

**Summer Training at
Seven Hills Hospital,
Mumbai
(April - June, 2013)**

Optimize the Patient Satisfaction in OPD

**By
Hemant Kumar Jain**

**Under the guidance of
Dr. J. P. Singh**

**Post Graduate Diploma in Hospital and Health Management
2012-2014**



**Institute of Health Management Research,
Jaipur
2013**

**INSTITUTE OF HEALTH
MANAGEMENT RESEARCH**

1, Prabhu Dayal Marg

Sanganer Airport, JAIPUR - 302 011, INDIA

Tel. : 3924700, 2791431-32

Fax : 91-141-3924738

E-mail : iihmr@iihmr.org

URL : <http://www.iihmr.org>

Gram : HEALTHINST

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that Hemant Kumar Jain, student of Post Graduate Diploma in Health and Hospital Management (PGDHM), from the Institute of Health Management Research (IHMR), Jaipur batch 17th has undergone summer training in SevenHills hospital, Mumbai and has done following project:

1. Optimize the patient satisfaction in OPD.

The candidate has successfully carried out the study assigned to him during the summer training from 8th April to 8th June and his approach to study has been sincere, scientific and analytical.

I wish her success in all his future endeavors.


Prof. Jagjeet Prasad Singh

Faculty and Mentor

IIHMR, Jaipur



Dr. Ashok Kaushik

Dean, Academics and Student Affairs

IIHMR, Jaipur

Ref: SHEHL/HRD/IL/May-13/007

31st May, 2013.

Whomsoever It May concern

This is to certify that **Mr. Hemant Jain** was doing Internship with SevenHills Hospital from 08th April 2013 to 31st May 2013. During this period he had a chance to understand and work closely with the Operations department and understand different aspects associated with it.

The project on "Optimizing Patient Satisfaction in OPD", has given good insight by creating brief statistical and analytical reports for future business prospects.

His exposure in these areas is very good. During his tenure he also aptly handled major responsibilities and found him to be hard working and productive.

We have found him to be a self starter, who is motivated, duty bound with strong conceptual knowledge.

We at Seven Hills wish him all the success in his future endeavors.

For, SevenHills Healthcare Private Limited.



Sanjay Gaikwad

General Manager – Human Resources

TABLE OF CONTENT

S.NO.	CONTENT	PAGE NO.
1.	Introduction	15
2.	Aim of the study	17
3.	Objectives	17
4.	Review of literature:	17
5.	Research design	20
6.	Material and methods	20
7.	Ethical consideration	21
8.	Results	22
9.	Discussion	123
10.	Conclusion	130
11.	Recommendation	131

List of Tables

Table No.	Particulars	Page no.
1.	Distribution of Socio-Demographic Parameters	22
2.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	23
3.	Age wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	23
4.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	23
5.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	24
6.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	24
7.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	25
8.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception	25
9.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	25
10.	Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	26
11.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	26
12.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	27
13.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	27
14.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	28
15.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff	28
16.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	29
17.	Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	29
18.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	30
19.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	30
20.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	31
21.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	31
22.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff	32

23.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception	32
24.	Age wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception	32
25.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception	33
26.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception	33
27.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception	34
28.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception	34
29.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception	35
30.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	35
31.	Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	35
32.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	36
33.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	36
34.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	37
35.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	37
36.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive	38
37.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	38
38.	Age wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	38
39.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	39
40.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	39
41.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	40
42.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	40
43.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive	41
44.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive	41
45.	Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive	41
46.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive	42

47.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive	42
48.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executives	43
49.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive	43
50.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive	43
51.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	44
52.	Age wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	44
53.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	44
54.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	45
55.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	45
56.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	46
57.	Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	46
58.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	46
59.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system	47
60.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	47
61.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	48
62.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	48
63.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	49
64.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration	49
65.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	49
66.	Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	50
67.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	50
68.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	50
69.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	51
70.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	51

71.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration	52
72.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	52
73.	Age wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	52
74.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	53
75.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	53
76.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	54
77.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	54
78.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter	54
79.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in waiting area	55
80.	Age wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in waiting area	55
81.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area	55
82.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area	56
83.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area	56
84.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area	57
85.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area	57
86.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	57
87.	Age wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	58
88.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	58
89.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	58
90.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	59
91.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	59
92.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area	60
93.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on Information display	60
94.	Age wise distribution of opinion on Information display	60
95.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on Information display	61
96.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on Information display	61
97.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on and Information display	62
98.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on Information display	62

99.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Information display	63
100.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area	63
101.	Age wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area	63
102.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area	64
103.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area	64
104.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area	65
105.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area	65
106.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Sitting arrangement in waiting area	65
107.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area	66
108.	Age wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area	66
109.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area	67
110.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility at waiting area	67
111.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area	68
112.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area	68
113.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area	69
114.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area	69
115.	Age wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area	69
116.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area	70
117.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area	70
118.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area	71
119.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area	71
120.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area	72
121.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	72
122.	Age wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	72

123.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	73
124.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	73
125.	Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	74
126.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	74
127.	Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area	75
128.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber	75
129.	Age wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber	75
130.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber	76
131.	Academic wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber	76
132.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber	77
133.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber	77
134.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber	77
135.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	78
136.	Age wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	78
137.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	78
138.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	79
139.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	79
140.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	80
141.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room	80
142.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	80
143.	Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	81
144.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	81
145.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	81
146.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	82

147.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	82
148.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation	83
149.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	83
150.	Age wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	83
151.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	84
152.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	84
153.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	85
154.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	85
155.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor	85
156.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	86
157.	Age wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	86
158.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	86
159.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	87
160.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	87
161.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	88
162.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room	88
163.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	88
164.	Age wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	89
165.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	89
166.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	89
167.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	90
168.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	90
169.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room	90
170.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory	91
171.	Age wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory	91
172.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory	91
173.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory	92
174.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory	92
175.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to	92

	laboratory	
176.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory	93
177.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	93
178.	Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	93
179.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	94
180.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	94
181.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	94
182.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	95
183.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory	95
184.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	96
185.	Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	96
186.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	96
187.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	97
188.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	97
189.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	98
190.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory	98
191.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	98
192.	Age wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	99
193.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	99
194.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	99
195.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	100
196.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	100
197.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test	101
198.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test	101
199.	Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test	101
200.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test	102
201.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time	102

	for test	
202.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test	102
203.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test	103
204.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test	103
205.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	103
206.	Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	104
207.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	104
208.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	105
209.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	105
210.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	106
211.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services	106
212.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	106
213.	Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	107
214.	marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	107
215.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	107
216.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	108
217.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	108
218.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services	109
219.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	109
220.	Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	109
221.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	110
222.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	110
223.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	111
224.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	111
225.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services	111
226.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	112
227.	Age wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	112

228.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	112
229.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	113
230.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	113
231.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	114
232.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy	114
233.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	114
234.	Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	115
235.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	115
236.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	115
237.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	116
238.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	116
239.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy	117
240.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	117
241.	Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	117
242.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	118
243.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	118
244.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	119
245.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	119
246.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy	120
247.	Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	120
248.	Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	120
249.	Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	121
250.	Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	121
251.	Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	122

252.	Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	122
253.	Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist	122

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Professor J.P.Singh my mentor, for their patient guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and useful critiques of this research work. I would also like to thank Dr. Ashok asthana, for giving this opportunity for conducting this research work and his advice and assistance in keeping my progress on schedule. My grateful thanks are also extended to Dr. Jharna my colleague for her help in conducting this study, doing the meteorological data analysis, their support in making the final report.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the employees of the Hospital for their support to given the valuable information about the hospital and the patient flow.

INTRODUCTION

Sevenhills Hospital is one of the largest Hospital in India. It is a Multi-speciality Hospital located in the suburb of Marol, Mumbai. A sprawling 17 acres of scenic landscape in the heart of Mumbai, is the abode of SevenHills HealthCity. Within lies one of Asia's largest hospitals, along with residential accommodation for its doctors and staff, an academic and research institute, and a business and convention centre.

VISION :- To evolve as a benchmark in quality healthcare available to one and all

MISSION :-

- To ensure accessible and affordable quality healthcare by compassionate medical professionals to all
- To be the centre of excellence for medical research and academics
- To cultivate an environment of trust, honesty, mutual respect, equality & ethics

Facilities under one roof

- Built on a sprawling area of 17 acres with up to 2 million sq. ft. of built up area.
- 16 blocks, having 11 levels each - interconnected via stairways & lobbys for patient ease.
- 300 residential apartments for consultants & staff assuring 24x7 availability.
- Design complaint with international accredited hospital architectural norms.
- 120 OPD chambers on one level ensures convenience to the patients.
- One of the very few hospitals in the world having an inpatient bed capacity of 1500.
- 24 Dialysis units, 36 Operation Theatres & 4 Cath Labs.
- Centrally located at Andheri, approximately 3 kms from the International Airport & 6 kms from Andheri Station.

SPECIALITIES PROVIDES BY THE HOSPITAL

- Cardiology
- Neurology
- Orthopedics and spine surgery
- Oncology
- Obstetrics and Gynecology
- Interventional Radiology
- ENT
- Pulmonary Medicine
- Nephrology
- Gastroenterology
- Nuclear Medicine
- General and Laparoscopic surgery

- Ophthalmology
- Pediatric
- Preventive and Rehabilitation Medicine
- Cosmetic Surgery
- Cosmetic Dermatology

Summer Training Project

AIM:

To study patient satisfaction of Outpatient Department of SevenHills hospital, Mumbai and to suggest measures to optimize it.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To subjectively and objectively assess the level of satisfaction with OPD services.
2. To determine the impact of various socio-demographic factors on the level of satisfaction.
3. To assess virtual and real gap between the patient's expectations and the service provided.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Patient satisfaction - A comparative study [Talluru Sreenivas, G.Prasad] In this study, selection of three different hospitals in Hyderabad city based on ownership was made which included Osmania General Hospital (Osmania), completely owned by Government, Deccan Hospitals Corporation Limited (Deccan) which runs under the control of private management and Nizam's Institute of Medical Sciences (Nizam's) which runs on corporate lines under the control of State government. The three hospitals were having similar and almost identical facilities. The sample respondents were drawn through stratified random sampling. The outpatients were taken based on the average number of patients per day for each hospital. It was observed that approximately 3000 patients visit Osmania, 2500 visit Nizam's and 1000 visit Deccan. The instrument was distributed to 300 outpatients in Osmania and 270 respondents were selected for final analysis. In case of Nizam's 240 respondents opinions were taken for final analysis. In case of Deccan out of 100, 90 found to be good and taken for final analysis. When asked was the staff at waiting area sympathetic towards Patients problems Osmania's 21.1percentage, Nizam's 35.6percentage and Deccan's 80.0percentage patients said Yes, 02.2percentage, 08.9percentage and 13.3percentage responded as can't say, and 76.7percentage, 55.5percentage, 06.7percentage said No respectively. When asked, was time interval between patient arrival and consulting the Doctor reasonable Osmania's 16.7 percentage, Nizam's 23.3percentage and Deccan's 86.7percentage said Yes and 03.3percentage, 10.0percentage, 03.3percentage responded as cant say and 80.0percentage, 66.7percentage and 10.0percentage said No respectively. When asked Was Space and physical facilities at consulting room satisfactory Osmania's 25.6 percentage, Nizam's 33.3percentageand Deccan's 86.7percentage said Yes and 10.0percentage, 03.3percentage and 03.3percentage responded as Cant say and 64.4percentage, 63.4percentage and 10.0percentage said No respectively. When asked that did Doctor give enough time to narrate the illness, Osmania's 20.0percentage Nizam's 38.9percentage and Deccan's 82.2percentage said Yes and 73.3percentage, 53.3percentage, 14.5percentage said No respectively. With respect to satisfaction with the Doctor after consultation, Osmania's 16.7percentage, Nizam's 28.8percentage and Deccan's 86.7percentage said Yes and 73.3percentage, 61.2percentage, 03.3percentage said No respectively. Was Doctor sympathetic towards the problems of the patient Osmania's 27.7percentage, Nizam's 34.4percentage and 80.0percentage said Yes and 65.6percentage, 52.3percentage and 03.3percentage said No respectively and the remainingpercent of the patient responded as cant say. When asked were Patients satisfied with the behavior of the staff , Osmania's 16.7percentage, Nizam's 25.6percentage and Deccan's 87.7percentage said Yes and 73.3percentage, 67.7percentage

and 05.6percentage said No respectively and remaining responded can't say. When asked that were Laboratory tests done in time Osmania's 14.4percentage, Nizam's 30.0percentage and Deccan's 83.3percentage said Yes and 64.5percentage, 60.0percentage, 06.7percentage said No respectively and remaining said Cant say. Were required medicines available on hospital premises Osmania's 20.0percentage, Nizam's 48.9percentage and Deccan's 80.0percentage said Yes and 73.3percentage, 45.6percentage and 03.3percentage said No respectively and remaining responded as cant say. When asked about visiting this hospital again, Osmania's 20.0percentage, Nizam's 31.1percentage and Deccan's 90.05 said Yes and 64.4percentage, 52.2percentage and 03.3percentage said No respectively, remainingpercent responded as cant say.

A study of patient's satisfaction towards services received at Sassoon General Hospital Pune on OPD basis[Patavegar Bilkish, Sangita et al] A cross sectional study was conducted among 450 patients during 6 months. Likert's 5 points rating scale was used. The rating was done as following-5=strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree. About 61percentage patients were females and remaining 39percentage were males. Maximum numbers of patients (88%) were satisfied regarding friendliness and helpfulness of staff. Regarding examination and explanation received from doctor 92percentage patients were satisfied and 8percentage patients were unsatisfied. About friendliness and helpfulness of nurses 84percentagepatients were found satisfied. Patient who waited more than 30 min for getting drugs were found highly unsatisfied (61.33percentage) and remaining 38.67percentage were satisfied as they could get the drugs within 30 min. About cleanliness of waiting area 44.5 percentage patients were found unsatisfied and remaining 55.5 percentage were satisfied. Regarding waiting time before consulting the doctor, patients who waited for Less than 30min, 103(44.98%) were satisfied and 71(32.13%) were unsatisfied. For 30min-1 hr 72 were satisfied (31.44%) and 78(35.29%) were unsatisfied. For more than 1hour 54(23.58%) were satisfied and 72(32.58%) were unsatisfied. Patients who said that 76-100percentage drugs were available 156(68.12%) were satisfied and 106(47.96%) were unsatisfied. For 51-75percentages availability of drugs 48(20.96%) were satisfied and 72(32.58%) were unsatisfied. For less than 50percentages availability of drugs 17 were satisfied (7.42%) and 24(10.86%) were unsatisfied.

A study on out patient satisfaction at Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India (2004) [Dr. S. K. Jawahar] The study was conducted on 200 patients of OPD. With regard to the time spent by the doctors during consultation 96.5percentages of the patients were satisfied and 3.5percentages were unsatisfied. When asked about doctors being compassionate and patient while listening to their problems and gave enough time to narrate the illness, 60% were satisfied while 40percentages were unsatisfied. With regard to the privacy in consultation, 97.5% of the patients were satisfied and 2.5percentages were not satisfied. The assessment of the services provided by nurses, security, receptionist, attendees (though the study has not mentioned the services provided by them) also showed that 90-95percentage of patients were satisfied with the service.

When asked about referring this hospital to others, 55.8percentages said that they would always do so, 30.2percentages said that they will do usually which indicates that they were satisfied with the hospital and remaining 11.6percentages said that they will sometimes recommend this hospital which meant, they weren't satisfied.

Measuring patient satisfaction: A cross sectional study to improve quality of care at a tertiary care hospital namely SKIMS, Soura, Srinagar [Andrabi Syed, Hamid Shamila et al].A set of

well structured close-ended questionnaire was given to 400 OPD patients. The instrument covered the information related to patients, socio-economic characteristics, registration process, perception towards availability of basic amenities, behavior of doctors and other staff and facilities available in pharmacy. 51percentages were males and 49percentages were females. The majority of respondents (58%) were in age group of 31-50 years. 94.25percentage patients did not find any problem in locating the hospital and 5.25percentages found difficulty in locating. Although Behavior was not well defined, 136(34%) found the registration clerk's behavior good, 251(62.75%) and 13(3.25%) found satisfactory and poor respectively. For Cleanliness, 314(78.5%) were satisfied and 86(21.5%) were not satisfied. Though behavior of the doctors was not defined in the study, 267(66.75%) were satisfied and 133(33.25%) were not satisfied. With regard to time given by doctors, 311(77.75%) were satisfied and 89(22.25%) were not satisfied. For Behavior of paramedical staff, 375(93.75%) patients were satisfied and 25(6.25%) were not satisfied.

