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 PHYSIOTHERAPY 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

Dr. Zuber Mujeeb Shaikh

ABSTRACT

The quality of Physiotherapy Department 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 Physiotherapy 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 Physiotherapy 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 Physiotherapy 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 Physiotherapy Department Services two months before and two months after the accreditation. The data were collected in order to cover all three shifts of the Physiotherapy 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 chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the level of satisfaction with respect to patients experience in the physiotherapy department between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=174 (Satisfied=110, Highly satisfied= 64) from N=117 (Satisfied = 79, Highly satisfied= 38).

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

I. 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 [1]. Satisfaction has been defined as a consumer's emotional feelings about a specific consumption experience [2]. Today, developed and 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 [3]. 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 [4].

II. 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 [5]. The literature emphasizes that hospital accreditation and patient satisfaction are both considered important quality indicators of healthcare delivered [6]. The results of patient satisfaction surveys can be used to monitor the quality of health care provided [7], to find out any shortages, to provide the necessary interventions, and as a valuable source of strategic planning of health services [8]. 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 [9]. Patient's perceptions about health care system seem to have been largely ignored by the health care managers in the developing countries [10]. 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 [11]. Therefore, assessing patient perspectives gives them a voice, which can make private and public health services more responsive to people's need and expectations [12].

III. DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Patient participation before and after accreditation

Groups	Frequency	Percent
Before Accreditation	180	48.8
After Accreditation	189	51.2
Total	369	100

Table 1 depicts that 180 patients were participated before accreditation and 189 patients were participated after accreditation. The participation of patients had increased only after accreditation.

Table 2: Groups and Age distribution

Group	Age					Chi square, p-value
	<18yrs	18-25yrs	25-55yrs	55-65yrs	>65yrs	
Before Accreditation	16	59	63	32	10	1.041, 0.904
After Accreditation	18	59	62	35	15	
Total	34	118	125	67	25	

Hypothesis:

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

H_1: There is significant difference in the Age categories between before 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.

Table 3: Group and Gender Distribution

Groups	Gender		Chi square, p-value
	Male	Female	
Before Accreditation	93	87	0.196, 0.658
After Accreditation	102	87	
Total	195	174	

Hypothesis:

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

H_1: There is significant difference in the gender distribution between before 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.

Table 4: Group and Geographical states Distribution

Groups	Geographical States (Of India)		Chi square, p-value
	Same State	Other States	
Before Accreditation	95	85	0.196, 0.658
After Accreditation	103	86	
Total	198	171	

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) in before and after accreditation groups.

Table 5: Distribution of patient's language and group

Group	Language		Chi square, p-value
	Telugu	Non-Telugu	
Before Accreditation	101	79	0.164, 0.685
After Accreditation	110	79	
Total	211	158	

Hypothesis:

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

H_1: There is significant difference in the language patients speak between before 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 among those who have visited hospital and before and after accreditation groups.

Table 6: Type of visits and Group

Groups	Type of visits			Chi square, p-value
	In-Patient Department	Out-Patient Department	Emergency Department	
Before Accreditation	18	152	10	0.127, 0.938
After Accreditation	21	158	10	
Total	39	310	20	

Hypothesis:

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

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

Table 7: Type of payment and Group

Group	Payment type		Chi square, p-value
	Cash	Insurance	
Before Accreditation	79	101	0.009, 0.922
After Accreditation	82	107	
Total	161	208	

Hypothesis:

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

H_1: There is significant difference in the type of payment made between before 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.

Table 8: Groups Versus How satisfied were you with the duration of waiting time for your/ patient's appointment with your physiotherapist?

Groups	How would you rate your level of satisfaction with respect to your experience in the physiotherapy department?					Chi square test, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	24	31	8	79	38	41.640, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	4	8	3	110	64	
Total	28	39	11	189	102	

p-value in bold represents 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 waiting time before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the waiting time before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the waiting time between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=174 (Satisfied=110, Highly satisfied= 64) from N=117 (Satisfied = 79, Highly satisfied= 38).

