INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT AND ALLIED SCIENCES (IJBMAS)

A Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

THE IMPACT OF HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION ON THE PATIENTS SATISFACTION OF LABORATORY DEPARTMENT SERVICES

Dr. Zuber Mujeeb Shaikh

Director, Corporate Quality Improvement,
Dr. Sulaiman Al-Habib Medical Group, Riyadh-11643, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email-drzuber5@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

The quality of hospital laboratory service is one of the most important parameter to be measured to satisfy the patients and their families. Patient satisfaction is considered a tool of measuring the quality of services provided. *Objectives:* To study the impact of National Accreditation Board for Hospitals & Healthcare Providers (NABH) Accreditation, India on Laboratory Department Service patient satisfaction. *Methods:* It is a quantitative, descriptive and inferential research based case study in which sample of a population was studied by structured satisfaction survey questionnaires (before and after the accreditation) in a private tertiary care hospital in Secunderabad, Telangana State, India to determine its characteristics, and it is then inferred that the population has the same or different characteristics. *Significance of Research:* It was observed initially before the accreditation that there was a lower patient satisfaction rate of the hospital Laboratory Department Services, which was affecting the study hospitals' business. *Hypothesis:* Null Hypothesis (Ho) and Alternative Hypothesis (H1) were used and tested to compare the before and after impact of accreditation by applying to each question in the questionnaire. *Study Design:* The closed ended questionnaire was developed considering the Laboratory Department Services by incorporating the six dimensions of quality Safe, Timely, Effective, Efficient, Equitable, and Patient-centred (STEEP) and tested prior to implementing. Questionnaires were given to the patients' families for completion upon using the Laboratory Department Services two months before and two months after the accreditation. The data were collected in order to cover all three shifts of the laboratory Department Services. *Study Population:* Simple random sampling method was selected, the researcher had involved all conscious patients (clinical conditions) from all age groups. *Data Collections:* Primary data were collected from the survey questionnaires. Secondary data were collected from relevant published journals, articles, research papers, academic

literature and web portals. *Conclusion:* At the 5 % level of significance, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses between before (M=43.63, SD=19.07) and after accreditation (M=55.44, SD=11.99) with p-value <0.001. The mean satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation.

Key words: Patient Satisfaction, National Accreditation Board for Hospitals & Healthcare Providers (NABH) Accreditation, Laboratory Department Services

INTRODUCTION

Patient satisfaction is one of the established yardsticks to measure success of the services being provided in the health facilities. But it is difficult to measure the satisfaction and gauze responsiveness of the health systems as not only the clinical but also the non-clinical outcomes of care do influence the customer satisfaction.[i] Satisfaction has been defined as a consumer's emotional feelings about a specific consumption experience.[ii]Today, developedand developing nations are working towards continuous quality improvement and patient safety by achieving the national and or international healthcare accreditation and providing safe, effective, patient-centred, timely, efficient and equitable health care services to all their patients, families and caretakers.[iii]Accreditation of a health care organization is an external evaluation of the level of compliance against a set of organizational standards. Healthcare accreditation standards are advocated as an important means of improving structure, process and outcome. [iv]

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

The increased international focus on improving patient outcomes, safety and quality of care has led stakeholders, policy makers and health care provider organizations adopt standardized processes for measuring health care systems. Patient satisfaction has become a key criterion by which the quality of health care services is evaluated. The literature emphasizes that patients who are satisfied with the provision of health care tend to be more compliant to their treatment plan, maintain their follow up visits; and are more willing to recommend the hospital to others.[v] The literature emphasizes that hospital accreditation and patient satisfaction are both considered important quality indicators of healthcare delivered.[vi] The results of patient satisfaction surveys can be used to monitor the quality of health care provided,[vii] to find out any shortages, to provide the necessary interventions, and as a valuable source of strategic planning of health services.[viii] It is judgment that a product or a services feature, or the product or service itself, provide a pleasurable level of consumption related fulfilment. The main beneficiary of a good health care system is clearly a patient. As a customer of healthcare, the patient is the focus of the health care delivery system.[ix]Patient's perceptions about health care system seem to have been largely ignored by the health care managers in the developing countries.[x]Patient satisfaction depends upon many factors such as: quality of clinical services provided, availability of medicine, behaviour of doctors and other health staff, cost of the services, hospital infrastructure, physical comfort, emotional support and respect for patient preferences. Mismatch between patient expectation and the service received relates to decreased satisfaction.[xi] Therefore, assessing patient perspectives gives them a voice, which can make private and public health services more responsive to people's need and expectations.[xii]

DATA ANALYSIS:

Table1. Patient participation before and after accreditation

Group	Frequency	Percentage
Before Accreditation	300	47.6
After Accreditation	330	52.4
Total	630	100.0

Table 1 depicts that there are about 300 patients participated before accreditation and 330 patients participated after accreditation. The participation of patients had increased only after accreditation.