Patients' satisfaction of health care services provided at outpatient department of Dhaka medical college hospital (2005-2006) [Md. Ziaul Islam and Md. Abdul Jabbar] 299 patients were interviewed face to face at the exit point after taking informed consent using a semi structured questionnaire. The level of patients' satisfaction was graded on a four-point scale – excellent, good, fair and poor. 81.14percentages of the patients expressed satisfaction (ranging from fair to good) with respect to adequacy of space, sitting arrangement and cleanliness of the waiting rooms, but were dissatisfied (75.31%) with respect to toilet facilities and supply of drinking water. Majority (74.90%) of patients were satisfied(ranging from fair to good) with OPD staffs with respect to their availability and readiness to register and make appointment with doctors, but most (41.06%) were dissatisfied with respect to their willingness to listen with compassion and reassure the patients with their problems. Majority of the patients (81%) were satisfied (ranging from fair to good) about the responsiveness and patience of the doctors. With regards to helpfulness of OPD staffs the level of satisfaction was poor (31.71%) Only 65.1percentages patients received the prescribed drug from the hospital pharmacy.

Patient satisfaction of health care services provided by Zamboanga city medical center Out Patient Department by John paul T.Cuevas. The patients/respondents were consecutively selected and a questionnaire was developed to evaluate their satisfaction regarding the availability, accessibility and convenience of the Out Patient Department services, including their perception about the behavior of staff, including a list of the amenities. A total of 300 respondents answered the questionnaire. Most of the respondents were female with 62.3percentage preponderance. As for educational attainment majority or 58.3percentages have at least attended or graduated college. A good number of the respondents or 66.7percentage were for follow up consult and only 33.3 percentage came for first time consultation, With regard to Space in waiting area 138 (46.0percentage) were satisfied and 162(54%) were not satisfied. With regard to Cleanliness 237 (79.0%) were satisfied 63(21%) were not satisfied. When asked about availability of medicines, 118 (39.3%) were satisfied and 182(60.7%) were not satisfied. With regard to availability of laboratory test 220 (73.3%) were satisfied and the remaining 80 were not satisfied. For location of the laboratory from the OPD 106 (35.3%) were satisfied and 194(64.7%) were not satisfied. For waiting time to get laboratory/imaging reports 92 (30.7%) were satisfied and 208 were not satisfied and for waiting time to see the doctor 177 (59.0%) and 123(41%) were not satisfied. Regarding waiting chairs 278 (92.7%), trash cans 267 (89.0%), Television in the waiting area 261 (87.0%). Related to Physical features, space of waiting area 268 (89.3%), cleanliness of the

area 272 (90.7%) were satisfied. With regard to Canteen 266 (88.7%) and drinking water 261 (87.0%) were satisfied.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A cross-sectional comparative study was done in the hospital to determine the patient satisfaction in OPD.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

STUDY RESPONDENTS

1. Patient
2. Patient attendant

SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

Samples were drawn by random sampling technique. The patient was given the instrument as soon as he entered the reception, and he was simultaneously being observed and followed to every department he had visited until he exited the hospital. When the observation of one patient was completed, next patient is followed from the reception.

SAMPLE SIZE

Total 90 patients were taken for this study as per selection method mentioned above.

TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

The research tool was a structured, self-administered questionnaire .The questionnaire contained 110 questions which included quantitative and qualitative questions. Nominal scale and likert five points scaling was used for measuring the satisfaction level.

The rating was done as follow:

1	2	3	4	5
Dissatisfied	Not satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Extremely satisfied

Nominal scale was used for non-parametric groups

1	Yes
2	No

The questionnaire was divided into following sections:

Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents attending OPD. Respondent's socio-demographic characteristics included age, gender, marital status, academic qualification and income status which further had sub-categories.

Physical facilities include location of the hospital, parking, registration counter, waiting area, wash room, consultation room, procedure room, laboratory, imaging, and pharmacy. The

physical facilities were assessed on the following attributes signage's, convenience, ambience, availability, cleanliness and sitting arrangement. Likert scale and nominal scale was used for rating.

Attributes of Assessment

Waiting time for registration, consultation, laboratory test, imaging techniques and medicine issue at pharmacy,
On ready availability of equipments and instruments for procedure

Clinical and Non-clinical staff services were assessed for warmth of reception, communication skill, responsiveness to their queries, clarity of information given, consultation time with doctor, empathy towards patient, explanation of the illness, probable diagnosis, explanation of the procedure undertaken, if any, information on preparation required for the test, treatment plan, medication details.

DATA COLLECTION

The patient is provided with the questionnaire as soon as he arrived at the entry to the hospital, simultaneously the observer filled another form for the same patient and followed him till his exit.

Data was collected by two methods:

Subjective data

Self-administered questionnaire was filled by the respondents and who were not able to read the questionnaire, observer assisted them in filling the questionnaire.

Objective data

Another copy of questionnaire was filled simultaneously by the observer who followed the respondents from the reception till he exited from the hospital. Observer considered all the facilities except the consultation room and wash room for reasons of privacy.

Observer filled the questionnaire as per following criteria

Waiting time:

Likert scale used for rating the waiting time

1 = waited more than 60 minutes

2 = waited 31-60 minutes

3 = waited 21-30 minutes

4 = waited 11-20 minutes

5 = waited 1-10 minutes

ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

The study was conducted in accordance with the following ethical considerations

1. Participation was purely voluntary on the patient's behalf. No pressure or inducement of any kind was applied to encourage an individual to become included in the study.
2. Before participation, all patients were notified about the study's aim, objectives, and methods.
3. Any patient had the right to abstain from participation and to terminate participation at any time.
4. The identity of individuals from whom information is obtained in the course of the study was kept strictly confidential. No information revealing the identity of any individual was included in the final report or in any other communication prepared in the course of the study.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data was analyzed using the SPSS statistical software program version 16. First, the mean, median, mode, standard deviation was calculated, and then test of significance applied to calculate the p value at the 95% confidential interval.

To find out the correlation between the subjective and objective data the Karl Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated.

RESULTS

A total of 90 patients filled the questionnaire. The results are presented in tabular forms. These results are presented on following attributes:-

- Socio-demographic characteristics
- Physical facilities
- Assessment of various OPD services on attributes mentioned above.
- Patient satisfaction on ready availability of equipments and instruments for procedure, clinical and Non-clinical staff services.
- Correlation between the subjective and objective assessment.

Table: 1 Distribution of Socio-Demographic Parameters

The results in table indicated

S. No.	Variables	Sample size	percentage
1.	Gender	90	
	Male	48	53.33
	Female	42	46.67
2.	Age(years)	90	
	Below 20 years	4	4.4
	20-40 years	76	84.4
	Above 50 years	10	11.1
3.	Marital status	90	
	Single	27	30
	Married	63	70
4.	Academic qualification	87	
	Post graduate	30	34.5
	Graduate	44	50.6
	Senior secondary(12 th)	8	9.2
	Below 10 th	5	5.7
5.	Medical expenses	83	
	Organisation	11	13.3
	Insurance	13	15.7
	Self finance	59	71.1
6.	Income status	75	
	Below 20000□	10	13.3
	20000-50000□	31	41.3
	50000-100000□	18	24
	Above 100000□	16	21.3
7.	Type of consultation visit	90	
	First	48	53.33
	Follow up	42	46.67

The results in the table shows that out of 90 respondents, 48(53.33%) were male and 42(46.67%) were female. Age has categorised in three groups below 20 years, 20 to 50 years and above 50 years. The results found that out of 90 respondent, 4(4.4%) were below 20 years, 76(84.4%) were 20 to 40 years and 10(11.1%) were above 50 years. Related to marital status 27(30%) were single and 63(70%) were married.

As regard to the academic qualification out of 87 respondents 30(34.5%) were post graduates, 44(50.6%) were graduates, 8(9.2%) were senior secondary (12th), 5(5.7%) were below 10th standard and as for medical expenses out of 83 respondents, 59(71.1%) were self financed, 13(15.7%) were insurance and 11(13.3%) were organisation expenses.

Regarding to income status per month in rupees out of 75 respondents, 10(13.3%) were earning below 20000□ group, 36(41.3%) were earning 20000-50000□, 18(24%) were earning 50000-100000□ and 12(21%) were earning above 100000□. A good number of the

respondents 48(53.3%) were for first visit consult and 41(46.1%) came for first time consultation.

Table:2 Gender wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.41(0.636)	-0.413	0.002
2	Female	4.32(0.802)	-0.195	0.108

Table no.2 shows that opinion on signage to reach reception, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for signage to reach reception, for males was 4.41 and 0.636 .For females mean and standard deviation was 4.32 and 0.802 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males was -0.413 and for females was -0.195. P value for males was 0.002 and females were 0.108.

Table:3 Age wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.50 (0.707)	equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.31 (0.793)	-0.327	0.002
3.	Above 50	4.50 (0.548)	-0.313	0.174

Table no.3 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation room, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.50 and 0.707; for 20-50 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.31 and 0.793 and for above 50 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.548. For age group below 20 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was equivocal .For age group 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.327 and P value was 0.002. For respondents above 50 years of age, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.313 and P value was 0.174.

Table:4 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.93 (0.874)	equivocal	
2.	Married	3.87 (1.040)	-0.377	0.001

Table no.4 shows that opinion on opinion on signage to reach reception, unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 3.93 and 0.874 and for married patients was 3.87and 1.040 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were unmarried was equivocal. For married respondents,

correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was -0.377 and 0.001 respectively.

Table:5 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.97(0.981)	-0.410	.015
2.	Graduate	4.02(0.886)	-0.212	0.178
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.00 (0.756)	equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	3.40 (1.673)	-0.535	0.177

Table no.5 shows that opinion on signage to reach reception, graduate are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.97 and 0.981, correlation between subjective and objective observation -0.410 and P value was 0.015. For graduates, mean and standard deviation was 4.02 and 0.886, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.212 and P value was 0.178, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.00 and 0.756, correlation was equivocal and for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.40 and 1.673, and correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.535 and P value was 0.177.

Table:6 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.09 (0.994)	-0.319	0.169
2.	Insurance	4.31 (0.947)	-0.305	0.156
3.	Self finance	3.79 (0.901)	-0.372	0.002

Table no.6 shows that opinion on signage to reach reception whose medical expenses by Insurance more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.09 and 0.994. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.31 and 0.947 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 3.79 and 0.901. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was -0.319 and P value was 0.169. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.305 and P value was 0.408 respectively. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.372 and P value was 0.002.

Table:7 Income status wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	3.79 (1.075)	equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.00 (0.856)	-0.383	.018
3.	50000-100000₹	3.88 (1.11)	-0.357	.080
4.	Above 100000₹	3.88 (0.961)	-0.377	.083

Table no.7 shows that opinion on signage to reach reception whose family income is 20000-50000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 3.79 and 1.075, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.856. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.88 and 1.11 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 3.88 and 0.961. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income below 20000₹ was equivocal. For respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.383 and P value was 0.018. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.357 and P value was 0.080. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was -0.377 and P value was 0.083.

Table:8 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on signage to reach reception

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.92 (0.846)	-0.323	.013
2.	Follow up	3.92 (1.061)	-0.342	.018

Table no.8 shows that opinion on signage to reach reception is equivocal for both the groups

For respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation, mean and standard deviation was 3.92 and 0.846 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 3.92 and 1.061. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was -0.323 and who came for follow up was -0.342. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.013 and for those who came for follow up was 0.018

Table:9 Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.45 (0.717)	0.567	<0.001
2	Female	4.30 (0.939)	0.524	<0.001

Table no.9 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.45 and 0.717 .For females mean and standard deviation was 4.30 and 0.939 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males was 0.567 and for females was 0.524. P value for both males and females was <0.001.

Table:10 Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.75 (0.500)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.34 (0.849)	0.588	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.50 (0.707)	0.425	0.097

Table no.10 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception, staff below 20 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.75 and 0.500; for 20-50 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.34 and 0.849 and for above 50 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.707. For age group 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.588 and P value was <0.001. For respondents above 50 years of age, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.425 and P value was 0.097.

Table:11 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.42 (0.809)	0.635	<0.001
2.	Married	4.50 (0.831)	0.502	<0.001

Table no.11 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.42 and 0.809 and for married patients was 4.50 and 0.831 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were unmarried was 0.635 and P value was <0.001. For married respondents, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.502 and <0.001 respectively

Table:12 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.34 (0.769)	0.471	0.006
2.	Graduate	4.50 (0.906)	0.536	<0.001
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.00 (0.816)	equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.40 (0.548)	0.667	0.110

Table no.12 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff, graduate are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.34 and 0.769, correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.471 and P value was 0.006. For graduates, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.906, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.536 and P value was <0.001, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.816, correlation was equivocal and for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.40 and 0.548 and correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.667 and P value was 0.110

Table:13 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.10(1.101)	0.500	0.071
2.	Insurance	4.33(0.778)	0.076	0.408
3.	Self finance	4.48(0.660)	0.754	<0.001

Table no.13 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff, whose medical expenses by organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.10 and 1.101. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.778 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.48 and 0.660. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.500 and P value was 0.701. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.756 and P value was 0.408 respectively. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.754 and P value was <0.001

Table:14 Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.50 (0.756)	0.354	0.195
2.	20000-50000₹	4.39 (0.875)	0.342	0.037
3.	50000-100000₹	4.71 (0.588)	0.741	<0.001
4.	Above 100000₹	4.06 (0.854)	0.738	0.001

Table no.14 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.50 and 0.756, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.875. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.71 and 0.588 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.06 and 0.854. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income below 20000₹ was 0.354 and P value was 0.195. For respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.342 and P value was 0.037. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.741 and P value was <0.001. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.738 and P value was 0.001.

Table:15 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.33 (0.694)	0.592	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.43 (0.979)	0.519	0.001

Table no.15 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of reception staff, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

For respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation, mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.694 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.43 and 0.979. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.592 and who came for follow up was 0.519. The P value for those who came for the first time was <0.001 and for those who came for follow up was 0.001.

Table:16 Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.45 (0.717)	0.791	<0.001
2	Female	4.14 (1.182)	0.388	0.007

Table no.16 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.45 and 0.717; for females it was 4.14 and 1.182 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males was 0.791 and P value was <0.001 and for females, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.388 and P value was 0.007.

Table:17 Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff:

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.75 (0.500)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.21 (1.068)	0.554	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.89 (0.333)	0.272	0.223

Table no.17 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

For age group below 20 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.75 and 0.500; for 20-50 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.21 and 1.068 and for above 50 years it was 4.89 and 0.333 respectively; for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.554 and P value was <0.001. For above 50 years of age, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.272 and P value was 0.223. For unmarried respondents, mean and standard deviation was 4.42 and 0.809 and for married patients was 4.89 and 1.101 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for unmarried respondents was 0.452 and P value was 0.012. For married respondents correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.546 and P value was <0.001

Table:18 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.42 (0.809)	0.452	0.012
2.	Married	4.89 (1.101)	0.546	<0.001

Table no.18 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.42 and 0.809 and for married patients was 4.89 and 1.101 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were unmarried was 0.452 and P value was <0.001. For married respondents, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.546 and <0.001 respectively

Table:19 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.33 (0.994)	0.315	0.048
2.	Graduate	4.36 (1.013)	0.447	0.004
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.14 (1.215)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.2 (0.837)	0.643	0.121

Table no.19 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff, graduate are more satisfied as compared to other groups

For post graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.994, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.36 and 1.013, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.14 and 1.215, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 0.837. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.315 and P value was 0.048. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.447 and P value was 0.004. For respondents who had academic qualification below X standard, correlation was 0.643 and P value was 0.121.