Table 9: Groups Versus How satisfied were you with the explanation given about the delay of your/ patient's appointment?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the explanation given about the delay of your/ patient's appointment? (patient centered)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	24	35	11	58	52	59.422, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	5	8	2	124	50	
Total	29	43	13	182	102	

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

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the explanation with respect to the explanation about the delay of appointment before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect the explanation with respect to the explanation about the delay of appointment before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect the explanation with respect to the explanation about the delay of appointment between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=174 (Satisfied=124, Highly satisfied= 50) from N=110 (Satisfied = 58, Highly satisfied= 52).

Table 10. Groups versus How satisfied were you with the courtesy provided by the staff on arrival?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the courtesy provided by the staff on arrival? (equitable)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	28	24	10	64	54	53.453, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	6	6	2	130	45	
Total	34	30	12	194	99	

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

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the courtesy provided by the staff on arrival before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is significhant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the courtesy provided by the staff on arrival before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the courtesy provided by the staff on arrival between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=175 (Satisfied=130, Highly satisfied= 45) from N=118 (Satisfied =64, Highly satisfied= 54).

Table 11. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the opportunity you/ patient were given for asking questions during your consultation?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the opportunity you/ patient were given for asking questions during your consultation? (patient centered)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	25	28	8	70	49	36.631, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	6	9	4	122	48	
Total	31	37	12	192	97	

p-value in bold represents 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 opportunity you/ patient were given for asking questions during your consultation before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the opportunity you/ patient were given for asking questions during your consultation before accreditation group and after accreditation group

Table 11 depicts that at the 5% level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the opportunity you/ patient were given for asking questions during your consultationbetween before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=170 (Satisfied=122, Highly satisfied= 48) from N=119 (Satisfied = 70, Highly satisfied= 49).

Table 12. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the physiotherapist on evaluating you/ patient on your first visit? (Effective, efficient)

Groups	How satisfied were you with the physiotherapist on evaluating you/ patient on your first visit? (Effective, efficient)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	29	22	13	64	52	38.221, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	8	11	4	121	45	
Total	37	33	17	185	97	

p-value in bold represents 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 physiotherapist on evaluating you/ patient on your first visit before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the physiotherapist on evaluating you/ patient on your first visit before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the physiotherapist on evaluating you/ patient on your first visitbetween before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=166 (Satisfied=121, Highly satisfied= 45) from N=114 (Satisfied = 64, Highly satisfied= 52).

Table 13. Groups versus how satisfied were you with your involvement in all decisions about your/ patient's care/condition?

Groups	How satisfied were you with your involvement in all decisions about your/ patient's care/condition?					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	29	24	11	59	57	41.470, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	7	8	4	113	57	
Total	36	32	15	172	114	

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

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the your involvement in all decisions about your/ patient's care/condition before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the your involvement in all decisions about your/ patient's care/condition before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the your involvement in all decisions about your/ patient's care/condition between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=170 (Satisfied=113, Highly satisfied= 57) from N=116 (Satisfied = 59, Highly satisfied= 57).

Table14. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the treatment (or advice/ support) received from the physiotherapist? (Effective)

Groups	How satisfied were you with the treatment (or advice/ support) received from the physiotherapist? (effective)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	26	28	12	64	50	45.550, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	6	10	3	124	46	
Total	32	38	15	188	96	

p-value in bold represents 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 treatment (or advice/ support) received from the physiotherapist before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the treatment (or advice/ support) received from the physiotherapist before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the treatment (or advice/ support) received from the physiotherapistbefore and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=160 (Satisfied=124, Highly satisfied= 46) from N=114 (Satisfied = 64, Highly satisfied= 50).

Table 15. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the instructions given by the physiotherapist about your/ patient's condition or treatment and necessary information/ exercise to be done at home?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the instructions given by the physiotherapist about your/ patient's condition or treatment and necessary information/ exercise to be done at home?					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	26	31	8	59	56	58.999, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	5	5	3	125	51	
Total	31	36	11	184	107	

p-value in bold represents 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 instructions given by the physiotherapist about your/ patient's condition or treatment and necessary information/ exercise to be done at home before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the instructions given by the physiotherapist about your/ patient's condition or treatment and necessary information/ exercise to be done at home before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the instructions given by the physiotherapist about your/ patient's condition or treatment and necessary information/ exercise to be done at homebetween before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=176 (Satisfied=125, Highly satisfied= 51) from N=115(Satisfied = 59, Highly satisfied= 56).

