

Do Public Hospitals Respond to the Needs of All Patients in the New South Africa?

M. Femi Ayadi, University of Houston, USA
AyadiM@uhcl.edu

Johan de Jager and T du Plooy, Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa
DeJagerJW@tut.ac.za

The evaluation of public healthcare is important for customers, healthcare providers and society. Understanding the determinants of healthcare satisfaction will lead to the improvement of healthcare quality in developing countries. In this study in- patients and out- patients' expectations, perceptions and satisfaction with the responsiveness provided by public healthcare in South-Africa is measured by using SERVQUAL. The major findings were that all patients demand excellent responsive levels but none of these were met, resulting in dissatisfaction. Overall patients were least satisfied with reasonable waiting time for receiving medicine as well as reasonable waiting time for treatment. The findings of this study could be used to guide public hospitals to render health-care programmes more patient-centred and to increase their efficiency in a context of scarce resources.

INTRODUCTION

Services are becoming an increasingly important element of national economies and it is crucial to appreciate the distinguishing qualities of services and resulting management implications with specific focus on healthcare services. The delivery of quality healthcare services and the integration of thereof in healthcare policies is a concern in various health organisations across the world (James, 2005:2). In the past decade in particular, patient satisfaction has become an important performance measure and outcome of healthcare (Sohail, 2003; Zineldin, 2006; Akter, Upal & Hani, 2008). Research on healthcare satisfaction is vital to ensure a high quality of care and patient satisfaction and to maximize the benefits of scarce resources, although this is still limited in South Africa (Wouters, Heunis, van Rensburg & Meulemans, 2008). Thus determining the factors associated with patient's satisfaction is critical for public healthcare providers in order to understand what is valued by patients, how the quality of care is perceived by the patients and to know where, when and how service changes and improvements could be made.

SERVICE MARKETING IN PUBLIC HEALTHCARE

There are various definitions of what constitutes a service but contemporary definitions agree that a service in itself delivers no tangible output, although it may facilitate the production of tangible products (Palmer, 2008). Armstrong and Kotler (2003) define a service as any act or performance that one party can offer to another that is essentially intangible and does not result in the ownership of anything. Services are also described as “deeds, performances or efforts that cannot be physical possessed (Lamb, Hair, McDaniel, Boshoff & Terblanche, 2004). Services have unique features that differentiate them from goods namely: intangibility, inseparability, heterogeneity and perishability (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1985; Palmer 2008). The intangibility of services results in high risk and difficulty for consumer to evaluate the quality causing them to rely on personnel information sources, physical evidence and price rather than the core service. Service organisations in return react to this by focussing on physical evidence

and service quality (Palmer, 2008). Service providers in the public healthcare sector should also understand the strategic- and management implications as a result of these characteristics.

A further challenge for managers and service providers in public healthcare arises from the fact that these services are provided by public originations. The application of marketing to public services is unique and challenging compared to services in the private sector (Palmer, 2008). In the public sector the choice of the buyers and sellers is much more limited. In public healthcare patients will only receive treatment at the hospital where they are designated and public healthcare organizations at various levels serve specific areas and needs as determined by the policy of the South African government. The aim of the public sector is not to earn a profit and it doesn't operate within narrow internal financial goals, however its goals are more diverse with various external stakeholders. Public managers have relatively limited discretion with the standards and ways of service delivery based on legislation and policies of the government. In South Africa, quality public service delivery is the focus of the White paper on the Transformation of Public Services and is guided by the Batho Pele (a Sotho word meaning "People First") principle. This philosophy serves as guide for public service delivery in South-Africa and demands that patients should be at the centre of healthcare service delivery capable of satisfying the healthcare needs of all South Africans equally. Continuous evaluation of the quality delivered by public healthcare organisations in South-Africa is therefore essential to implement the policies of the government effectively and efficiently (Arries & Newman, 2008).