Table:20 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff:

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.1 (1.287)	0.690	0.014
2.	Insurance	4.27 (0.786)	0.429	0.094
3.	Self finance	4.39 (0.947)	0.614	<0.001

Table no.20 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

For patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, mean and standard deviation was 4.10 and 1.287. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.27 and 0.786 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.947. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.690 and P value was 0.014. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.429 and P value was 0.094. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.614 and P value was <0.001.

Table:21 Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.33 (0.866)	0.728	0.013
2.	20000-50000₹	4.26 (1.059)	0.249	0.105
3.	50000-100000₹	4.59 (0.712)	0.390	0.061
4.	Above 100000₹	3.94 (1.289)	0.791	<0.001

Table n.21 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff, whose family income is 50000-100000₹, are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.33 and 0.866, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.26 and 1.059. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.59 and 0.712 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 3.94 and 1.289. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income below 20000₹ was 0.728 and P value was 0.013. For respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.249 and P value was 0.105. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.390 and P value was 0.061. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.791 and P value was <0.001.

Table:22 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.21 (0.999)	0.588	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.47 (1.028)	0.385	0.010

Table no.22 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by reception staff, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.21 and 0.999 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.47 and 1.028. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.588 and who came for follow up was 0.385. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.00 and who came for follow up was <0.001.

Table:23 Gender wise distribution of opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.56 (0.698)	0.609	<0.001
2	Female	4.40 (0.949)	0.236	0.064

Table no.23 shows that opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception, males are more satisfied as compared to females

For males, mean and standard deviation was 4.56 and 0.698 for females it was 4.40 and 0.949 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and P value was 0.609 and <0.001. For females, correlation was 0.236 and P value was 0.064.

Table:24 Age wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	5.00 (0.00)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.37 (0.912)	0.380	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.80 (0.632)	0.742	0.004

Table no. 24shows that opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception, below 20 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups in the cleanliness in consultation chamber

For age group below 20 years mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.00; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.37 and 0.912, and 4.80 and 0.632 respectively; for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.380 and P value was <0.001. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.742 and P value was 0.004.

Table:25 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.56 (0.698)	0.123	0.275
2.	Married	4.59 (0.590)	0.437	<0.001

Table no.25 shows that opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

For unmarried respondents, mean and standard deviation was 4.56 and 0.698; for married respondents, mean and standard deviation was 4.59 and 0.590 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was 0.123 and P value was 0.275. For married respondents, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.437and P value was <0.001

Table:26 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.40 (0.986)	0.540	0.001
2.	Graduate	1.47(0.827)	0.267	0.084
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.00 (1.069)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.60 (0.548)	0.408	0.248

Table no.26 shows that opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception, below 10th are more satisfied as Compared to other groups

For post graduates, mean and standard deviation was 4.40 and 0.986, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 1.47 and 0.827, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 1.069, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.548. For post graduates respondent, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.540 and P value was 0.001. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.267 and 0.084 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 0.408 and P value was 0.248.

Table:27 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.36 (0.924)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.46 (0.660)	0.245	0.210
3.	Self finance	4.50 (0.843)	0.500	<0.001

Table no.27 shows that opinion on opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

For patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, mean and standard deviation was 4.36 and 0.924. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.46 and 0.660 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.843. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the medical insurance was 0.245 and P value was 0.210. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.500 and P value was <0.001.

Table:28 Income status wise distribution of opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.50 (0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.32 (0.909)	0.343	0.030
3.	50000-100000₹	4.82 (0.393)	0.201	0.289
4.	Above 100000₹	4.82 (0.854)	0.500	<0.001

Table no.28 shows that opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.5 and 0.707, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.32 and 0.909. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.82 and 0.393 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.82 and 0.854. For respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.343 and P value was 0.030. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.201 and P value was 0.289. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.500 and P value was <0.001.

Table:29 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Convenience to reach OPD reception

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.35 (0.838)	0.551	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.55 (0.932)	0.139	0.196

Table no.29 shows that opinion on convenience to reach OPD reception who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

For respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation, mean and standard deviation was 4.35 and 0.838 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.55 and 0.932. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.551 and who came for follow up was 0.139. The P value for those who came for the first time was <0.001 and for those who came for follow up was 0.196.

Table:30 Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.68(0.580)	0.612	<0.001
2	Female	4.33(1.049)	0.090	0.331

Table no.30 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive, males are more satisfied as compared to females

For males mean and standard deviation was 4.68 and 0.580; for females it was 4.33 and 1.049 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value for males was 0.612 and <0.001 respectively and for females it was .090 and 0.331 respectively

Table:31 Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.67 (0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.49 (0.857)	0.293	0.018
3.	Above 50	4.86 (0.378)	-0.143	0.368

Table no. 31 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.67 and 0.577; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.49 and 0.857, and 4.86 and 0.378 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.293 and P value was 0.018. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.143 and P value was 0.368

Table:32 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.42 (0.769)	0.243	0.165
2.	Married	4.86 (0.828)	0.315	0.020

Table no.32 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive, married are more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as unmarried was 4.42 and 0.769 and for married patients was 4.86 and 0.828 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were unmarried was 0.243 and P value was 0.165. For respondents whose marital status was married, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.315 and P value was 0.020.

Table:33 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.68(0.557)	0.387	0.031
2.	Graduate	4.46 (0.989)	0.319	0.112
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.50 (1.000)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.75 (0.500)	0.333	0.333

Table no. 33 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive, below 10th is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.68 and 0.557, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.46 and 0.989, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 1.00, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.75 and 0.50. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.387 and P value was 0.031. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.319 and P value was 0.012. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 0.333 and P value was 0.333.

Table:34 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.44 (0.882)	0.737	0.012
2.	Insurance	4.36 (0.674)	0.029	0.466
3.	Self finance	4.77 (0.490)	0.629	<0.001

Table no.34 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.44 and 0.882. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.36 and 0.674 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.77 and 0.490. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.737 and P value was 0.012. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.029 and P value was 0.466. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.629 and P value was <0.001.

Table:35 Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	4.67 (0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000□	4.39 (1.037)	-0.031	0.451
3.	50000-100000□	4.60 (0.699)	-0.302	0.199
4.	Above 100000□	4.58 (0.669)	0.535	0.037

Table no.35 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive, whose family income is below 20000□ more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 4.67 and 0.707, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.699. For patients having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.699 and for above 100000□, mean and standard deviation was 4.58 and 0.669. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income below 20000□ was and P value was. For respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000□, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.031 and P value was 0.451. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000□, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.302 and P value was 0.199. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000□, correlation was 0.535 and P value was 0.037.

Table:36 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.41 (0.783)	0.390	0.011
2.	Follow up	4.69 (0.838)	0.017	0.467

Table no.36 shows that opinion on politeness of communication of customer care executive, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.41 and 0.783 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.69 and 0.883. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.390 and who came for follow up was 0.017. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.011 and who came for follow up was 0.467.

Table:37 Gender wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.73(0.560)	0.681	<0.001
2	Female	4.33 (1.049)	0.344	0.043

Table no. 37 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive, males are more satisfied as compared to females

For males mean and standard deviation was 4.73 and 0.560; And for females was 4.33 and 1.049 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.681 and 0.344 respectively and P value for males and females was <0.001 and 0.043 respectively

Table:38 Age wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.66 (0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.51 (0.857)	0.423	0.001
3.	Above 50	5.00 (0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no. 38 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive room above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.667 and 0.577; for 20-50 years it was, 4.51 and 0.857 and for above 50 years mean and standard deviation was, 5.00 and 0.0 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.423 and P value was 0.001.

Table:39 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.47 (0.772)	0.590	0.005
2.	Married	5.00 (0.825)	0.359	0.009

Table no.39 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as unmarried was 4.47 and 0.772 and for married patients was 5.00 and 0.825 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were unmarried was 0.590 and P value was 0.005. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.359 and 0.009 respectively

Table:40 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.72 (0.542)	0.933	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.46 (0.989)	0.356	0.037
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.50 (1.000)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00 (0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no. 40 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive, below 10th is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.72 and 0.542, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.46 and 0.989, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 1.00, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.0. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.933 and P value was 0.00. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.356 and P value was 0.037

Table:41 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.56 (0.882)	0.935	<0.001
2.	Insurance	4.55 (0.688)	-0.113	0.370
3.	Self finance	4.74 (0.505)	0.708	<0.001

Table no. 41 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

For respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, mean and standard deviation was 4.56 and 0.882. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.55 and 0.688, and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.74 and 0.505. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.935 and P value was 0.00. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was -0.113 and 0.370 respectively. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.708 and P value was <0.001

Table:42 Income status wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.78 (0.667)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.47 (1.037)	-0.31	0.451
3.	50000-100000₹	4.80 (0.632)	0.885	<0.001
4.	Above 100000₹	4.33 (1.073)	0.644	0.012

Table no.42 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive whose family income is 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

For patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month, mean and standard deviation was 4.78 and 0.667, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.47 and 1.037. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.8 and 0.632 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 1.073. For respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.31 and P value was 0.451. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.885 and P value was <0.001. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.644 and P value was 0.012

Table:43 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.44 (0.786)	0.586	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.73 (0.827)	0.079	0.351

Table no.43 shows that opinion on responsiveness to queries by customer care executive, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

For respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time mean and standard deviation was 4.44 and 0.786 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.73 and 0.827. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was and who came for follow up was 0.586 and 0.079 respectively. The P value for those who came for the first time was and who came for follow up was <0.001 and 0.351 respectively

Table:44 Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.63(0.714)	0.791	<0.001
2	Female	4.29(1.083)	0.210	0.151

Table no.44 shows that opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.63 and 0.714; for females it was 4.29 and 1.083 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.791 and 0.210 respectively and P value for males and females was <0.001 and 0.151 respectively

Table:45 Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.67 (0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.42 (0.936)	0.480	0.001
3.	Above 50	5.00 (0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no.45 shows that opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive, above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.67 and 0.577; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.42 and 0.936, and 5.00 and 0.0 respectively; for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.480 and P value was 0.001.

Table:46 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.53 (0.697)	0.462	0.009
2.	Married	5.00 (0.960)	0.490	<0.001

Table no. 46 shows that opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.53 and 0.697 and for married patients was 5.00 and 0.960 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was 0.462 and P value was 0.009. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.490 and P value was <0.001

Table:47 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.56 (0.870)	0.825	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.52 (0.935)	0.207	0.150
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.25 (0.957)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.75 (0.500)	0.577	0.211

Table no.47 shows that opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.56 and 0.87, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.52 and 0.935, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.25 and 0.957, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.50. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.825 and P value was 0.00. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.207 and 0.150 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was and P value was 0.577 and 0.211 respectively.

Table:48 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executives

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.67 (0.707)	0.750	0.010
2.	Insurance	4.55 (0.688)	0.052	0.439
3.	Self finance	4.61 (0.766)	Equivocal	

Table no.48 shows that opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.55 and 0.688 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.61 and 0.766. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.750 and P value was 0.010. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.052 and P value was 0.439

Table:49 Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.67 (0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.47 (1.020)	-0.130	0.298
3.	50000-100000₹	4.60 (0.843)	Equivocal	
4.	Above 100000₹	3.93 (1.385)	0.749	0.003

Table no.49 shows that opinion on whose family income is below 20000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.67 and 0.707, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.47 and 1.020. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.843 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 3.93 and 1.385. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income 20000-50000₹ was -0.130 and P value was 0.298. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.749 and P value was 0.003.

Table:50 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.32 (0.783)	0.673	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.49 (0.711)	-0.150	0.470

Table no.50 shows that opinion on clarity of information by customer care executive, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

For respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation, mean and standard deviation was 4.32 and 0.783 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.49 and 0.711. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.673 and who came for follow up was -0.150. The P value for those who came for the first time was <0.001 and for those who came for follow up was 0.470

Table:51 Gender wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.33 (0.993)	0.950	<0.001
2	Female	4.56 (0.759)	0.812	<0.001

Table no.51 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.33 and 0.993, and 4.56 and 0.759 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.950 and 0.812 respectively and P value for both males and females was <0.001

Table:52 Age wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	5.00 (0.00)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.39 (0.9)	0.909	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.40 (1.075)	0.907	<0.001

Table no. 52 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system, below 20 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years is 5.00 and 0.00; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.9, and 4.40 and 1.075 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for age group below 20 years was and P value was ; for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.909 and P value was <0.001. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.907 and P value was <0.001

Table:53 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.59 (0.590)	0.672	0.001
2.	Married	4.36 (1.002)	0.935	<0.001

Table no.53 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.59 and 0.590 and for married patients was 4.36 and 1.002 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value for respondents who were single was 0.672 and 0.001 respectively. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.935 and <0.001 respectively

Table:54 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.19 (1.075)	0.969	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.63 (0.646)	0.749	<0.001
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.17 (1.329)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.67 (0.577)	1.000	<0.001

Table no.54 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.19 and 1.075, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.63 and 0.646, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.17 and 1.329, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.67 and 0.577. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.969 and P value was <0.001 . For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.749 and <0.001 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 1.00 and P value was <0.001

Table:55 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.50 (0.707)	0.815	0.002
2.	Insurance	4.40 (8.843)	1.000	<0.001
3.	Self finance	4.43 (0.957)	0.883	<0.001

Table no.55 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.50 and 0.707. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.4 and 0.843 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.43 and 0.957. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.815 and P value was 0.002. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 1.000 and <0.001 respectively. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.833 and P value was <0.001

Table:56 Income status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.43 (0.354)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.58 (0.717)	0.918	<0.001
3.	50000-100000₹	4.53 (0.717)	0.847	<0.001
4.	Above 100000₹	4.53 (1.385)	0.923	<0.001

Table no. 56 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system, whose family income is 20000-50000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.43 and 0.354, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.58 and 0.717. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.53 and 0.717 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.53 and 1.385. Correlation between subjective and objective

observation for respondents having monthly income for respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹ was 0.918 and P value was <0.001. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.847 and P value was <0.001. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation and P value was 0.923 and <0.001 respectively

Table:57 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with appointment system

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.19 (1.050)	0.944	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.64 (0.0)	0.769	<0.001

Table no.57 shows that opinion on satisfaction with appointment system, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.19 and 1.050 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.64 and 0. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.944 and who came for follow up was 0.769. The P value for those who came for the first time was <0.001 and who came for follow up was <0.001

Table:58 Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.31(0.719)	0.312	0.017
2	Female	4.38(0.764)	0.401	0.003

Table no.58 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.31 and 0.719; for females it was 4.83 and 0.764 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.312 and 0.401 respectively and P value for males and females was 0.017 and 0.003 respectively

Table:59 Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.25 (0.500)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.29 (0.745)	Equivocal	
3.	Above 50	4.80 (0.632)	Equivocal	

Table no.59 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff presents at OPD registration, above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years is 5.00 and 0.00; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.29 and 0.745, and 4.80 and 0.632 respectively; for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.349 and P value was <0.001. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.411 and P value was 0.003

Table:60 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.22 (0.801)	0.534	0.002
2.	Married	4.80 (1.002)	0.282	0.12

Table no.60 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.22 and 0.801 and for married patients was 4.80 and 1.002 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents for unmarried was 0.534 and P value was 0.002. For respondents who were married, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.282 and P value was 0.012

Table:61 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.37 (0.718)	0.272	0.077
2.	Graduate	4.36 (0.718)	0.402	0.003
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.12 (0.991)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.60 (0.548)	0.327	0.295

Table no.61 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff presents at OPD registration, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.37 and 0.718, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.36 and 0.718, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.12 and 0.991, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.548. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.272 and P value was 0.077. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.402 and P value was 0.003. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 0.327 and P value was 0.295.

Table:62 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	3.91 (0.944)	0.571	0.033
2.	Insurance	4.31 (0.751)	0.284	0.173
3.	Self finance	4.46 (0.652)	0.350	0.003

Table no.62 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 3.91 and 0.944. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.31 and 0.751 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.46 and 0.652. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.571 and P value was 0.033. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.350 and P value was 0.003.