Table2. Group and Age distribution

Group	Age group					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	<17yrs	17-25yrs	25-55yrs	55-65yrs	>65yrs	
Before Accreditation	42	86	68	64	40	1.078,
After Accreditation	45	99	82	61	43	0.898
Total	87	185	150	125	83	

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the Age categories between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the Age categories between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 2 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the age distribution between before and after accreditation groups. Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Table3. Group and Gender Distribution

Group	Gender		Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Male	Female	
Before Accreditation	148	152	0.133,
After Accreditation	158	172	0.715
Total	306	324	

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the gender distribution between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the gender distribution between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 3 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the gender distribution between before and after accreditation groups. Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Table4. Group and Geographical states Distribution

Group	Geographical States (Of India)		Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Same State	Other States	
Before Accreditation	188	112	0.371,
After Accreditation	199	131	0.543
Total	387	243	

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the geographical states (of India) of patients between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the geographical states (of India) of patients between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 4 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the geographical states (of India) between before and after accreditation groups.

Table5. Distribution of patients who speak Telugu, Non-Telgu and Group

Group	Language		Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Telugu	Non-Telugu	
Before Accreditation	208	92	0.070, 0.791
After Accreditation	232	98	
Total	440	190	

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the language patients speak between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the language patients speak between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 5 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between those who speak Telugu and those don't speak people who have visited the hospital and before and after accreditation groups. Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Table6. Type of visits and Group

Group	Type of visit		Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Out Patient Department	Emergency Department	
Before Accreditation	171	129	1.713, 0.191
After Accreditation	205	125	
Total	376	254	

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the type of hospital visits between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the type of hospital visits between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 6 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the type of hospital visits before and after accreditation groups. Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Table7. Type of payment and Group

Group	Payment type			Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Cash	Insurance	Government	
Before Accreditation	106	165	29	1.933, 0.380
After Accreditation	112	195	23	
Total	218	360	52	

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the type of payment made between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the type of payment made between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 7 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the type of payment between before and after accreditation groups. Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Table8. How satisfied were you with the access to the Laboratory and between Groups?

Group	How satisfied were you with the access to the Laboratory? (Patient centred)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	55	54	15	86	90	86.374, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	12	11	11	135	161	
Total	67	65	26	221	251	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses with the access to the laboratory before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses with the access to the laboratory between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 8 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses with the access to the laboratory between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=296 (Satisfied=135, Highly satisfied= 161) from N=176 (Satisfied = 86, Highly satisfied= 90). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table9. How satisfied were you with the professionalism and courtesy of the staff at Lab Reception and between the before and after accreditation groups?

Group	How satisfied were you with the professionalism and courtesy of the staff at Lab Reception? (Equitable)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	45	68	25	86	76	95.091 **<0.001**
After Accreditation	14	12	14	136	154	
Total	59	80	39	222	230	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses with the professionalism and courtesy of the staff at lab reception between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses with the professionalism and courtesy of the staff at lab reception between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 9 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses with the professionalism and courtesy of the staff at lab reception between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=290 (Satisfied=136, Highly satisfied= 154) from N=162 (Satisfied = 86, Highly satisfied= 76). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table10. How satisfied were you with the Receptionist knowledge and assistance with your/ patient's query and between the before and after accreditation groups?

Group	How satisfied were you with the Receptionist knowledge and assistance with your/ patient's query? (Patient centred)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	53	54	22	79	92	86.509, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	9	13	18	142	148	
Total	62	67	40	221	240	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses to the receptionist knowledge and assistance with patient's query between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses to the receptionist knowledge and assistance with patient's query between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 10 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses to the receptionist knowledge and assistance with patient's query between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=290 (Satisfied=142, Highly satisfied= 148) from N=171 (Satisfied = 79, Highly satisfied= 92). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table11. How satisfied were you with the Education provided to you/ the patient and between the before and after accreditation groups?