SERVICE QUALITY IN PUBLIC HEALTHCARE

Grönroos (1984) was the first who attempted to define and explain service quality and differentiated between the process of delivery (functional quality), which relates to the perceived quality and the actual output of the service (technical quality), which relates to objective quality. Technical quality in healthcare is the accuracy of diagnosis and procedures and functional quality refers to the manner of delivery of healthcare. Sohail (2003) is of the opinion that service quality is primarily shaped by functional quality, because patients often find it difficult to assess the technical quality. Service quality, unlike product quality, is more abstract and elusive, because of features unique to services is therefore difficult to evaluate and measure. Evaluating the quality of service can be complicated due to the following reasons (Lamb *et al.*, 2004). Firstly, services have fewer search qualities that can easily be assessed before a use or purchase. Healthcare is characterized by high involvement of the consumers due to the higher risk in terms of outcomes, yet it requires the complete involvement of these customers during the service production and delivery process (Palmer, 2008). This implies that the quality of the process and outcome is of equal importance. Secondly services tend to exhibit more experience qualities that can only be assessed after use, such as the quality of medical consultation and treatment resulting in better health. Lastly services tend to exhibit more credence qualities that consumers may have difficulty assessing, even after the purchase, because they may not have the necessary knowledge or experience. For instance, even after undergoing an operation, a patient may be unable to assess whether the quality of service received was good or not.

Quality within healthcare service delivery refers to services that meet set standards, implying excellence, and satisfy the needs of both consumers and health-care practitioners in a way that adds significant meaning to both parties healthcare experiences (Arries & Newman, 2008). Zineldin (2006) advocates that quality healthcare should be regarded as the right of all patients and ought to be the responsibility of all the staff within healthcare organisations. Internationally, healthcare quality is still a concern as reflected by the various studies published recently (Sohail, 2003; Zineldin, 2006; Akter, Upal & Hani, 2008). The most popular model of service quality is SERVQUAL, a set of 22 structured and paired questions designed to assess customers' expectations of service provision and the customers' perceptions of what was actually delivered. This instrument is structured in five dimensions, namely: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy: (Parasuraman, *et al.*, 1988). SERVQUAL is widely used by academics and practitioners to measure service quality including numerous studies on service quality in

the healthcare (Akter, Upal & Hani, 2008; Sohail, 2003). Zineldin, (2006) explored how patients in Egypt and Jordan evaluate the quality of health care and comment that health quality models applied in the West are not necessary applicable in developing countries. This study consequently identified the health attributes found to be appropriate for hospitals in Egypt and Jordan. Two existing models namely the technical/functional and SERVQUAL quality models was adopted to develop a new five quality (5Q) model for healthcare. It includes technical, functional infrastructure, interaction and atmosphere qualities and services. In this study patients' satisfaction with the quality of service delivered at a number of public and private hospitals in Egypt and Jordan was measured. Akter, Upal and Hani (2008) assessed the service quality and satisfaction in suburban public hospitals in Bangladesh. They adopted and applied SERVQUAL to measure the difference between patients' expectation and perception of delivered service on the following dimensions of service quality: responsiveness, assurance, communication, discipline (adherence to rules and regulations) and baksheesh (additional compensation). It was found that the majority of suburban public hospitals do not meet the patient's expectations on all these dimensions resulting in dissatisfaction.

Two of the recent studies on service quality in the healthcare sector in South-Africa include those by Wouters *et al.* (2008) and Arries and Newman (2008). Wouters, Heunis, van Rensburg and Meulemans (2008) evaluated patient satisfaction with antiretroviral services at primary health-care facilities in South Africa in a longitudinal study. In this study, high levels of patient satisfaction were found despite the limited human resources available. Arries and Newman (2008) conducted qualitative research to explore outpatient's experiences of the quality of services delivered at a public hospital in Gauteng. It was found that outpatients reported positive experiences with the medical staff, specifically the doctors, while they had negative experiences with the lack of service orientation especially the nursing staff, unethical situations, and frustrating inter-personal relationship difficulties. The study for this paper is not qualitative like Arries and Newman. Quantitative methodology was applied by interviewing in-patients as well as out-patients at another training hospital in Gauteng. The questionnaire used in this study also differentiate clearly between services provided by doctors, nurses as well as non medical staff in order exactly evaluate the performance of each groups as experienced by the patients. SERVQUAL was used in the study to measure in- and out- patients expectations, perceived performance and satisfaction with the responsiveness provided by the large public hospital in Gauteng.