Table:63 Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.30 (0.823)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.39 (0.667)	0.293	0.055
3.	50000-100000₹	4.56 (0.616)	0.412	0.045
4.	Above 100000₹	4.25 (0.683)	-0.293	0.136

Table no.63 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.30 and 0.823, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.667. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.56 and 0.616 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.25 and 0.683.

Table:64 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.15 (0.772)	0.525	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.56 (0.634)	0.103	0.260

Table no.64 shows that opinion on politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.15 and 0.722 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.56 and 0.634. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.525 and who came for follow up was 0.103. The P value for those who came for the first time was and who came for follow up was 0.00and 0.260 respectively

Table:65 Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.40(0.798)	0.374	0.005
2	Female	4.40(0.701)	0.066	0.334

Table no.65 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration is equivocal for both genders

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.40 and 0.798 and 4.40 and 0.701 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.374 and 0.066 respectively and P value for males and females was 0.005 and 0.334respectively

Table:66 Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.25(0.500)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.35 (0.780)	Equivocal	
3.	Above 50	4.90 (0.316)	Equivocal	

Table no.66 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years is 4.25 and 0.50; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.35 and 0.780, and 4.90 and 0.316 respectively.

Table:67 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.33 (0.734)	0.462	0.009
2.	Married	4.90 (0.756)	0.158	0.106

Table no.67 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, married are more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.33 and 0.734 and for married patients was 4.90 and 0.756 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those who were single was 0.462 and P value was 0.009. For respondents who were married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.158 and 0.106 respectively

Table:68 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.34 (0.809)	0.137	0.240
2.	Graduate	4.41 (0.726)	0.378	0.006
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.25 (0.886)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.80 (0.447)	-0.612	0.136

Table no.68 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.34 and 0.809, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.41 and 0.726, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.25 and 0.886, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.80 and 0.447. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.137 and P value was 0.240. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.378 and 0.006 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was -0.612 and P value was 0.136

Table:69 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.45 (0.820)	0.395	0.115
2.	Insurance	4.17 (0.835)	-0.015	0.480
3.	Self finance	4.44 (0.726)	0.271	0.019

Table no.69 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.45 and 0.820. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.17 and 0.835 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.44 and 0.726. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.395 and P value was 0.115. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was -0.015 and 0.480 respectively. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.271 and P value was 0.019

Table:70 Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.30 (0.823)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.39 (0.702)	0.108	0.282
3.	50000-100000₹	4.72(0.461)	0.261	0.054
4.	Above 100000₹	4.31(0.873)	0.173	0.261

Table no.70 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.30 and 0.823, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.702. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.72 and 0.461 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.31 and 0.873. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income status of 20000-50000₹ was 0.108 and P value was 0.282. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.261 and P value was 0.054. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.173 and P value was 0.261.

Table:71 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.32 (0.783)	0.328	0.011
2.	Follow up	4.49 (0.711)	0.247	0.059

Table no.71 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.32 and 0.783 and for those who came for follow up, mean

and standard deviation was 4.49 and 0.247. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.328 and who came for follow up was 0.247. The P value for those who came for the first time was and who came for follow up was 0.011 and 0.059 respectively

Table:72 Gender wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.27(0.818)	0.500	<0.001
2	Female	4.32(0.797)	0.332	0.016

Table no.72 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.27 and 0.818 and 4.32 and 0.797 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.500 and .332 respectively and P value for males and females was <0.001 and 0.016 respectively

Table:73 Age wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00 (0.816)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.26 (0.812)	Equivocal	
3.	Above 50	4.70 (0.675)	Equivocal	

Table no.73 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years is 4.00 and 0.816; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.26 and 0.812, and 4.70 and 0.675 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for age groups was equivocal.

Table:74 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.59 (0.590)	0.672	<0.001
2.	Married	4.34 (0.834)	0.383	0.001

Table no.74 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.59 and 0.590 and for married patients was 4.34 and 0.834 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective

observation for respondents who were single was 0.672 and P value was <0.001. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.383 and 0.001 respectively

Table:75 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.37 (0.809)	0.590	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.35 (0.783)	0.419	0.003
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.62 (1.061)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.60 (0.548)	0.167	0.394

Table no.75 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.37 and 0.809, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.35 and 0.783, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.62 and 1.061, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.548. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.590 and P value was <0.001. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.419 and 0.003 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 0.167 and P value was 0.394

Table:76 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.55 (0.934)	0.239	0.239
2.	Insurance	4.08 (0.760)	0.520	0.034
3.	Self finance	4.29 (0.817)	0.384	0.001

Table no.76 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.55 and 0.934. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.08 and 0.760 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.29 and 0.817. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.239 and P value was 0.239. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.520 and P value was 0.034. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.384 and P value was 0.001.

Table:77 Income status wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.10 (0.876)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.35 (0.679)	0.383	0.018
3.	50000-100000₹	3.62 (0.767)	0.395	0.052
4.	Above 100000₹	4.20 (1.014)	0.306	0.134

Table no.77 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, whose family income is 20000-50000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.10 and 0.876, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.35 and 0.629. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.62 and 0.767 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 1.014. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income status of 20000-50000₹ was 0.383 and P value was 0.018. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.395 and P value was 0.052.

Table:78 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on satisfaction with the time taken at OPD registration counter

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.15 (0.850)	0.542	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.46 (0.720)	0.211	0.099

Table no.78 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.15 and 0.850 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.46 and 0.720. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.542 and who came for follow up was 0.211. The P value for those who came for the first time was <0.001 and who came for follow up was 0.099.

Table:79 Gender wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in waiting area:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.90 (0.309)	0.691	<0.001
2	Female	4.74 (0.665)	0.691	<0.001

Table no.79 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.90 and 0.309, and 4.74 and 0.665 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.691 and 0.691 respectively and P value for males and females was <0.001 and <0.001 respectively

Table:80 Age wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in waiting area

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.75 (0.50)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.80 (0.542)	0.246	0.016
3.	Above 50	5.00 (0.0)	Equivocal	

Table no.80 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.75 and 0.50; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.80 and 0.542, and 5.00 and 0.0 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for age group 20-50 years was 0.246 and P value was 0.016.

Table:81 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.74 (0.594)	Equivocal	
2.	Married	4.86 (0.470)	0.333	0.04

Table no.81 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, married are more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.74 and 0.594 and for married patients was 4.86 and 0.470 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose marital status was married was 0.333 and P value was 0.04.

Table:82 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.87 (0.346)	0.680	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.86 (0.409)	Equivocal	
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.38 (1.188)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00 (0.00)	Equivocal	

Table no.82 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.87 and 0.346, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.86 and 0.409, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.38 and 1.188, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.680 and P value was <0.001.

Table:83 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.55 (0.934)	0.194	0.284
2.	Insurance	4.77 (0.599)	Equivocal	
3.	Self finance	4.88 (0.375)	0.311	0.008

Table no.83 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.55 and 0.934. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.77 and 0.599 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.88 and 0.375. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.194 and P value was 0.284. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.311 and P value was 0.008.

Table:84 Income status wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.88 (0.632)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.87 (0.428)	Equivocal	
3.	50000-100000₹	4.89 (0.323)	Equivocal	
4.	Above 100000₹	4.89 (0.806)	0.303	0.127

Table no.84 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.88 and 0.632, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.87 and 0.428. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.89 and 0.323 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.89 and 0.806. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.303 and P value was 0.127.

Table:85 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Cleanliness in waiting area

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.73 (0.644)	0.239	0.051
2.	Follow up	4.93 (0.264)	Equivocal	

Table no.85 shows that opinion on cleanliness in waiting area, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.73 and 0.644 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.93 and 0.264. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.239 and P value was 0.051.

Table:86 Gender wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.77 (0.555)	0.076	0.308
2	Female	4.62 (0.731)	Equivocal	

Table no.86 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.77 and 0.555, and 4.62 and 0.731 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males was 0.076 and P value for males was 0.308

Table:87 Age wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.75 (0.50)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.66 (0.684)	0.016	0.445
3.	Above 50	5.00 (0.00)	Equivocal	

Table no.87 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.75 and 0.50; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.66 and 0.684, and 5.00 and 0.00 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.016 and P value was 0.445.

Table:88 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.52 (0.643)	-0.085	0.339
2.	Married	4.78 (0.634)	0.153	0.114

Table no.88 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.52 and 0.643 and for married patients was 4.78 and 0.634 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was -0.085 and P value was 0.339. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.153 and P value was 0.114.

Table:89 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.80 (0.407)	0.482	0.004
2.	Graduate	4.66 (0.680)	-0.77	0.309
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.38 (1.188)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00 (0.00)	Equivocal	

Table no.89 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.80 and 0.407, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.66 and 0.680, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.38 and 1.188, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.482 and P value was 0.004. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.77 and P value was 0.309.

Table:90 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.55 (0.934)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.46 (0.967)	Equivocal	
3.	Self finance	4.75 (0.512)	0.275	0.017

Table no.90 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.55 and 0.934. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.46 and 0.967 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.75 and 0.512. Correlation between subjective and objective observation whose self finance their medical expenses was 0.275 and P value was 0.017.

Table:91 Income status wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.75 (0.675)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.77 (0.497)	0.012	0.475
3.	50000-100000₹	4.89 (0.323)	Equivocal	
4.	Above 100000₹	4.89 (0.814)	0.184	0.247

Table no.91 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.75 and 0.675, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.77 and 0.497. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.89 and 0.323 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.89 and 0.814. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.012 and P value was 0.475. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.184 and P value was 0.247.

Table:92 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on ambience of waiting area

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.73 (0.644)	-0.006	0.484
2.	Follow up	4.66 (0.656)	0.161	0.158

Table no.92 shows that opinion on ambience of waiting area, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.73 and 0.644 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.66 and 0.656. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was -0.006 and who came for follow up was 0.161. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.484 and who came for follow up was 0.158

Table:93 Gender wise distribution of opinion on Information display:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.22 (0.800)	-0.143	0.199
2	Female	4.08 (0.722)	0.164	0.159

Table no.93 shows that opinion on Information display, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.22 and 0.8, and 4.08 and 0.722 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was -0.143 and 0.164 respectively and P value for males and females was 0.199 and 0.159 respectively.

Table:94 Age wise distribution of opinion on Information display

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.25 (0.957)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.08 (0.741)	0.036	0.389
3.	Above 50	4.67 (0.707)	-0.287	0.227

Table no.94 shows that opinion on Information display, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.25 and 0.957; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.08 and 0.741, and 4.67 and 0.707 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.036 and P value was 0.389. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was - 0.287 and P value was 0.227

Table:95 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on Information display

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.08 (0.702)	-0.302	0.071
2.	Married	4.19 (0.793)	0.106	0.229

Table no.95 shows that opinion on Information display, married are more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.08 and 0.702 and for married patients was 4.19 and 0.793 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was 0.227 and P value was 0.071. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.106 and P value was 0.229.

Table:96 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on Information display

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.18 (0.723)	0.049	0.406
2.	Graduate	4.14 (0.798)	-0.300	0.431
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.75 (0.707)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00 (0.0)	Equivocal	

Table no.96 shows that opinion on Information display, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.18 and 0.723, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.14 and 0.798, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.75 and 0.707, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.049 and P value was 0.406. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was -0.30 and 0.431 respectively.

Table:97 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on and Information display

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.27 (0.786)	0.232	0.246
2.	Insurance	4.11 (0.782)	Equivocal	
3.	Self finance	4.12 (0.765)	0.069	0.318

Table no.97 shows that opinion on Information display, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.27 and 0.786. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.11 and 0.782 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.12 and 0.765. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.232 and P value was 0.286.. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.069 and P value was 0.318.

Table:98 Income status wise distribution of opinion on Information display

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.12 (0.886)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.50 (0.707)	0.084	0.344
3.	50000-100000₹	4.54 (0.519)	0.260	0.165
4.	Above 100000₹	4.54 (0.688)	0.108	0.356

Table no.98 shows that opinion on Information display, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.12 and 0.886, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.5 and 0.707. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.54 and 0.519 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.54 and 0.688. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income for respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹ was 0.084 and P value was 0.344. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.260 and P value was 0.165. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.108 and P value was <0.001.

Table:99 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Information display

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.12 (0.822)	0.181	0.132
2.	Follow up	4.17 (0.697)	-0.234	0.088

Table no.99 shows that opinion on Information display, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.12 and 0.822 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.17 and 0.697. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.181 and who came for follow up was -0.234. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.132 and who came for follow up was 0.088 respectively.

Table:100 Gender wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.55 (0.619)	0.028	0.427
2	Female	4.55 (0.619)	0.275	0.035

Table no.100 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement is equivocal for both genders.

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.55 and 0.619, and 4.55 and 0.619 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.028 and 0.275 respectively and P value for males and females was 0.427 and 0.035 respectively.

Table:101 Age wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.75 (0.50)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.51 (0.663)	0.119	0.152
3.	Above 50	4.89 (0.333)	0.667	0.018

Table no.101 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area, above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups in the cleanliness in consultation chamber

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.75 and 0.50; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.51 and 0.663, and 4.89 and 0.333 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for age group 20-50 years was 0.119 and P value was 0.152. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.667 and P value was 0.018.

Table:102 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.19 (0.843)	0.357	0.37
2.	Married	4.73 (0.450)	0.161	0.104

Table no.102 shows that that opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 4.19 and 0.843 and for married patients was 4.73 and 0.450 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was 0.357 and P value was 0.37. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.161 and P value was 0.104

Table:103 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.48 (0.634)	0.011	0.478
2.	Graduate	4.52 (0.664)	0.174	0.134
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.75 (0.707)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00 (0.00)	Equivocal	

Table no.103 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.48 and 0.634, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.52 and 0.664, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.75 and 0.707, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.00. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.011 and P value was 0.478. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.174 and 0.134 respectively.

Table:104 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.64 (0.505)	-0.239	0.239
2.	Insurance	4.31 (1.032)	-0.202	0.254
3.	Self finance	4.62 (0.524)	0.406	0.001

Table no.104 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.64 and 0.505. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.31 and 1.032 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.62 and 0.524. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was -0.239 and P value was 0.239. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.202 and P value was 0.254 respectively. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.406 and P value was 0.001.

Table:105 Income status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area:

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.62 (0.699)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.53 (0.730)	0.428	0.009
3.	50000-100000₹	4.39 (0.698)	Equivocal	
4.	Above 100000₹	4.39 (0.479)	0.022	0.468

Table no.105 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in waiting area, whose family income is below 20000₹ more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.62 and 0.699, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.53 and 0.730. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.698 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.39 and 0.479. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.428 and P value was 0.009. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, for respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.022 and P value was 0.468.

Table:106 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on Sitting arrangement in waiting area:

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.52 (0.618)	0.159	0.141
2.	Follow up	4.60 (0.672)	0.145	0.186

Table no.106 shows that opinion on Sitting arrangement in waiting area, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 4.52 and 0.618 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and .0672. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.159 and who came for follow up was 0.145. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.141 and who came for follow up was 0.186.

Table:107 Gender wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	2.83 (1.257)	0.294	0.025
2	Female	2.81 (1.254)	0.114	0.230

Table no.107 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, males are more satisfied as compared to females.

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 2.83 and 1.257, and 2.81 and 1.254 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.294 and 0.114 respectively and P value for males and females was 0.025 and 0.230 respectively.

Table:108 Age wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	2.75 (1.258)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	2.77 (1.203)	0.145	0.106
3.	Above 50	3.20 (1.610)	0.535	0.045

Table no.108 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups in the cleanliness in consultation chamber

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 2.75 and 1.258; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 2.77 and 1.203, and 3.20 and 1.610 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.145 and P value was 0.106. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.535 and P value was 0.045.

Table:109 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	2.56 (1.086)	0.247	0.112
2.	Married	2.94 (0.1304)	0.213	0.047

Table no.109 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, married are more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 2.56 and 1.086 and for married patients was 2.94 and 0.1304 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was 0.247 and P value was 0.112. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.213 and P value was 0.047.