Group	How satisfied were you with the Education provided to you/ the patient? (Effective)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	46	61	17	89	87	96.039, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	11	8	10	142	159	
Total	57	69	27	231	246	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses to satisfaction with respect to the Education provided to you/ the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses to satisfaction with respect to the Education provided to you/ the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 11depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses to satisfaction with respect to the Education provided to you/ the patient between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=301 (Satisfied=142, Highly satisfied= 159) from N=176 (Satisfied = 89, Highly satisfied= 87). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table12. Responses with respect to the satisfaction to the waiting time and between the before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the waiting time?					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	49	46	20	92	93	84.201, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	8	8	13	147	154	
Total	57	54	33	239	247	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses with respect to the satisfaction to the waiting time between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses with respect to the satisfaction with the waiting time between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 12 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses with respect to the satisfaction with the waiting time between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=301 (Satisfied=147, Highly satisfied= 154) from N=185 (Satisfied =92, Highly satisfied= 93). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table13. Responses in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness of the department and between the before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the Cleanliness of the department?					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	46	54	24	83	93	81.131, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	8	12	19	136	155	
Total	54	66	43	219	248	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness of the department between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness of the department between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 13 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses to the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness of the department between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=291 (Satisfied=136, Highly satisfied= 155) from N=176 (Satisfied =83, Highly satisfied= 93). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table14. Responses in the satisfaction with the overall privacy given to the patient in the laboratory and between the before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the overall privacy given to you/ the patient in the laboratory? (Patient centred)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	55	47	18	86	94	78.976, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	7	16	14	132	161	
Total	62	63	32	218	255	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with the overall privacy given to the patient in the laboratory between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with the overall privacy given to the patient in the laboratory between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 14 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with the overall privacy given to the patient in the laboratory between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=293 (Satisfied=132, Highly satisfied= 161) from N=180 (Satisfied =86, Highly satisfied= 94). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table15. Responses in the satisfaction with respect to the blood collection procedure and between the before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the blood collection procedure? (Safe and efficient)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	59	57	19	76	89	95.272, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	18	7	14	136	155	
Total	77	64	33	212	244	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the blood collection procedure between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the blood collection procedure between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 15 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the blood collection procedure between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=291 (Satisfied=136, Highly satisfied= 155) from N=165 (Satisfied =76, Highly satisfied= 89). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table16. Responses in the satisfaction with respect to the timeliness of the provision of results and between the before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the timeliness of the provision of results? (Efficient)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	55	54	15	89	87	76.055, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	13	13	21	135	148	
Total	68	67	36	224	235	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the timeliness of the provision of results between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the timeliness of the provision of results between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 16 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the timeliness of the provision of results between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=283 (Satisfied=135, Highly satisfied= 148) from N=176 (Satisfied =89, Highly satisfied= 87). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table17. Responses in the satisfaction with respect to the time it took to receive the report and between before and after accreditation groups

Group	How would your level of satisfaction with respect to the time it took to receive the report?					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	**Dissatisfied**	**Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied**	**Satisfied**	**Highly Satisfied**	
Before Accreditation	45	68	25	86	76	103.754, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	9	11	18	137	155	
Total	54	79	43	223	231	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the time it took to receive the report between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the time it took to receive the report between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 17 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the time it took to receive the report between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=292 (Satisfied=137, Highly satisfied= 155) from N=162 (Satisfied =86, Highly satisfied= 76). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table18. Responses in the satisfaction with respect to the laboratory report presentation and between before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the laboratory report presentation? (Patient centred)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	46	61	22	79	92	91.606, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	11	12	10	135	162	
Total	57	73	32	214	254	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the laboratory report presentation between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the laboratory report presentation between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 18 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the laboratory report presentation between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=297 (Satisfied=135, Highly satisfied= 162) from N=171 (Satisfied =79, Highly satisfied=92). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table19. Responses in the satisfaction with respect to the availability of laboratory physician to explain the result and between before and after accreditation groups