HYPOTHESIS

Three primary hypotheses are tested namely:

Hypothesis 1

Ho: In- and out-patients have the same level of expectations with regard to hospital responsiveness variables.

If the Ho hypothesis is accepted then it can be assumed that equality exists amongst in- and out-patients and that all patients expect the same level of treatment with regards to responsiveness. On the other hand, if the Ho hypothesis is rejected it is assumed that in- and out-patients inequality exists in terms of their expectations.

Hypothesis 2

Ho: There exist no significant differences between in- and out-patients with regard to the perceived performance of the hospital in terms of responsiveness.

Hypotheses 3

Ho: There exist no significant differences between in- and out patients' satisfaction levels with regard to the hospital's responsiveness respectively.

If the Ho hypothesis is accepted then it implies that the expectations of patients are met, leading to a feeling of satisfaction. On the other hand, if the Ho hypothesis is rejected, then it is assumed that patients

expectations are not met which may lead to a feeling of dissatisfaction. The null hypothesis is tested at a 0.05 significance level.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this paper is to examine responsiveness as determinant of service quality in a government-controlled hospital in South Africa.

The objectives of this study are twofold namely:

- To determine if equality exists between in- patients and out-patients for the service responsiveness provided to patients in a government-controlled hospital in South Africa (perceived performance).
- To determine whether the expectations of in- and out-patients on how hospital staff responds to their needs in terms of the responsiveness variables, are met (satisfaction).

In- patients refer to patients admitted in the hospital and out-patients refer to patients who receive medical consultation and/or treatment without being admitted. The service responsiveness content under investigation includes the constructs: Prompt service during registration/admission, Reasonable waiting time for treatment, Reasonable waiting time for receiving medicine, Responsiveness to complaints, Speediness of services by medical staff, Proper explaining of hospital procedure (what to do and where).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology that was followed for the investigation is consequently explained. The data analysis illustrates the levels of importance, perceived performance and consequently satisfaction of one dimension of service quality dimensions for in- and out- patients of the hospital namely, responsiveness.

The SPSS version 15.0 statistical package was utilised to analyse the data. For this analysis the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was employed based on the assumption that if the significant values exceeded 0.5, normality could not be assumed and the researchers had to rely on employing non-parametric analysis techniques. As normality could not be assumed after applying the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test the researchers employed the Kruskal Wallis test to test the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between the levels of importance and satisfaction between the two groups respectively and that there exists significant differences between the groups of patients.

The sample framework, measuring instrument and data collection and analysis

A service satisfaction survey was conducted in 2007 amongst patients treated at a provincial hospital in Gauteng, South Africa. The attitudes of the patients were tested regarding pre-identified service quality aspects related to healthcare. A total of 448 patients (205 in- and 242 outpatients) were personally interviewed during the research. Although an attempt was made to select the patients randomly it was not always possible due to patients that were not able and/or willing to complete the questionnaires. In such cases substitutes were selected to overcome the problem of no-responses.

The expectations and perceptions of in- and out-patients with regard to the hospital's responsiveness services is reported in this paper. The two dimensions represented a mirror-image of each other. A five - point Likert type scale was used to measure the levels of perceived performance of the hospitals as well as the expectation levels of the patients. Respondents were asked to indicate their evaluation on the scales in which 1 = Very important (Excellent) and 5 = Not important at all (Not good at all.)

A total of 6 items were used to measure the responsiveness related variables as offered by the hospital. An item analysis was carried out to test the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire and an overall Cronbach coefficient Alpha of 0.91254 and 0.9163 were measured for expectations and performance respectively. Data was captured by a trained assistant and analysed using the SPSS version 15 statistical

package. Data was analysed after grouping the list of 53 pre-identified service related variables into five service related groupings. Only the responsiveness dimension were analysed for the purpose of this paper.

FINDINGS

The patients reported fairly high expectations on all the responsiveness variables (table 1). This clearly signals that all patients demand excellent responsive levels. The two most important issues (in terms of their expectations) for patients in general were: Proper explaining of hospital procedure (what to do and where to go) and speediness of services by medical staff. Interesting to note is that the perceived performance of the hospitals services was in the same sequence, implying that satisfaction was met in terms of the rank. However if the mean is used as indication, satisfaction was not met as the means of expectations were lower than the perceived performance.