Table:110 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility at waiting area

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.1 (1.291)	-0.403	0.018
2.	Graduate	2.66 (1.119)	0.126	0.208
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	2.00 (0.756)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	3.60 (1.673)	0.468	0.213

Table no.110 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.1 and 1.291, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 2.66 and 1.119, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 2.00 and 0.756, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.60 and 1.673. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.403 and P value was 0.018. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.126 and 0.208 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 0.468 and P value was 0.213

Table:111 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	3.45 (1.368)	-0.353	0.144
2.	Insurance	3.54 (1.127)	0.438	0.067
3.	Self finance	2.59 (1.140)	0.183	0.085

Table no.111 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, whose medical expenses insurance more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 3.45 and 1.368. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 3.54 and 1.127 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 2.59 and 1.140. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was -0.353 and P value was 0.144. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.438 and P value was 0.067. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.183 and P value was 0.085.

Table:112 Income status wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	2.59 (1.370)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	2.68 (1.326)	0.395	0.014
3.	50000-100000₹	2.41 (1.064)	-1.00	0.352
4.	Above 100000₹	2.41 (1.181)	0.396	0.065

Table no. 112 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, whose family income is 20000-50000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 2.59 and 1.370, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 2.68 and 1.326. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 2.41 and 1.064 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 2.41 and 1.181. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.395 and P value was 0.014. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -1.00 and P value was 0.352. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.396 and P value was 0.065

Table:113 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.06 (1.223)	0.297	0.021
2.	Follow up	2.49 (1.186)	0.40	0.403

Table no.113 shows that opinion on entertainment facility in waiting area, who visited first time are more satisfied as compared to those who visited for follow up

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 3.06 and 1.223 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 2.49 and 1.186. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was and who came for follow up was 0.297 and 0.40 respectively. The P value for those who came for the first time was and who came for follow up was 0.021 and 0.403 respectively.

Table:114 Gender wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.90 (0.951)	0.242	0.071
2	Female	3.72 (0.974)	-0.253	0.065

Table no.114 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 3.90 and 0.951, and 3.72 and 0.974 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was 0.242 and -0.253 respectively and P value for males and females was 0.071 and 0.065 respectively

Table:115 Age wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	3.30 (0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	3.71 (0.958)	0.058	0.326
3.	Above 50	4.56 (0.726)	0.000	0.500

Table no.115 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, Above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 3.3 and 0.577; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 3.71 and 0.958, and 4.56 and 0.726 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.058 and P value was 0.326. For above 50 years of age, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.000 and P value was 0.500

Table:116 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.48 (1.046)	Equivocal	
2.	Married	3.96 (0.884)	Equivocal	

Table no. 116 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area for marital status as single was 3.48 and 1.046 and for married patients was 3.96 and 0.884 respectively

Table:117 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.81 (1.021)	-0.53	0.398
2.	Graduate	3.78 (0.898)	0.072	0.337
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.50 (0.837)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.75 (0.500)	0.577	0.211

Table no.117 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.81 and 1.021, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 3.78 and 0.898, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.50 and 0.837, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.75 and 0.500. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.53 and P value was 0.398. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.072 and 0.337 respectively Correlation between subjective and objective observation for those whose academic qualification was below 10th was 0.577 and P value was 0.211.

Table:118 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.00 (0.756)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	3.82 (0.982)	0.337	0.155
3.	Self finance	3.84 (0.934)	0.065	0.326

Table no. 118 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied, compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.00 and 0.756. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 3.82 and 0.982 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 3.84 and 0.934. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.337 and P value was 0.155. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.065 and P value was 0.326.

Table:119 Income status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	3.84 (0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	3.85 (0.949)	-0.169	0.002
3.	50000-100000₹	3.56 (1.031)	0.420	0.053
4.	Above 100000₹	3.56 (0.632)	0.00	0.500

Table no.119 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 3.84 and 0.707, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.85 and 0.949. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.56 and 1.031 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 3.56 and 0.632. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.62 and 0.767 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 1.014. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who had an income status of 20000-50000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.169 and P value was 0.002. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.420 and P value was 0.053. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.00 and P value was 0.500

Table:120 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages at waiting area

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.64 (1.046)	0.265	0.059
2.	Follow up	3.92 (0.850)	-0.170	0.153

Table no.120 shows that opinion on arrangement of drinking water, snacks and beverages in waiting area, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 3.64 and 1.046 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 3.92 and .0850. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.265 and who came for follow up was -0.170. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.059 and who came for follow up was 0.153

Table:121 Gender wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area:

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.90 (1.578)	0.066	0.355
2	Female	4.24 (0.699)	0.426	0.008

Table no.121 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 3.90 and 1.578, and 4.24 and 0.699 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for males and females was respectively and P value for males and females was respectively

Table:122 Age wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	3.75 (0.50)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.13 (0.689)	0.143	0.131
3.	Above 50	4.78 (0.441)	Equivocal	

Table no.122 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years 3.75 and 0.50; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.13 and 0.689, and 4.78 and 0.441 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.143 and P value was 0.131.

Table:123 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.88 (0.666)	-0.53	0.412
2.	Married	4.34 (0.658)	0.297	0.024

Table no.123 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for marital status as single was 3.88 and 0.666 and for married patients was 4.34 and 0.658 respectively. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents who were single was -0.53 and P value was 0.412. For respondents whose marital status was married, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.297 and P value was 0.024 respectively.

Table:124 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.07 (0.675)	0.632	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.19 (0.701)	0.063	0.369
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.25 (0.500)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00 (0.0)	Equivocal	

Table no.124 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.07 and 0.675, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.19 and 0.701, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.25 and 0.500, for people having academic qualification below X standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.0. For respondents who were post graduates, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.632 and P value was <0.001. For Graduates, correlation between subjective and objective observation and P value was 0.063 and 0.369 respectively.

Table:125 Medical Expenses wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.38 (0.518)	0.000	0.500
2.	Insurance	4.08 (0.793)	0.707	0.017
3.	Self finance	4.00 (1.486)	0.037	0.407

Table no.125 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, whose medical expenses organization more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.38 and 0.518. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.08 and 0.793 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 1.486. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization was 0.00 and P value was 0.500. For respondents who had medical insurance, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.707 and P value was 0.017. For respondents, who were self financing their medical expenses, Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.037 and P value was 0.407.

Table:126 Income status wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.00 (0.782)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.35 (0.629)	0.000	0.500
3.	50000-100000₹	4.06 (0.772)	0.509	0.031
4.	Above 100000₹	4.06 (0.632)	0.524	0.049

Table no.126 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.00 and 0.782, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.35 and 0.629. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.06 and 0.772 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.06 and 0.632. Correlation between subjective and objective observation for respondents having monthly income below 20000₹ was and P value was 0.500. For respondents who had an income status of 50000-100000₹, correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.509 and P value was 0.031. For respondents who had a monthly income of above 100000₹, correlation was 0.524 and P value was 0.049

Table:127 Type of consultation visit wise distribution of opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.89 (1.641)	0.254	0.074
2.	Follow up	4.19 (0.688)	0.194	0.152

Table no.127 shows that opinion on arrangement of waste disposal at waiting area, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time, mean and standard deviation was 3.89 and 1.641 and for those who came for follow up, mean and standard deviation was 4.19 and 0.668. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation for the respondents who had visited this hospital for the first time was 0.254 and who came for follow up was 0.194. The P value for those who came for the first time was 0.074 and who came for follow up was 0.152

Table:128 Gender wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.88(0.334)	0.233	0.062
2	Female	4.76(0.624)	0.196	0.104

Table no.128 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber, males are more satisfied as compared to females

For cleanliness in the consultation room, mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.88 and 0.334, and 4.76 and 0.624 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.233 for males and 0.196 for females, and the p value 0.062 for male and 0.104 for females.

Table:129 Age wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.75(0.500)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.80(0.520)	0.177	0.063
3.	Above 50	5.00(0.00)	Equivocal	

Table no.129 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

For cleanliness in the consultation room, mean and standard deviation for age groups below 20 years was 4.75 and 0.500, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.80 and 0.52, and 5.00 and 0.00 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was for below 20 years, for 20-50 years 0.177. P value for below 20 years, for the 20-50 years 0.063.

Table:130 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.70(0.669)	Equivocal	
2.	Married	4.87(0.383)	0.319	0.006

Table no.130 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber, married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

For cleanliness in the consultation room, mean and standard deviation for single and married were 4.70 and 0.669, and 4.87 and 0.383 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.319 for married, and the p value 0.006 for married.

Table:131 Academic wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.77(0.504)	0.409	0.015
2.	Graduate	4.91(0.366)	Equivocal	
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.5(0.926)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5(0.00)	Equivocal	

Table no.131 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber, below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

For cleanliness of the consultation room, mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.77 and 0.504, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.91 and 0.366, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.926, 5.00 and 0.000. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduate was 0.409 and P value 0.015.

Table:132 medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.82(0.603)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.54(0.776)	-0.179	0.280
3.	Self finance	4.86(0.395)	0.415	0.001

Table no.132 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

For Cleanliness in consultation room, mean and standard deviation for patients whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.82 and 0.603. For patients who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.54 and 0.776 and for patients who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.86 and 0.395. The correlation between the subjective and objective for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, -0.719 for insurance, 0.415 for self finance. The P value for organization medical expenses, 0.280 for insurance, 0.001 for self finance.

Table:133 Income status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.86(0.632)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.84(0.454)	0.341	0.032
3.	50000-100000₹	4.88(0.485)	0.904	<0.001
4.	Above 100000₹	4.88(0.602)	0.122	0.327

Table no.133 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber whose family income is 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ is more satisfied as compared to other groups.

For cleanliness in consultation room, mean and standard deviation for patients having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.86 and 0.632, for patients having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.84 and 0.454. For patients having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.88 and 0.485 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.88 and 0.602. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.341 for the respondents who had income status 20000-50000₹, 0.904 for 50000-100000₹ The P value 0.032 for the respondents who had income status 20000-50000₹, <0.001 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.327 for above 100000₹.

Table:134 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of consultation chamber

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.75(0.565)	0.192	0.095
2.	Follow up	4.90(0.379)	Equivocal	

Table no.134 shows that opinion on cleanliness in consultation chamber, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

For cleanliness in the consultation room, mean and standard deviation for first visit and follow up was 4.75 and 0.565, and 4.90 and 0.379 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.192 for first visit and the p value 0.095

Table:135 Gender wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.77(0.428)	0.263	0.041
2	Female	4.64(0.759)	0.320	0.017

Table no.135 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, males are more satisfied as compared to females

For the sitting arrangement in consultation room, mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.77 and 0.428, and 4.64 and 0.759 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.263 for males and 0.320 for females, and the p value 0.041 for male and 0.017 for females.

Table:136 Age wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.50(0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.68(0.637)	0.287	0.006
3.	Above 50	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no.136 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, above 50 years is more satisfied as compared to other groups

For sitting arrangement in consultation room, mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.50 and 0.577, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.68 and 0.637, and 5.00 and 0.000 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.177 for 20-50 years and for the above 50 years .The p value for the 20-50 years 0.287.

Table:137 Marital status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.59(0.747)	0.167	0.208
2.	Married	4.76(0.534)	0.400	0.001

Table no.137 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, whose marital status are married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

For sitting arrangement in consultation room, mean and standard deviation for single and married was 4.59 and 0.747, and 4.76 and 0.534 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.167 for single and 0.400 for married, and the p value 0.208 for single and 0.001 for married.

Table:138 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.62(0.775)	0.553	0.001
2.	Graduate	4.77(0.476)	0.347	0.031
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.62(1.188)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no.138 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, whose academic qualification was below 10th were more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.62 and 0.775, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.77 and 0.476, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.62 and 1.188, 5.00 and 0.000 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates was 0.553, 0.347 for graduates P value was 0.001 for post graduates, 0.031 for graduates

Table:139 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.45(0.820)	0.588	0.029
2.	Insurance	4.38(0.961)	0.284	0.173
3.	Self finance	4.83(0.425)	0.535	<0.001

Table no.139 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, who self finance their medical expenses were more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.45 and 0.820. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.38 and 0.961 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.83 and 0.425. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.588 for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.284 for medically insured respondents, 0.535 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was 0.029 for respondents whose medical expenses incurred by organization, 0.173 for those who had insurance, <0.001 for those who were self financing their expenses

Table:140 Income status wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.83(0.675)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.77(0.504)	0.516	0.002
3.	50000-100000₹	4.72(0.752)	0.240	0.169
4.	Above 100000₹	4.72(0.730)	0.340	0.099

Table no.140 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, whose family income status below 20000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.83 and 0.675, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.77 and 0.504. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.72 and 0.752 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.72 and 0.730. Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.516 for 20000-50000₹, 0.240 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.340 for above

100000□. P value was 0.002 for the respondents who had 20000-50000□, 0.169 for 50000-100000□ and 0.099 for above 100000□.

Table:141 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.69(0.552)	0.130	0.190
2.	Follow up	4.72(0.679)	0.590	<0.001

Table no.141 shows that opinion on sitting arrangement in consultation room, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited for the first time was 4.69 and 0.552. For those who came for those who came for follow up it was 4.72 and 0.590 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.130 for respondents who came for first time, and 0.590 for follow up. P value was 0.190 for respondents who came for first time respondents and <0.001 for those who came for follow up.

Table:142 Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.91(1.139)	0.437	0.001
2	Female	4.64(1.322)	0.506	<0.001

Table no.142 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 3.91 and 1.139, and females were 4.64 and 1.322 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.437 for males and 0.506 for females, and P value was 0.001 for males and <0.001 for females.

Table:143 Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	3.50(1.000)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	3.76(1.250)	0.542	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.00(1.225)	-0.007	0.492

Table no.143 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation those who are above 50 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 3.50 and 1.000, for 20-50 years mean and standard deviation was 3.76 and 1.250 and above 50 years it was 4.00 and 1.225 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50

years was 0.542 and for above 50 years 1.000. P value for 20-50 years was <0.001 and for above 50 years it was 0.492

Table:144 marital stat wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.44(1.188)	0.385	0.026
2.	Married	3.89(1.243)	0.503	0.000

Table no.144 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation, whose marital status are married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 3.44 and 1.188, for married respondents it was 3.89 and 1.243 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.385 for unmarried respondents and 0.508 for married respondents, and P value was 0.026 for unmarried respondents and <0.001 for married respondents.

Table:145 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.90(1.398)	0.523	0.002
2.	Graduate	3.80(1.069)	0.417	0.002
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.38(1.188)	0.526	0.010
4.	Below 10 th	4.60(0.894)	0.196	0.376

Table no.145 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation, whose below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.90 and 1.398, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 3.80 and 1.069, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.38 and 1.188, 4.60 and 0.894. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates was 0.523, for graduates it was 0.417, for senior secondary it was 0.526, and 0.196 for below 10th standard .P value was 0.002 for post graduates ,0.002 for graduates, 0.010 for senior secondary and 0.376 for below 10th standard

Table:146 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.30(1.160)	0.405	0.108
2.	Insurance	3.92(1.256)	-0.004	0.494
3.	Self finance	3.71(1.260)	0.534	<0.001

Table no.146 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.30 and 1.160. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 3.92 and 1.256 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 3.71 and 1.260. The correlation between the subjective and objective 0.405 for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, -0.004 for medically insured respondents, 0.534 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value 0.108 for organization medical expenses, 0.494 for medically insured respondents, <0.001 for those who were self financing their expenses

Table:147 Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	3.80(1.476)	0.602	0.033
2.	20000-50000₹	4.10(0.960)	0.669	<0.001
3.	50000-100000₹	3.11(1.231)	0.157	0.267
4.	Above 100000₹	3.56(1.413)	0.433	0.047

Table no.147 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation, whose family income status 20000-50000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.30 and 0.823, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.57 and 0.626. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.24 and 0.903 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.719. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.154 for the respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.870 for 20000-50000₹, 0.465 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.719 for above 100000₹. P value was 0.335 for those respondents who had income status below 20000₹, <0.001 for 20000-50000₹, 0.030 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.001 for those earning above 100000₹.

Table:148 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time before consultation

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.66(1.128)	0.395	0.003
2.	Follow up	3.90(1.338)	0.511	<0.001

Table no.148 shows that opinion on waiting time before consultation, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who had visited the hospital for the first time was 3.66 and 1.128, for those who came for those who came for follow up was 3.90 and 1.338 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.395 for first time and 0.511 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.003 for first time and <0.001 for follow up

Table:149 Gender wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.51(0.727)	0.696	<0.001
2	Female	4.45(0.705)	0.592	<0.001

Table no.149 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males and females was 4.51 and 0.727, for females it was 4.45 and 0.705 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.696 for males and 0.592 for females, and P value <0.001 for males and <0.001 for females.