Group	How satisfied were you with the availability of Laboratory physicians to explain the result? (Timeliness)					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	47	50	17	97	89	72.211, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	10	13	12	133	162	
Total	57	63	29	230	251	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the availability of laboratory physician to explain the result between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the availability of laboratory physician to explain the result between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 19 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the availability of laboratory physician to explain the result between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=295 (Satisfied=133, Highly satisfied= 162) from N=186 (Satisfied =97, Highly satisfied=89). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table20. Responses to the overall experience with the laboratory service and between before and after accreditation groups

Group	What is your overall level of satisfaction with our laboratory services?					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	47	55	20	87	91	85.198, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	7	12	17	134	160	
Total	54	67	37	221	251	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the responses to the overall experience with the laboratory services between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the responses to the overall experience with the laboratory services between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 20 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses in the overall satisfaction with respect to the laboratory services between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=294 (Satisfied=134, Highly satisfied= 160) from N=178 (Satisfied =87, Highly satisfied=91). Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table21. Overall satisfaction score by combining the responses: (Higher the score the better the satisfaction)

Lab questions combined				
Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T test statistic, p-value
Before Accreditation	300	43.6267	19.07389	-9.203, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	330	55.4424	11.99308	

p-value in bold represents a significant test with p-value<0.05

Hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the overall satisfaction by combining the responses between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is a significant difference in the overall satisfaction by combining the responses between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 21 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses between before (M=43.63, SD=19.07) and after accreditation (M=55.44, SD=11.99) with p-value <0.001. The mean satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation. Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

CONCLUSION

At the 5 % level of significance, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses between before (M=43.63, SD=19.07) and after accreditation (M=55.44, SD=11.99) with p-value <0.001. The mean satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation. The satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation which indicated that the accreditation has a positive impact on the satisfaction of Laboratory Department Services of the study hospital.

KY Publications

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited to the Laboratory Department Services of the study hospital and for a limited duration (before two months and after two months of accreditation) only.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In future such research should be conducted to study the impact of national and international accreditations on the other services of the hospitals over a large period of time.

SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR THE STUDY:

This research was self financed by the author himself.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS:

The accreditation has a positive impact on the satisfaction of Laboratory Department Services of the study hospital.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

DISCLAIMER

REFERENCES

[i]Agrawal D. Health Sector Reforms: Relevance in India. Indian Journal of Community Medicine 2006; 31:220-2

[ii]Oliver, R.L. (1977), "Effects of expectation and disconfirmation on post-exposure product evaluations: An alternative interpretation", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 64 No. 4, pp. 246-50.

[iii] Quality of care: a process for making strategic choices in health systems, World Health Organization 2006.

[iv]Lluis Bohigas et al. A comparative analysis of surveyors from six hospital accreditation programmes and a consideration of the related management issues, International Journal for Quality in Health Cane 1998; Volume 10, Number I: pp. 7-13.

[v]Saeed AA, Mohammed BA, Magzoub ME, Al-Doghaither AH (2001).Satisfaction and correlates of patients' satisfaction with physicians' services in primary health care centers. Saud Med J. Mar; 22(3): 262-7.

[vi]Heuer AJ (2004). Hospital accreditation and patient satisfaction: testing the relationship. J Healthc Qual. Jan-Feb; 26(1):46-51.

[vii]Al-Habdan I (2004). Survy of satisfaction of patients attending pediatric orthopedic clinics at King Fahd Hospital of the University, al-Khobar. Saudi Med. J. 25(3):388-389.

[viii]Saeed AA, Mohamed BA (2002). Patients' perspective on factors affecting utilization of primary health care centers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Saudi Medical J. 23(10): 1237-1242.

[ix]Spreng, R.A., MacKenzie, S.B. and Olshavsky, R.W. (1996), "A re-examination of the determinants of consumer satisfaction", Journal of Marketing, Vol. 60, July, pp. 15-32.

[x]Jenkinson C, Coulter A, Bruster S, Richards N, Chandola T. Patient's experiences and satisfaction with healthcare: Results of a questionnaire study of specific aspects of care. Qual Saf Health Care 2002; 11:335-9

[xi]McKinley RK, Roberts C. Patient's Satisfaction with out of hours primary medical care. Qual Health Care 2001; 10:23-8

[xii]World Health Organization. The World Health Report 2000- Health Systems: Improving Performance. Geneva: WHO, 2000.