Table 1: Test for differences with regard to expectations on responsiveness constructs

Responsiveness:	N	In-patients		Out-patients		Total patients		Sig pvalue
		Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	
Prompt service during registration/admission V 36	448	1.93	1.11	1.71	0.97	1.83 2	1.05	0.022
Reasonable waiting time for treatment V 37	448	1.96	1.17	1.82	1.07	1.9 5	1.12	0.198
Reasonable waiting time for receiving medicine V 38	448	1.82	1.13	1.9	1.17	1.85 4	1.15	0.422
Responsiveness to complaints V 39	448	2.07	1.54	2.27	1.47	2.16 6	1.50	0.031
Speediness of services by medical staff V 40	448	1.89	1.3	1.75	1.05	1.83 2	1.2	0.029
Proper explaining of hospital procedure (what to do and where to	448	1.9	1.12	1.7	1.04	1.81 1	1.1	0.022

*Significant on 0.95 level

Std = standard deviation

With regards to the two groups, in-patients expectations of the two most preferred variables were significantly higher compared to those of outpatients. The overall least preferred variable in the responsiveness category was responsiveness to complaints. Significant differences were measured between in-and outpatients with out-patients rated it significantly less important than in-patients.

Table 2: Test for significant differences with regard to perceived performance on responsiveness constructs

Responsiveness:	N	Inpatients		Outpatients		Total patients		Sig
		Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	
Prompt service during registration/admission V 89	448	2.58	1.36	2.7	1.3	2.63 3	1.33	0.185
Reasonable waiting time for treatment V 90	448	2.68	1.36	2.93	1.4	2.8 5	1.39	0.054
Reasonable waiting time for receiving medicine V 91	448	2.5	1.37	3.12	1.51	2.79 4	1.47	0.001
Responsiveness to complaints V 92	448	2.67	1.54	3.37	1.63	2.98 6	1.62	0.001
Speediness of services by medical staff V 93	448	2.48	1.33	2.46	1.22	2.47 2	1.29	0.824
Proper explaining of hospital procedure (what to do and where to go)	448	2.39	1.23	2.4	1.3	2.39 1	1.26	0.74

*Significant on 0.95 level

Std = standard deviation

A non-parametric test procedure was used to compare the patient's expectations with regard to the responsiveness variables with their perceived performance of the hospital, as experienced by the sample as a whole. The test computes the differences between the mean values of two variables for each case and tests whether the average differs significantly from 0. This test could be used as the observations for each variable pair was made under the same conditions. The aim was to determine whether performance on responsiveness matches the expectations of patients or not.

Table 3: Test for significant differences between expectations and perceived performance of responsiveness

Responsiveness:	In-patients				Out-patients				Total patients		
	Em	Pm	Em - Pm	Sig	Em	Pm	Em - Pm	Sig	Em	Pm	Em - Pm
Prompt service during registration/admission V 36-	1.53	2.58	-1.05	0.0001	1.71	2.7	-0.99	0.0001	1.83	2.63	-0.83
Reasonable waiting time for treatment V 37 – 90	1.93	2.68	-0.75	0.0001	1.82	2.93	-1.11	0.0001	1.9	2.8	-0.95
Reasonable waiting time for receiving medicine V 38 – 91	1.96	2.5	-0.54	0.0001	1.9	3.12	-1.22	0.0001	1.85	2.79	-0.946
Responsiveness to complaints V 39 – 92	1.82	2.67	-0.85	0.0001	2.27	3.37	-1.1	0.0001	2.16	2.98	-0.824
Speediness of services by medical staff V 40 – 93	2.07	2.48	-0.41	0.0001	1.75	2.46	-0.71	0.0001	1.83	2.47	-0.642
Proper explaining of hospital procedure (what to do and	1.89	2.39	-0.5	0.0001	1.7	2.4	-0.7	0.0001	1.81	2.39	-0.581