Table:150 Age wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.50(0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.42(0.744)	0.591	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.90(0.316)	1.000	<0.001

Table no.150 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, those who were above 50 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.50 and 0.577; for 20-50 years it was 4.42 and 0.744 and for above 50 years, mean and standard deviation was 4.90 and 0.316 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for 20-50 years 0.591 and 1.000 for the above 50 years. P value for the 20-50 years <0.001 and <0.001 for above 50 years.

Table:151 marital status wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.27(0.827)	0.322	0.058
2.	Married	4.57(0.644)	0.783	<0.001

Table no.151 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, whose marital status were married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.27 and 0.827 and for married respondents it was 4.57 and 0.644 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was for unmarried respondents and 0.322, for married respondents 0.783, and P value for unmarried respondents was 0.058 and was <0.001 for married respondents

Table:152 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.69(0.541)	0.827	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.37(0.787)	0.597	<0.001
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.12(0.991)	0.374	0.063
4.	Below 10 th	4.75(0.500)	0.816	0.092

Table no.152 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, whose academic qualification was below 10th were more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.69 and 0.827, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.37 and 0.597, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.12 and 0.991, 4.75 and 0.500. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates was 0.827 for graduates 0.597, for senior secondary 0.374, and for below 10th standard 0.816 .P value<0.001 for post graduates, <0.001 for graduates, for senior secondary 0.063 and for below 10th standard 0.092.

Table:153 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.45(1.036)	0.475	0.22
2.	Insurance	4.58(0.669)	0.696	0.006
3.	Self finance	4.49(0.630)	0.731	<0.001

Table no. 153 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, whose medical expenses were incurred by insurance are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.45 and 1.036. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.58 and 0.669 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.49 and 0.630. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation for whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 0.475, for medically insured respondents 0.696, for those who were self financing their expenses 0.731. P value 0.220 for respondents whose medical expenses incurred by organization, 0.006 for insured respondents, for those who were self financing P value was <0.001

Table:154 Income status wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.30(0.823)	0.154	0.335
2.	20000-50000₹	4.57(0.626)	0.870	<0.001
3.	50000-100000₹	4.24(0.903)	0.465	0.030
4.	Above 100000₹	4.60(0.737)	0.719	0.001

Table no.154 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, whose family income status above 100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.30 and 0.823, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.57 and 0.626. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.24 and 0.903 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.737. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.154 for the respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.870 for 20000-50000₹, 0.465 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.719 for above 100000₹. P value for the respondents, who had income status below 20000₹ was 0.335, for 20000-50000₹ was <0.001, 0.030 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.001 for above 100000₹.

Table:155 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on time given by the doctor

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.41(0.805)	0.511	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.55(0.597)	0.820	<0.001

Table no.155 shows that opinion on time given by the doctor, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for the first time was 4.41 and 0.805, and those who came for those who came for follow up was 4.55 and 0.597 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.511 for respondents who came for first time respondents and 0.820 for those who came for those who came for follow up, and P value <0.001 for respondents who came for first time and <0.001 for follow up.

Table:156 Gender wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.69(0.630)	Equivocal	
2	Female	4.79(0.419)	-0.386	0.096

Table no.156 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.69 and 0.630, and for females was 4.79 and 0.419 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was -0.386 for females

Table:157 Age wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	NA(NA)		
2.	20-50 years	4.77(0.514)	-0.297	0.116
3.	Above 50	4.67(0.516)	Equivocal	

Table no.157 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, those who are 20-50 years more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was NA and NA; 4.77 and 0.514 for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.67 and 0.516. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.297. P value was 0.116 for 20-50 years.

Table:158 marital status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.83(0.408)	Equivocal	
2.	Married	4.73(0.533)	-0.292	0.128

Table no.158 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose marital status are unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.83 and 0.408, and 4.73 and 0.533 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was -0.292 for married respondents, and P value 0.128 for married respondents.

Table:159 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.83(0.389)	Equivocal	
2.	Graduate	4.75(0.577)	-0.329	0.136
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.67(0.577)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.57(0.478)	Equivocal	

Table no.159 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose academic qualification was post graduation were more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.83 and 0.389, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.75 and 0.577, for respondents who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.67 and 0.577, and 4.57 and 0.478 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for graduates was -0.329. P value 0.136 for graduates.

Table:160 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	5.00(0.000)	-0.500	0.333
3.	Self finance	4.68(0.557)	Equivocal	

Table no.160 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization and insurance are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 5.00 and 0.000. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.000 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.68 and 0.557. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation for whose medical expenses incurred by medically insured respondents was -0.500. P value was 0.333 for respondents whose medical expenses incurred by insured respondents.

Table:161 Income status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.68(1.155)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.83(0.389)	Equivocal	
3.	50000-100000₹	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
4.	Above 100000₹	5.00(0.408)	Equivocal	

Table no.161 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose family income status below above 100000₹ and 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.68 and 1.155, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.83 and 0.389. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.000 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.408.

Table:162 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to procedure room

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.90(0.316)	-0.655	0.039
2.	Follow up	4.68(0.568)	Equivocal	

Table no.162 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, who visited first time are more satisfied as compared to those who visited for follow up

Mean and standard deviation for those who came for the first time was 4.90 and 0.316 and those who came for those who came for follow up was 4.68 and 0.568 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was -0.655 for respondents who came for first time and P value was 0.039.

Table:163 Gender wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.85(0.376)	Equivocal	
2	Female	4.89(0.315)	1.000	0.000

Table no.163 shows that opinion on cleanliness of procedure room, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.85 and 0.376, and for females was 4.89 and 0.315 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was for males and 1.000 for females, and P value for males was and <0.001 for females

Table:164 Age wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	NA(NA)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.88(0.326)	0.798	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.83(0.408)	Equivocal	

Table no.164 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, those who are 20-50 years more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was NA and NA; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.88 and 0.326, and 4.83 and 0.408 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was for 20-50 years it was 0.798. P value for below 20 years, for 20-50 years was <0.001.

Table:165 marital status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
2.	Married	4.85(0.368)	0.676	<0.001

Table no.165 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose marital status are unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 5.00 and 0.000, and 4.87 and 0.368 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was for unmarried respondents and 0.676 for married respondents, and P value for unmarried respondents and <0.001 for married respondents

Table:166 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.92(0.289)	1.000	<0.001
2.	Graduate	4.88(0.342)	Equivocal	
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.67(0.577)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.69(0.707)	Equivocal	

Table no.166 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose academic qualification was post graduation were more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.92 and 0.289, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.88 and 0.342, for respondents who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.67 and 0.577. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates was 1.000, P value is <0.001.

Table:167 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.80(0.447)	1.000	<0.001
2.	Insurance	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
3.	Self finance	4.88(0.332)	Equivocal	

Table no.167 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose medical expenses were incurred by insurance were more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.80 and 0.447. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.000 and for respondents who were self financing their

medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.88 and 0.332. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation 1.000, P value was <0.001

Table:168 Income status wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.88(0.675)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.83(0.389)	0.674	0.008
3.	50000-100000₹	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
4.	Above 100000₹	5.00(0.408)	Equivocal	

Table no.168 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, whose family income status above 100000₹ and 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.88 and 0.675, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.83 and 0.389. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.000 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and 0.408. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.674 for 20000-50000₹. P value for the respondents, who had income status below 20000₹ was 0.008.

Table:169 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on cleanliness of procedure room

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
2.	Follow up	4.82(0.395)	Equivocal	

Table no.169 shows that opinion on accessibility to procedure room, who visited first time are more satisfied as compared to those who visited for follow up

Mean and standard deviation for those who came for the first time was 5.00 and 0.000 and those who came for those who came for follow up was 4.82 and 0.395 respectively.

Table:170 Gender wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.26(0.653)	-0.331	0.105
2	Female	4.08(0.793)	0.426	0.073

Table no.170 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, males are more satisfied as compared with females

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.26 and 0.653, and for females it was 4.08 and 0.793 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was - 0.105 for males and 0.426 for females, and P value was 0.105 for males, and 0.073 for females.

Table:171 Age wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(NA)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.14(0.705)	0.044	0.412
3.	Above 50	5.00(0.000)	0.094	0.351

Table no.171 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, those who are above 50 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and NA; for 20-50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.14 and 0.705 and for above 50 years, it was 5.00 and 0.00 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective for 20-50 years, it was 0.044 and for above 50 years it was 0.094. P value was 0.044 for 20-50 years age group, it was 0.412 and for above 50 years, it was 0.351

Table:172 marital status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.00(0.471)	Equivocal	
2.	Married	4.29(0.784)	Equivocal	

Table no.172 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, whose marital status are married more satisfied as compared to singles

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.00 and 0.471, and for married respondents, it was 4.29 and 0.784 respectively.

Table:173 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.33(0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	Graduate	4.18(0.636)	0.294	0.142
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.00(NA)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.25(0.957)	Equivocal	

Table no.173 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, whose academic qualification was post graduation are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.33 and 0.707, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.18 and 0.636, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.00 and NA, 4.25 and 0.957. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.294 for graduates. P value was 0.142 for graduates.

Table:174 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.33(0.577)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.00(0.816)	Equivocal	
3.	Self finance	4.25(0.716)	0.412	0.045

Table no. 174 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, whose medical expenses incurred by organization are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.33 and 0.577. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.816 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.25 and 0.716. The correlation between the subjective and objective for who self financing their medical expenses it was 0.412. P value was 0.045.

Table:175 Income status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.25(0.837)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	4.33(0.500)	Equivocal	
3.	50000-100000₹	4.00(0.707)	0.530	0.071
4.	Above 100000₹	4.00(1.051)	Equivocal	

Table no.175 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, whose family income status 20000-50000₹ is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.25 and 0.837, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.500. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.707, and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 1.051. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.530 for 50000-100000₹. P value was 0.071 for 50000-100000₹.

Table:176 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to laboratory

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.05(0.708)	0.410	0.041
2.	Follow up	3.56(1.078)	Equivocal	

Table no.176 shows that opinion on accessibility to laboratory, who visited first time were more satisfied as compared to those who visited for follow up

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time respondents was 4.05 and 0.708 and those who came for those who came for follow up was 3.56 and 1.078 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.410 for respondents who came for first time. P value was 0.041 for respondents who came for first time.

Table:177 Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.16(0.765)	0.300	0.130
2	Female	4.25(1.084)	0.503	0.040

Table no.177 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, females were more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.16 and 0.765, and for females it was 4.25 and 1.084 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.300 for males and 0.503 for females, and P value was 0.130 for males and 0.040 for females.

Table:178 Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(NA)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.14(0.803)	0.355	0.032
3.	Above 50	5.00(0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no.178 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, those who were above 50 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups.

For politeness in communication of staff at laboratory, mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and NA; for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.14 and 0.803, and 5.00 and 0.00 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.355 for 20-50 years. P value for 20-50 years was 0.032.

Table:179 marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.00(0.667)	-0.395	0.129
2.	Married	4.29(0.845)	0.566	0.006

Table no.179 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, whose marital status were married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.00 and 0.667 and for married respondents was 4.29 and 0.845 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and

objective observation was -0.395 for unmarried respondents and 0.566 for married respondents, P value was 0.129 for unmarried respondents and 0.006 for married respondents.

Table:180 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.11(0.928)	0.577	0.067
2.	Graduate	4.29(0.772)	0.258	0.167
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.00(NA)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.25(0.500)	0.522	0.239

Table no.180 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, whose academic qualification was graduation are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.11 and 0.928, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.29 and 0.772, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.00 and NA, 4.25 and 0.500 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates was 0.577, 0.258 for graduates, for senior secondary, and 0.522 for below 10th standard .P value was 0.067 for post graduates, 0.167 for graduates, for senior secondary and 0.239 for below 10th standard.

Table:181 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.33(0.577)	-1.000	<0.001
2.	Insurance	4.36(0.900)	Equivocal	
3.	Self finance	4.30(0.801)	0.521	0.013

Table no.181 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, whose medical expenses were incurred by insurance were more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.33 and 0.577. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.36 and 0.900 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.30 and 0.801. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was -1.000 for respondents whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.521 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was, <0.001 and 0.013 respectively.

Table:182 Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	4.00(0.707)	-0.423	0.239
2.	20000-50000□	4.44(0.882)	0.592	0.081

3.	50000-100000□	4.22(0.667)	0.795	0.005
4.	Above 100000□	4.00(1.000)	0.456	0.220

Table no.182 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, whose family income status is 20000-50000□ are more Satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 4.00 and 0.707, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.44 and 0.882. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.22 and 0.667 and for above 100000□, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.1.000. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation -0.423 for the respondents who had income status below 20000□, 0.592 for 20000-50000□, 0.795 for 50000-100000□ and 0.456 for above 100000□. P value was 0.239 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000□, 0.081 for 20000-50000□, 0.005 for 50000-100000□ and 0.220 for above 100000□

Table:183 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.05(0.780)	0.427	0.034
2.	Follow up	4.55(0.597)	0.361	0.153

Table no.183 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time was 4.05 and 0.780 and those who came for follow up was 4.55 and 0.597 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.427 for respondents who came for first time and for those who came for follow up was 0.361. P value was 0.034 for respondents who came for first time and 0.153 for follow up.

Table:184 Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.94(0.725)	0.601	0.007
2	Female	4.00(0.953)	0.379	0.112

Table no. 184 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory, females were more satisfied as compared with males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 3.94 and 0.725, and for females was 4.00 and 0.953 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.601 for males and 0.379 for females, and P value was 0.007 for males and 0.112 for females.

Table:185 Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(NA)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.00(0.816)	0.473	0.006
3.	Above 50	3.00(NA)	0.603	0.004

Table no.185 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory; those who were 20-50 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and NA, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.816, and 3.00 and NA respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was for 20-50 years 0.473 and for above 50 years 0.603. P value for below 20 years was, for 20-50 years was 0.006 and for above 50 years it was 0.004

Table:186 marital status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.10(0.738)	0.048	0.448
2.	Married	3.90(0.852)	Equivocal	

Table no.186 shows that opinion on politeness of staff at laboratory, whose marital status unmarried are more satisfied as compared to married.

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.10 and 0.738, and 3.90 and 0.852 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.048 for unmarried respondents. P value was 0.448 for unmarried respondents.

Table:187 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.00(0.866)	0.207	0.312
2.	Graduate	4.19(0.750)	0.493	0.032
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	5.00(NA)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	3.75(0.957)	0.577	0.211

Table no.187 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory, whose academic qualification was graduation are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.00 and 0.866, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.19 and 0.750, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and NA, 3.75 and 0.957 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates was 0.207, for graduates it was 0.493, 0.577 for below 10th standard. P value was 0.312 for post graduates, 0.032 for graduates, 0.211 for below 10th standard.

Table:188 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.00(1.000)	0.866	0.167
2.	Insurance	3.86(0.900)	0.420	0.174
3.	Self finance	4.00(0.816)	0.518	0.016

Table no.188 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization and self finance were more satisfied compared to insurance

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.00 and 1.000. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 3.86 and 0.900 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.816. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.866 for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, 0.420 for medically insured respondents, 0.518 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was 0.167 for organization medical expenses, 0.174 for medically insured respondents, 0.016 for those who were self financing their expenses.

Table:189 Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	3.60(0.874)	0.375	0.267
2.	20000-50000₹	4.50(0.535)	0.645	0.059
3.	50000-100000₹	3.89(0.782)	0.408	0.158
4.	Above 100000₹	3.60(0.894)	0.102	0.435

Table no.189 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory, whose family income status below 20000-50000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 3.60 and 0.874, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.535. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.89 and 0.782 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 3.60 and 0.894. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.375 for respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.645 for

20000-50000□, 0.408 for 50000-100000□ and 0.102 for above 100000□. P value was 0.267 for respondents, who had income status below 20000□, 0.059 for 20000-50000□, 0.158 for 50000-100000□ and 0.435 for above 100000□

Table:190 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.11(0.737)	0.404	0.048
2.	Follow up	3.73(0.905)	0.583	0.038

Table no.190 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by the staff at laboratory, who visited first time are more satisfied as compared to those who visited follow up

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who visited this hospital for the first time, and those who came for follow up was 4.11 and 0.737, and 4.73 and 0.905 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.404 for respondents who came for the first time and 0.583 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.048 for respondents who came for first time, and 0.038 for follow up.