Table 16. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the necessary information given to you and/or your family about the reason and benefits of the treatment / exercise

Groups	How satisfied were you with the necessary information given to you and/or your family about the reason and benefits of the treatment / exercise					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	31	25	12	63	49	57.965, **<0.001**

KY Publications

After Accreditation	3	4	5	116	61	
Total	34	29	17	179	110	

p-value in bold represents 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 necessary information given to you and/or your family about the reason and benefits of the treatment / exercise before accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the necessary information given to you and/or your family about the reason and benefits of the treatment / exercise before 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 significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the necessary information given to you and/or your family about the reason and benefits of the treatment / exercise department between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=177 (Satisfied=116, Highly satisfied= 61) from N=102(Satisfied = 63, Highly satisfied= 49).

Table 17. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the privacy given to you/ patient when treated or advised?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the privacy given to you/ patient when treated or advised?					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	29	23	11	64	53	37.646, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	7	8	2	101	71	
Total	36	31	13	165	124	

p-value in bold represents 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 privacy given to you/ patient when treated or advised

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the privacy given to you/ patient when treated or advised

Table 17 depicts that at the 5% level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the privacy given to you/ patient when treated or advised between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=172 (Satisfied=101, Highly satisfied= 71) from N=117(Satisfied = 64, Highly satisfied= 53).

Table 18. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the cleanliness and safety of the environment in the waiting area, Consultation Room, Procedure Room and the Gym?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the cleanliness and safety of the environment in the waiting area, Consultation Room, Procedure Room and the Gym? (safe)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	30	28	10	72	40	34.360, **<0.001**

| After Accreditation | 11 | 6 | 6 | 105 | 61 | |
| Total | 41 | 34 | 16 | 177 | 101 | |

p-value in bold represents 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 and safety of the environment in the waiting area, Consultation Room, Procedure Room and the Gym

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety of the environment in the waiting area, Consultation Room, Procedure Room and the Gym

Table 18 depicts that at the 5% level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety of the environment in the waiting area, Consultation Room, Procedure Room and the Gym between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=166 (Satisfied=105, Highly satisfied= 61) from N=112(Satisfied = 72, Highly satisfied= 40).

Table 19. Groups versus how satisfied were you with the treatment provided by the physiotherapy staff?

Groups	How satisfied were you with the treatment provided by the physiotherapy staff? (effective)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	18	35	10	76	41	44.618, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	5	5	4	104	71	
Total	23	40	14	180	112	

p-value in bold represents 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 treatment provided by the physiotherapy staff?

H_1: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the treatment provided by the physiotherapy staff?

Table 19 depicts that at the 5% level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the treatment provided by the physiotherapy staffbetween before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=175 (Satisfied=104, Highly satisfied= 71) from N=117 (Satisfied = 76, Highly satisfied= 41).

Table 20. Groups versus how would you rate your level of satisfaction with respect to your experience in the physiotherapy department?

Groups	How would you rate your level of satisfaction with respect to your experience in the physiotherapy department?					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Before Accreditation	24	31	8	79	38	41.640, **<0.001**
After Accreditation	4	8	3	110	64	
Total	28	39	11	189	102	

p-value in bold represents 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 level of satisfaction with respect to your experience in the physiotherapy department

H$_1$: There is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the level of satisfaction with respect to your experience in the physiotherapy department

Table 20 depicts that at the 5% level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the level of satisfaction with respect to patients experience in the physiotherapy department between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=174 (Satisfied=110, Highly satisfied= 64) from N=117 (Satisfied = 79, Highly satisfied= 38).

IV.   CONCLUSION

At the 5% level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is significant difference in the responses in the satisfaction with respect to the level of satisfaction with respect to patients experience in the physiotherapy department between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction has improved to N=174 (Satisfied=110, Highly satisfied= 64) from N=117 (Satisfied = 79, Highly satisfied= 38). The satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation which indicates that the accreditation has a positive impact on the satisfaction of Physiotherapy Department of the study hospital.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited to the Physiotherapy 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

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

DISCLAIMER

REFERENCES

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

[2]   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.

KY Publications

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

[4]   Lluis Bohigas et all. 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.

[5]   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.

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

[7]   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.

[8]   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.

[9]   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.

[10]   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

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

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