Em = Expectations mean Pm = Perceived performance mean

Significant on 0.95level

Significant differences exist between expectations and perceived performance for both in-and out-patients on all responsiveness variables. This is an indication that expectations have not been met. The overall smallest deviation between expectations and perceived performance is measured in terms of proper explaining of hospital procedure where in-patients are less dissatisfied with this variable compared to out-patients. This variable was rated first in terms of expectations as well as their perceived performance of the hospitals services. The overall second smallest deviation between expectations and perceived performance is the speediness of services provided by medical staff. Again in-patients were less dissatisfied with this service. The variable in this category that was perceived most dissatisfied was reasonable waiting time for receiving medicine. Out-patients indicated the highest level of dissatisfaction with regard to this variable. This variable was rated relatively important in terms of expectations.

CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The results of the investigation hold important implications for future planning and development in the South African healthcare industry and more specifically, public hospitals. Service managers should take cognisance of the most important service quality issues identified in this investigation. In this regard, (in terms of their expectations) for patients in general were: Proper explaining of hospital procedure (what to do and where to go) and speediness of services by medical staff. Coincidentally the order in which they perceived the performance of the hospitals services was in the same sequence. Further measurements however confirmed that satisfaction was not met. Consequently, it is important to communicate these findings to the respective individuals or groups that take responsibility for satisfying customer needs, in particular public hospitals.

The importance of these findings lies incontrovertibly therein that they prospectively contribute towards a constructive paradigm shift that espouses the benefits of an improved perception of service delivery, especially, but not necessary limited to the public health sector. Based on the findings of this study it can be recommended in the public health sector should consist of investment in, firstly, an analysis of

patients' perceptions of the performance of a hospital on ongoing and formalised basis and secondly, of proper staff and management training sessions. With regard to specific outcomes, service managers should be aware of the various gaps in performance in the responsiveness dimension, such as proper explaining of hospital procedure.

In conclusion, the findings of this study clearly identifies important positive and negative perceptions regarding the healthcare services provided by the hospital under examination and substantiate the conclusion that it is imperative the hospital management take the necessary measures to improve the perceived performance of the hospital. A different approach should be considered and implemented to satisfy the needs of in- and out- patients as significant differences exist between the two groups.

REFERENCES

- Akter, S. Hani, U. and Upal, M. (2008). "Service Quality Perception and Satisfaction: A study over Sub-urban Public Hospitals in Bangladesh." *International Journal of Services Research*. February (Special Issue):125-145.
- Arries, E. J. and Newman, O. (2008). "Outpatients' Experiences of Quality Service Delivery at a Teaching Hospital in Gauteng." *Health SA Gesondheid*, 13(1):40-54.
- Armstrong, G. and Kotler, P. (2003). *Principles of Marketing*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Boshoff, C., and Gray, B. (2004). "The relationship between service quality, customer satisfaction and buying intentions in the private hospital industry." *South African Journal of Business Management*, 35(4): 27-37.
- Grönroos, C. (1984). "A Service quality model and its marketing implications." *European Journal of Marketing*, 18 (4): 36-44.
- James, C. (2005). "Manufacturing's prescription for improving healthcare quality." *Hospital Topics*, 83(1):2-8.
- Lamb, JF. Hair, C. McDaniel, C. Boshoff, N. and Terblanche. (2004). *Marketing*. Cape Town, South Africa. Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Ovretveit, J. (2004). "Formulating a health quality improvement strategy." *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 17(3): 368-76.
- Palmer, A. 2008. *Principles of Services Marketing*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., and Berry, L.L. (1985). "A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for further research." *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4): 41-50.
- Sohail, M. (2003). "Service quality in hospitals: more favourable than you might think". *Managing Service Quality*, 13(2):197-206.
- Zineldin, M. (2006). The quality of health care and patient satisfaction: "An exploratory investigation of the 5Qs model at some Egyptian and Jordanian medical clinics." *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 19(1):60-92.
- Wouters, E. Heunis, C. van Rensburg, D. and Meulemans, H. (2008). "Patient satisfaction with antiretroviral services at primary health-care facilities in the Free State, South Africa – a two-year study using four waves of cross-sectional data." *BMC Health Services Research*, 8:210.