Table:191 Gender wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.22(0.943)	0.778	<0.001
2	Female	4.33(0.888)	0.535	0.030

Table no.191 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, females were more satisfied as compared with males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.22 and 0.943, for females it was 4.33 and 0.888 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.778 for males and 0.535 for females, and P value <0.001 for males and 0.030 for females

Table:192 Age wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(NA)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.32(0.905)	0.692	<0.001
3.	Above 50	3.00(NA)	Equivocal	

Table no.192 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, those who were 20-50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and NA, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.32 and 0.905, and 3.00 and NA

respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.692 for 20-50 years. P value for 20-50 years was <0.001 .

Table:193 marital status wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.00(1.054)	0.803	0.003
2.	Married	4.40(0.821)	0.565	0.006

Table no.193 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, whose marital status is married more satisfied as compared to singles

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents was 4.00 and 0.1.054 and for married respondents was 4.40 and 0.821 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.803 for unmarried respondents, and 0.565for married respondents, and P value for unmarried respondents was 0.003 and for married respondents was 0.006.

Table:194 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.56(0.726)	0.548	0.080
2.	Graduate	4.19(0.981)	0.783	<0.001
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	5.00(NA)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	3.75(0.957)	Equivocal	

Table no.194 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, whose academic qualification was post graduate, are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.56 and 0.726, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.19 and 0.981, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and NA, 3.75 and 0.957 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.548 for post graduates, 0.783 for graduates. P value was 0.080 for post graduates, <0.001 for graduates.

Table:195 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.67(0.577)	-1.000	<0.001
2.	Insurance	4.43(0.976)	0.710	0.037
3.	Self finance	4.16(0.958)	0.813	<0.001

Table no.195 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, whose medical were incurred by organization were more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.67 and 0.577. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.43 and 0.976 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.16 and 0.958. The correlation between the subjective and objective -1.000 for respondents whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.710 for medically insured respondents, 0.813 for those who were self financing their expenses.

Table:196 Income status wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	4.00(1.000)	0.559	0.164
2.	20000-50000□	4.62(0.518)	1.000	<0.001
3.	50000-100000□	3.89(1.054)	0.685	0.021
4.	Above 100000□	4.60(0.894)	0.612	0.136

Table no.196 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, whose family income status above 100000□ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 4.00 and 1.000, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.62 and 0.518. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 3.89 and 1.054 and for above 100000□, mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.894. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.559 for the respondents who had income status below 20000□, 1.000 for 20000-50000□, 0.685 for 50000-100000□ and 0.612 for above 100000□. P value was 0.164 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000□, <0.001 for 20000-50000□, 0.021 for 50000-100000□ and 0.136 for above 100000□

Table:197 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on explanation about preparation required before test

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.47(0.697)	0.352	0.070
2.	Follow up	3.91(1.136)	0.849	0.001

Table no.197 shows that opinion on explanation about preparation required before test, who visited first time, were more satisfied as compared to those who visited follow up

For explanation about preparation required before test, mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 4.47 and 0.697, and 3.91 and 1.136 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.352 for respondents who came for first time and

0.849 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.70 for respondents who came for first time and 0.001 for follow up.

Table:198 Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.16(0.843)	0.827	<0.001
2	Female	4.17(0.835)	0.271	0.197

Table no.198 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, females were more satisfied as compared with males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.16 and 0.843, and for females was 4.17 and 0.835 respectively. . The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.827 for males, and 0.271 for females, and P value was <0.001 for males and 0.197 for females.

Table:199 Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	5.00(NA)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.18(0.819)	0.547	0.002
3.	Above 50	3.50(0.707)	Equivocal	

Table no.199 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, those who were 20-50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 5.00 and NA, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.18 and 0.819, and 3.50 and 0.707 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.547 for 20-50 years. P value was 0.002 for 20-50 years.

Table:200 marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.00(0.667)	0.527	0.059
2.	Married	4.24(0.889)	0.550	0.014

Table no.200 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, whose marital status are married more satisfied as compared to singles

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.00 and 0.667, and 4.24 and 0.889 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and

objective observation was 0.527 for unmarried respondents and 0.550 for married respondents, and P value was 0.059 for unmarried respondents and 0.014 for married

Table:201 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.22(0.667)	0.411	0.180
2.	Graduate	4.18(0.728)	0.427	0.064
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	5.00(NA)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	3.75(1.500)	0.866	0.167

Table no.201 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, whose academic qualification was post graduation are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.22 and 0.667, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.18 and 0.728, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 5.00 and NA, 3.75 and 1.500. The correlation between subjective and objective observation for post graduates 0.411 and 0.427 for graduates, and 0.866 for below 10th standard. P value was 0.180 for post graduates, 0.064 for graduates, and 0.167 for below 10th standard.

Table:202 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.33(1.160)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.14(0.900)	0.315	0.246
3.	Self finance	4.15(0.875)	0.695	0.001

Table no.202 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.33 and 1.160. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.14 and 0.900 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.15 and 0.875. The correlation between the subjective and objective for whose medical expenses incurred by medically insured 0.315, 0.695 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was 0.246 and 0.001 respectively

Table:203 Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	3.60(1.342)	0.802	0.051
2.	20000-50000□	4.33(0.707)	0.750	0.026

3.	50000-100000□	4.33(0.707)	0.645	0.059
4.	Above 100000□	4.20(0.447)	0.00	0.500

Table no.203 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, whose family income status below 20000-50000□ and 50000-100000□ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 3.60 and 0.1.342, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.0.707. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.707 and for above 100000□, mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 0.447. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.802 for the respondents who had income status below 20000□, 0.750 for 20000-50000□, 0.645 for 50000-100000□ and 0.000 for above 100000□. P value was 0.051 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000□, 0.026 for 20000-50000□, 0.059 for 50000-100000□ and 0.500 for above 100000□.

Table:204 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for test

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.26(0.872)	0.632	0.002
2.	Follow up	4.00(0.739)	0.296	0.260

Table no.204 shows that opinion on waiting time for test, who visited first time were more satisfied as compared to those who visited follow up

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 4.26 and 0.872, and 4.00 and 0.739 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.632 for respondents who came for first time and 0.296 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.002 for respondents who came for first time and 0.260 for follow up

Table:205 Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.56(0.784)	0.535	0.013
2	Female	4.00(0.877)	Equivocal	

Table no.205 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, females are more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 3.56 and 0.784 and for females it was, 4.00 and 0.877 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.535 for males and P value was 0.013 for males.

Table:206 Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S.	Age	Likert scale	Correlation between	P value
----	-----	--------------	---------------------	---------

No.		Mean(SD)	subjective and objective observation	
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(1.414)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	3.67(0.784)	0.261	0.099
3.	Above 50	4.33(1.155)	0.208	0.396

Table no.206 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, those who are above 50 years more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and 1.414, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 3.67 and 0.784, and 4.33 and 1.155 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.261, for 20-50 years, and for above 50 years was 0.208. P value was for below 20 years, for 20-50 years, it was 0.099 and for above 50 years was 0.396.

Table:207 marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.44(0.726)	0.302	0.199
2.	Married	3.83(0.887)	0.252	0.124

Table no.207 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, whose marital status are married more satisfied as compared to singles

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 3.44 and 0.726, and 3.83 and 0.887 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.302 for unmarried respondents and 0.252 for married respondents, and P value was 0.199 for unmarried respondents and 0.124 for married respondents.

Table:208 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.86(1.215)	0.853	0.015
2.	Graduate	3.44(0.629)	0.508	0.022
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.00(0.707)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.33(0.577)	Equivocal	

Table no.208 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, whose academic qualification was below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.86 and 1.215, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 3.44 and 0.629, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.707, and 4.33 and 0.577 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation

0.853 for post graduates, 0.508 for graduates, for senior secondary, and for below 10th standard .P value was 0.015 for post graduates, 0.022 for graduates, for senior secondary and for below 10th standard.

Table:209 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	3.75(0.500)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.00(0.707)	0.527	0.181
3.	Self finance	3.80(0.951)	0.369	0.054

Table no.209 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, whose medical expenses were incurred by insurance are were more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 3.75 and 0.500. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.707, for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 3.80 and 0.951. The correlation between the subjective and objective for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.527 for medically insured respondents, 0.369 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by the organization, 0.181 for medically insured respondents, 0.054 for those who were self financing their expenses.

Table:210 Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	3.33(0.577)	-0.866	0.167
2.	20000-50000□	3.62(0.768)	0.344	0.124
3.	50000-100000□	3.40(1.140)	0.105	0.433
4.	Above 100000□	4.00(0.707)	0.00	0.500

Table no.210 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, whose family income status above 100000□ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 3.33 and 0.577, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 3.62 and 0.768. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 3.40 and 0.105 and for above 100000□, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.707. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.866 for the respondents who had income status below 20000□, 0.344 for 20000-50000□, 0.105 for 50000-100000□ and <0.001 for above 100000□. P value was 0.167 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000□, 0.124 for 20000-50000□, 0.433 for 50000-100000□ and 0.500 above 100000□.

Table:211 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.50(0.786)	0.575	0.006
2.	Follow up	4.07(0.829)	-0.022	0.472

Table no.211 shows that opinion on waiting time for the technique at imaging services, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time.

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 3.50 and 0.786, and 4.07 and 0.829 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.575 for respondents who came for first time and -0.022 for those who came for follow up. P value was 0.006 for respondents who came for first time and 0.472 for follow up.

Table:212 Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.18(0.728)	0.460	0.036
2	Female	4.50(0.650)	0.187	0.270

Table no.212 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, females were more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.18 and 0.728, and for females it was 4.50 and 0.650 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.460 for males and 0.187 for females, and P value was 0.036 for males and 0.270 for females.

Table:213 Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.31(0.736)	0.328	0.059
3.	Above 50	4.67(0.577)	0.522	0.239

Table no.213 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, those who are above 50 years more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and 0.000, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 3.71 and 1.029, and 3.50 and 0.690 respective.

Table:214 marital status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.12(0.641)	0.548	0.102
2.	Married	4.39(0.722)	0.355	0.052

Table no.214 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, whose marital status are married more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.12 and 0.641, and 4.39 and 0.722 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.548 for unmarried respondents and 0.355 for married respondents, and P value was 0.102 for unmarried respondents and 0.052 for married respondents.

Table:215 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.71(0.488)	0.400	0.216
2.	Graduate	4.20(0.775)	0.372	0.095
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.40(0.894)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.00(0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no.215 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, whose academic qualification was post graduate, are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.71 and 0.488, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 0.775, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.40 and 0.894, 4.00 and 0.000. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.400 for post graduates and 0.372 for graduates. P value was 0.216 for post graduates, 0.095 for graduates.

Table:216 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.00(0.816)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	3.60(0.548)	0.667	0.110
3.	Self finance	4.53(0.612)	0.852	<0.001

Table no.216 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.00 and 0.816. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 3.60 and 0.548, for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.53 and 0.612. The correlation between the subjective and objective was 0.667 for medically insured respondents, 0.852 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value 0.110 for medically insured respondents, <0.001 for those who were self financing their expenses.

Table:217 Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	4.33(0.577)	1.000	<0.001
2.	20000-50000□	4.33(0.778)	0.516	0.052
3.	50000-100000□	4.40(0.548)	0.612	0.136
4.	Above 100000□	4.20(0.837)	0.00	0.500

Table no.217 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, whose family income status below 50000-100000□ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 4.33 and 0.577, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.33 and 0.778. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 4.40 and 0.548 and for above 100000□, mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 0.837. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation was 1.000 for the respondents who had income status below 20000□, 0.516 for 20000-50000□, 0.612 for 50000-100000□ and 0.001 for above 100000□. P value was <0.001 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000□, 0.052 for 20000-50000□, 0.136 for 50000-100000□ and 0.500 above 100000□.

Table:218 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.24(0.562)	-0.042	0.437
2.	Follow up	4.43(0.852)	0.677	0.008

Table no.218 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at imaging services, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time.

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time was 4.24 and 0.562 and for those who came for follow up was 4.43 and 0.852 respectively. The correlation between

the subjective and objective observation was -0.042 for respondents who came for first time and 0.677 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.437 for respondents who came for first time, and 0.008 for those who came for follow up.

Table:219 Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.41(0.712)	0.241	0.184
2	Female	4.43(0.646)	0.272	0.184

Table no.219 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, females are more satisfied as compared with males

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.41 and 0.712 and for females it was, 4.43 and 0.646 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.241 for males and 0.272 for females, and P value was 0.184 for males and 0.184 for females.

Table:220 Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.50(0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.38(0.697)	0.238	0.131
3.	Above 50	4.67(0.577)	Equivocal	

Table no.220 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, those who are above 50 years more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.50 and 0.707, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.38 and 0.697, and 4.67 and 0.577 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.238 for 20-50 years P value was 0.131 for 20-50 years.

Table:221 marital stat wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.50(0.535)	0.548	0.102
2.	Married	4.39(0.722)	0.202	0.184

Table no.221 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, whose marital status married are more satisfied as compared to unmarried

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.50 and 0.535, and 4.39 and 0.722 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and

objective observation was 0.548 for unmarried respondents and 0.548 for married respondents, and P value was 0.102 for unmarried respondents and 0.184 for married respondents.

Table:222 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.57(0.535)	0.707	0.116
2.	Graduate	4.47(0.743)	0.564	0.011
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.40(0.894)	Equivocal	
4.	Below 10 th	4.00(0.000)	Equivocal	

Table no.222 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, whose academic qualification was post graduate are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.57 and 0.535, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.47 and 0.743, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.40 and 0.894, 4.00 and 0.000 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.707 for post graduates and 0.564 for graduates .P value was 0.116 for post graduates, 0.011 for graduates.

Table:223 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.25(0.957)	Equivocal	
2.	Insurance	4.00(0.707)	0.645	0.120
3.	Self finance	4.53(0.612)	0.396	0.011

Table no. 223 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.25 and 0.957. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.707 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.53 and 0.612. The correlation between the subjective and objective for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.645 for medically insured respondents, 0.396 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was, 0.120 and 0.011 respectively.

Table:224 Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.33(0.577)	1.000	0.000
2.	20000-50000₹	4.58(0.669)	0.506	0.047
3.	50000-100000₹	4.60(0.548)	-0.408	0.248
4.	Above 100000₹	4.00(0.707)	0.845	0.036

Table no.224 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, whose family income status below 50000-100000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.33 and 0.577, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.58 and 0.669. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.60 and 0.548, for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.707. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation 1.000 for the respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.506 for 20000-50000₹, -0.408 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.845 for above 100000₹. P value was 0.000 for the respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.047 for 20000-50000₹, 0.248 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.036 for above 100000₹.

Table:225 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.35(0.606)	-0.075	0.387
2.	Follow up	4.50(0.760)	0.649	0.011

Table no.225 shows that opinion on clarity of information given by staff at imaging services, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time.

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 4.35 and 0.606, and 4.50 and 0.760 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was -0.075 for respondents who came for first time and 0.649 for those who came for follow up. P value was 0.387 for respondents who came for first time and 0.011 for follow up.

Table:226 Gender wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.78(1.045)	0.381	0.156
2	Female	3.94(1.083)	0.031	0.428

Table no.226 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, females were more satisfied as compared to males

Mean and standard deviation for males 3.78 and 1.045 and for females it was, 3.94 and 1.083 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.381 for males and 0.031 for females, and P value was 0.156 for males and 0.428 for females

Table:227 Age wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(0.00)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	3.80(1.063)	0.045	0.370
3.	Above 50	4.67(0.577)	-0.577	0.52

Table no.227 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, those who were above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and 0.000, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 3.80 and 1.063, and 4.67 and 0.577 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation, for 20-50 years, it was 0.045 and for above 50 years, it was -0.577. P value was 0.370 for 20-50 years, and 0.520 for above 50 years,

Table:228 marital status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.90(0.889)	0.074	0.378
2.	Married	3.84(1.143)	-0.105	0.240

Table no.228 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, whose marital status are unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 3.90 and 0.889, and 3.84 and 1.143 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.074 for unmarried respondents and -0.105 for married respondents, and P value was .378 for unmarried respondents and 0.240 for married respondents.

