 (27.73)   | 31 (23.31)   |
| 10-15 min                                                  | 27 (20.45)   | 12 (09.02)   |
| >15 min                                                   | 17 (12.88)   | 21 (15.79)   |
Around 55% patients at RHTC and 64% at UHTC were came to know about the facility through old patients. Majority of the patients 65.15% in RHTC and 91.73% in UHTC come via walking to the health facility. Waiting period between arrival and consulting by doctor is 15-30 minutes in majority of the patients. Almost 44% patients in RHTC and around 52% in UHTC were given less than 5 minutes during consultation by doctor (Table 2).

Almost all patients were satisfied with the behaviour of the doctor at RHTC & UHTC (100% in RHTC & 97% at UHTC). Bodyguards also reported 98.2% patients were satisfied with the drinking water available at RHTC while 82.71% were satisfied with the drinking water at UHTC. Toilets were not up to the mark in 31.82% patients in RHTC and 32.33% in UHTC. Around 98% patients at RHTC and 97% at UHTC were satisfied in cleanliness of the centre (Table 4).

### Table 3: Perception regarding the behaviour of the staff at the centre.

| Variables                                    | RHTC (n=132) | UHTC (n=133) |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Behaviour of doctor                          |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 36 (27.27)   | 006 (04.51)  |
| Good                                         | 96 (72.73)   | 125 (93.99)  |
| Average                                      | 00 (00.00)   | 002 (01.50)  |
| Behaviour of paramedical workers (pharmacist, lab tech, nursing staff) |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 010 (07.58)  | 001 (00.75)  |
| Good                                         | 122 (92.42)  | 130 (97.75)  |
| Average                                      | 000 (00.00)  | 002 (01.50)  |
| Behaviour of class IV (sweeper, ward boy, ayaben) |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 008 (06.06)  | 00 (00.00)   |
| Good                                         | 124 (93.94)  | 131 (98.50)  |
| Average                                      | 000 (00.00)  | 002 (01.50)  |

### Table 4: Satisfaction regarding the basic amenities at the centre.

| Variables                                    | RHTC (n=132) | UHTC (n=133) |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Satisfaction regarding cleanliness of centre  |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 012 (09.09)  | 000 (00.00)  |
| Good                                         | 118 (89.40)  | 130 (97.74)  |
| Average                                      | 002 (01.51)  | 003 (02.26)  |
| Satisfaction regarding lighting of centre    |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 010 (07.57)  | 001 (00.75)  |
| Good                                         | 118 (89.40)  | 129 (96.99)  |
| Average                                      | 004 (03.03)  | 003 (02.26)  |
| Satisfaction regarding ventilation of centre  |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 016 (12.12)  | 001 (00.75)  |
| Good                                         | 114 (86.37)  | 130 (97.75)  |
| Average centre                               | 002 (01.51)  | 002 (01.50)  |
| Satisfaction with availability of drinking water |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 00 (00.00)   | 002 (01.50)  |
| Good                                         | 80 (60.60)   | 110 (82.71)  |
| Not used                                     | 52 (39.40)   | 021 (15.79)  |
| Satisfaction regarding sanitary latrines/urinals |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 02 (01.51)   | 03 (02.26)   |
| Good                                         | 88 (66.67)   | 87 (65.41)   |
| Average                                      | 42 (31.82)   | 43 (32.33)   |

### Table 5: Perception after taking treatment at the centre.

| Parameters                                    | RHTC (n=132) | UHTC (n=133) |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Satisfaction with given treatment            |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 44 (33.33)   | 003 (02.26)  |
| Good                                         | 86 (65.16)   | 128 (96.24)  |
| Average                                      | 02 (01.51)   | 002 (01.50)  |
| Satisfaction regarding overall health services |              |              |
| Excellent                                    | 012 (09.09)  | 002 (01.50)  |
| Good                                         | 118 (89.40)  | 130 (97.75)  |
| Average                                      | 002 (01.51)  | 001 (00.75)  |
| Would you like to visit health centre again?  |              |              |
| Yes                                          | 132 (100)    | 127 (95.49)  |
| No                                           | 000 (00.00)  | 006 (04.51)  |
| Would you motivate to your friends/relatives to visit this health centre? | | |
| Yes                                          | 132 (100)    | 127 (95.49)  |
| No                                           | 000 (00.00)  | 006 (04.51)  |
| Reasons for preferring services at this centre |              |              |
| Free services                                | 112 (84.85)  | 95 (71.43)   |
| Nearby services                              | 086 (65.15)  | 74 (55.64)   |
| Good service                                 | 054 (40.91)  | 39 (29.32)   |
| Suggestions to improve the quality of the services |      |              |
| Improve in emergency management              | 04 (03.03)   | 01 (00.75)   |
| Increase medicine                            | 10 (07.57)   | 02 (01.50)   |
| Avail more beds                              | 05 (03.78)   | 06 (04.51)   |
| Increase staff                               | 03 (02.27)   | 11 (08.27)   |
| Avail specialist services                    | 03 (02.27)   | 05 (03.76)   |
| Avail more laboratory tests                  | 02 (01.51)   | 04 (03.00)   |

### DISCUSSION

### Satisfaction regarding behaviour of staff

In this study, patients were satisfied with behavior of doctors (100% in RHTC and 98.5% in UHTC). Bhattacharya et al also reported 98.2% patients were satisfied with behavior of doctors which is similar with the present study. A study in Nagpur by Kulkarni et al showed that patients were more satisfied with behavior of doctors (87.8%).
Overall level satisfaction to services

In present study overall satisfaction was 98% participants in RHTC and 99% in UHTC. A study in Nagpur by Kulkarni et al showed that 75.08% of the patients were satisfied regarding.8

In a study done by Qureshi et al in in Srinagar showed only 6.7% patients were poorly satisfied with hospital services.9 In a study carried out in Ethiopia, Abdosh reported 54.1% patients were satisfied with services in the hospital.10

Satisfaction regarding basic amenities

In present study only 60% were satisfied to the drinking water facility at RHTC and 82% at UHTC while other had not used drinking water. Studies done by Rasheed et al and Gupta et al showed satisfaction in drinking water were (92.8%) and 96.6% respectively.11,12 In the present study toilets were not up to the mark according to 31.82% patients in RHTC and 32.33% in UHTC. Similar perceptions were shown in Study done by Kumari et al found unsatisfactory toilet facilities 37.4% as well as the cleanliness of the toilets 27.3%.13

CONCLUSION

Patient’s satisfaction is the perception of the patient towards health facility (including staff and infrastructure). It is the best way to assess the quality of the services provided. Majority of the patients in this study are satisfied with the services provided yet there are many scope of improvements as per their suggestions. Quality is not the destination but the continuous process so, patient satisfaction needs to be surveyed periodically for the improvement in the health centre and so it can provide better treatment to the community.
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