Table:229 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.81(1.059)	Equivocal	
2.	Graduate	3.85(1.093)	-0.120	0.253
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.83(1.169)	0.448	0.070

4.	Below 10 th	4..33(1.155)	Equivocal	
----	------------------------	--------------	-----------	--

Table no.229 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, whose academic qualification was below 10th are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.81 and 1.059, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 3.85 and 1.093, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.83 and 1.169, 4.33 and 1.155 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was -0.120 for graduates, 0.448 for senior secondary. P value was 0.253 for graduates, 0.070 for senior secondary.

Table:230 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.00(1.054)	0.000	0.500
2.	Insurance	3.70(1.337)	0.79	0.414
3.	Self finance	3.80(1.036)	0.298	0.083

Table no.230 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, whose medical expenses incurred by organization are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.00 and 1.054. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 3.70 and 1.337, for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 3.80 and 1.036. The correlation between the subjective and objective 0.000 for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.79 for medically insured respondents, 0.298 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was 0.500, 0.414 and 0.083 respectively.

Table:231 Income status wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	3.80(1.265)	Equivocal	
2.	20000-50000₹	3.78(0.998)	-0.120	0.297
3.	50000-100000₹	4.00(0.961)	0.00	0.500
4.	Above 100000₹	4.00(1.514)	Equivocal	

Table no.231 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, whose family income status below 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ is more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 3.80 and 1.265, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 3.78 and 0.998. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 0.961, and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.00 and 1.514. The Correlation between subjective and objective

observation was -0.120 for 20000-50000₹, 0.00 for 50000-100000₹. P value was 0.297 for the respondents, who had income status 20000-50000₹, 0.500 for 50000-100000₹.

Table:232 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on accessibility to pharmacy

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	3.56(1.078)	0.147	0.208
2.	Follow up	4.11(0.993)	-0.260	0.069

Table no.232 shows that opinion on accessibility to pharmacy, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 3.56 and 1.078, and 4.11 and 0.993 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.147 for respondents who came for first time and -0.260 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.208 for respondents who came for first time and 0.069 for follow up.

Table:233 Gender wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	3.47(0.929)	0.784	0.000
2	Female	3.91(0.884)	0.442	0.000

Table no.233 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy, females are more satisfied as compared with males

For the waiting time for the medicine at pharmacy, mean and standard deviation for males and females was 3.47 and 0.929, 3.91 and 0.884 respectively. . The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.784 for males and 0.442 for females, and P value was 0.000 for male and 0.000 for females.

Table:234 Age wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.00(0.000)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	3.71(1.029)	0.740	0.000
3.	Above 50	3.50(1.195)	0.690	0.029

Table no.234 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy; those who were below 20 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.00 and 0.000, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 3.71 and 1.029, and 3.50 and 0.690 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was for below 20 years, for 20-50 years 0.740 and for the above 50 years 0.690. P value was <0.001, for the 20-50 years and for above 50 years it was 0.029.

Table:235 marital status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	3.70(0.865)	0.907	0.000
2.	Married	3.69(1.095)	0.695	0.000

Table no.235 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy, whose marital status unmarried are more satisfied as compared to married.

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 3.70 and 0.865, and 3.69 and 1.095 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.907 for unmarried respondents and 0.695 for married respondents, and P value was <0.001 for both unmarried and married respondents

Table:236 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	3.52(1.262)	0.908	0.000
2.	Graduate	3.81(0.821)	0.586	0.000
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	3.67(1.211)	0.408	0.248
4.	Below 10 th	3.67(0.577)	Equivocal	

Table no.236 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy, whose academic qualification graduates are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 3.52 and 1.262, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 3.81 and 0.821, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 3.67 and 1.211, 3.67 and 0.577 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.908 for post graduates and 0.586 for graduates, 0.408 for senior secondary. P value was 0.000 for post graduates, 0.000 for graduates, 0.248 for senior secondary.

Table:237 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
--------	------------------	-----------------------	--	---------

1.	Organization	3.62(1.302)	0.824	0.006
2.	Insurance	4.20()	0.736	0.008
3.	Self finance	3.56(1.013)	0.717	0.000

Table no.237 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy, whose medical expenses incurred by insurance are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 3.62 and 1.302. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.20 and 0. and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 3.56 and 1.013. The correlation between the subjective and objective 0.824 for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.736 for medically insured respondents, 0.717 for those who were self financing their expenses. P 0.006, 0.008 and <0.001 respectively.

Table:238 Income status wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000□	3.67(1.033)	0.620	0.132
2.	20000-50000□	3.96(1.022)	0.819	<0.001
3.	50000-100000□	3.23(0.725)	0.221	0.234
4.	Above 100000□	3.50(1.092)	0.933	<0.001

Table no.238 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy, whose family income status 20000-50000□ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000□ per month was 3.67 and 1.033, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000□ mean and standard deviation was 3.96 and 1.022. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000□ mean and standard deviation was 3.23 and 0.725, for above 100000□ mean and standard deviation was 3.50 and 1.092. The correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.620 for the respondents who had income status below 20000□, 0.819 for 20000-50000□, 0.221 for 50000-100000□ and 0.933 for above 100000□. P value was 0.132 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000□, <0.001 for 20000-50000□, 0.234 for 50000-100000□ and <0.001 for above 100000□

Table:239 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.15(0.850)	0.844	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.46(0.720)	0.651	<0.001

Table no.239 shows that opinion on waiting time for medicine at pharmacy, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time.

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 4.15 and 0.850, and 4.46 and 0.720 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.844 for respondents who came for first time and 0.651 for those who came for follow up and P value was <0.001 for respondents who came for first time and for follow up.

Table:240 Gender wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.53(0.654)	0.620	0.000
2	Female	4.00(0.884)	0.453	0.003

Table no.240 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy, males are more satisfied as compared to females

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.53 and 0.654, and for females, it was 4.00 and 0.884 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.620 for males and 0.453 for females, and P value was <0.001 for males and 0.003 for females.

Table:241 Age wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.50(0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.37(0.807)	0.529	0.000
3.	Above 50	4.89(0.333)	-0.316	0.204

Table no.241 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy; those who were above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.50 and 0.707, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.37 and 0.807, and 4.89 and 0.333 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was 0.529 for 20-50 years and for above 50 years, it was -0.316 .P value was <0.001, for 20-50 years and for above 50 years 0.204.

Table:242 marital stat wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.52(0.680)	0.834	0.000
2.	Married	4.41(0.814)	0.384	0.004

Table no.242 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy, whose marital status are unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.52 and 0.680, and 4.41 and 0.814 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.834 for unmarried respondents and 0.384 for married respondents, and P value was < 0.001 for unmarried respondents and 0.004 for married respondents.

Table:243 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.54(0.508)	0.649	0.001
2.	Graduate	4.42(0.902)	0.523	0.001
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.17(0.983)	0.225	0.334
4.	Below 10 th	4.00(0.000)	0.866	0.167

Table no.243 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy, whose academic qualification post graduates are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.54 and 0.508, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.42 and 0.902, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.17 and 0.983, 4.00 and 0.000 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.649 for post graduates, 0.523 for graduates, 0.225 for senior secondary, and 0.866 for below 10th standard. P value was 0.001 for both post graduates and graduates, 0.334 for senior secondary and 0.167 for below 10th standard.

Table:244 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.60(0.699)	0.653	0.041
2.	Insurance	4.30(0.823)	0.286	0.211
3.	Self finance	4.55(0.589)	0.687	<0.001

Table no.244 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy, whose medical expenses incurred by insurance is more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.60 and 0.653. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.30 and 0.823 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.55 and 0.589. The correlation between

the subjective and objective 0.653 for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.286 for medically insured respondents, 0.687 for those who were self financing their expenses .P value was 0.041for those whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization. 0.211for medically insured respondents, <0.001 for those who were self financing their expenses.

Table:245 Income status wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.83(0.408)	0.447	0.187
2.	20000-50000₹	4.35(0.935)	0.443	0.020
3.	50000-100000₹	4.50(0.650)	0.592	0.013
4.	Above 100000₹	4.21(0.802)	0.438	0.067

Table no.245 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy, whose family income status below 20000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.83 and 0.408, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.35 and 0.935. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.50 and 0.650 and for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.21 and 0.438. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.447 for the respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.443 for 20000-50000₹, 0.592 for 50000-100000₹, 0.438 above 100000₹. P value was 0.187 for the respondents, who had income status below 20000₹, 0.020 for 20000-50000₹, 0.013 for 50000-100000₹, and 0.067 for above 100000₹.

Table:246 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.41(0.701)	0.579	<0.001
2.	Follow up	4.46(0.852)	0.478	0.002

Table no.246 shows that opinion on politeness in communication of the staff at pharmacy, who visited for follow up are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 4.41 and 0.701, and 4.46 and 0.852 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.579 for respondents who came for first time and 0.478 for those who came for follow up and P value was <0.001 for respondents who came for first time and 0.002 for those who came for follow up.

Table:247 Gender wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Gender	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1	Male	4.57(0.655)	0.896	<0.001
2	Female	4.35(0.884)	0.925	<0.001

Table no.247 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist, males were more satisfied as compared with females

Mean and standard deviation for males was 4.57 and 0.655, and for females was 4.35 and 0.884 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.896 for males and 0.925 for females, and P value was <0.001 for both males and females

Table:248 Age wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Age	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20 years	4.50(0.707)	Equivocal	
2.	20-50 years	4.40(0.815)	0.482	<0.001
3.	Above 50	4.89(0.333)	-0.316	0.204

Table no.248 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist; those who were above 50 years are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for age group below 20 years was 4.50 and 0.707, for 20-50 years and above 50 years mean and standard deviation was 4.40 and 0.815, and 4.89 and 0.333 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation was for below 20 years, for 20-50 years 0.482 and for the above 50 years -0.316. P value was, it was <0.001 for 20-50 years and for above 50 years 0.204

Table:249 marital stat wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Marital status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Single	4.62(0.669)	0.685	<0.001
2.	Married	4.40(.818)	0.395	0.003

Table no.249 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist, whose marital status are unmarried more satisfied as compared to married

Mean and standard deviation for unmarried respondents and married respondents was 4.62 and 0.669, and 4.40 and 0.818 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.685 for unmarried respondents and 0.395 for married

respondents, and P value was <0.001 for unmarried respondents and 0.003 for married respondents.

Table:250 Academic qualification wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Academic qualification	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Post graduate	4.60(0.577)	0.524	0.010
2.	Graduate	4.42(0.867)	0.554	<0.001
3.	Senior secondary(12 th)	4.17(0.983)	0.225	0.334
4.	Below 10 th	4.00(0.000)	0.866	0.167

Table no.250 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist, whose academic qualification was post graduates are more satisfied as compared to other groups.

Mean and standard deviation for post graduates was 4.60 and 0.577, for graduates mean and standard deviation was 4.42 and 0.867, for people having academic qualification till senior secondary and below 10th standard, mean and standard deviation was 4.17 and 0.983, 4.00 and 0.000 respectively. The correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.524 for post graduates, 0.554 for graduates, 0.225 for senior secondary, and 0.866 for below 10th standard .P value was 0.010 for post graduates, <0.001 for graduates, 0.334 for senior secondary and 0.167 for below 10th standard.

Table:251 Medical expenses wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Medical expenses	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Organization	4.50(0.850)	0.561	0.046
2.	Insurance	4.30(0.823)	0.577	0.052
3.	Self finance	4.55(0.589)	0.598	<0.001

Table no.251 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist, who self finance their medical expenses are more satisfied compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization was 4.50 and 0.850. For respondents who had medical insurance, mean and standard deviation was 4.30 and 0.823 and for respondents who were self financing their medical expenses, mean and standard deviation was 4.55 and 0.598. The correlation between the subjective and objective 0.561 for whose medical expenses incurred by their organization, 0.577 for medically insured respondents, 0.598 for those who were self financing their expenses. P value was 0.046 for respondents whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, 0.052 for medically insured respondents, <0.001 for those who were self financing their expenses.

Table:252 Income status wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Income status	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	Below 20000₹	4.83(0.408)	0.316	0.271
2.	20000-50000₹	4.27(0.985)	0.397	0.037
3.	50000-100000₹	4.57(0.548)	0.559	0.019
4.	Above 100000₹	4.36(0.745)	0.180	0.278

Table no.252 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist, whose family income status below 20000₹ are more satisfied as compared to other groups

Mean and standard deviation for respondents having an income status of below 20000₹ per month was 4.83 and 0.408, for respondents having an income status of 20000-50000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.27 and 0.985. For respondents having income status of 50000-100000₹ mean and standard deviation was 4.57 and 0.548, for above 100000₹, mean and standard deviation was 4.36 and 0.745. The Correlation between subjective and objective observation 0.316 for the respondents who had income status below 20000₹, 0.397 for 20000-50000₹, 0.559 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.180 for above 100000₹. P value was 0.271 for respondents, who had an income status below 20000₹, 0.037 for 20000-50000₹, 0.019 for 50000-100000₹ and 0.278 for above 100000₹.

Table: 253 Type of consultation wise distribution of opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist

S. No.	Type of consultation visit	Likert scale Mean(SD)	Correlation between subjective and objective observation	P value
1.	First visit	4.44(0.660)	0.471	0.003
2.	Follow up	4.47(0.896)	0.469	0.003

Table no .253 shows that opinion on clarity of instruction given by the pharmacist, who visited follow up for are more satisfied as compared to those who visited first time.

Mean and standard deviation for respondents who came for first time and those who came for follow up was 4.44 and 0.660, and 4.47 and 0.896 respectively. The correlation between the subjective and objective observation was 0.471 for respondents who came for first time and 0.469 for those who came for follow up and P value was 0.003 for respondents who came for first time, and 0.003 for those who came for follow up.

DISCUSSION:

The study of patient's satisfaction on OPD services of a tertiary care hospital was undertaken. The parameters assessed were parking, reception, registration, doctor's consultation, clinical procedures at OPD, Hospital laboratory service, imaging services and OPD pharmacy.

Parking:

86.25 percent respondents appreciated the availability of space in parking area, males were more satisfied as compared to females, and respondents below 20 years of age, those who were graduates, whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, whose family income was 50000-100000 ₹, who were unmarried and those who came for follow up were more satisfied. 84.25 percent respondents appreciated signage for parking the car, females showed more satisfaction than males, respondents who were graduates, below 20 years of age, those whose expenses were borne by third party insurers, whose family income was 20000-50000 ₹ per month, who were unmarried and visited this hospital for the first time showed more satisfaction when compared to other groups. 83.5 percent respondents appreciated the accessibility from parking to reception, males were more satisfied as compared to females, and respondents below 20 years of age, who had an academic qualification till 12th standard, who were self financing their medical expenses, whose family income was below 20000 ₹, who were married and came for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. Overall satisfaction was 85 percent (approx 84.66 percent)

Reception:

88 percent respondents appreciated signage to reach reception, males were more satisfied as compared to females, respondents above 50 years of age, whose family income status was 20000-50000 ₹ were more satisfied as compared to other groups, unmarried ones were more satisfied as compared to married ones, graduates respondents and those whose expenses were borne by third party insurers were more satisfied as compared to other groups. The level of satisfaction was equivocal for those who had visited for the first time and those came for follow up. There was discordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.2-8). The presence of receptionist was appreciated by 95.3 percent of respondents. 93 percent of the respondents felt the warmth of reception. 84.5 percent respondents appreciated politeness of communication of reception staff, males showed more satisfaction as compared to females, respondents who were below 20 years of age, married, who were graduates, whose medical expenses were incurred by their organization, whose family income was 50000-100000 ₹ and who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.9-15). The attentiveness of reception staff was appreciated by 97.6 percent respondents. 82.75 percent respondents appreciated the clarity and brevity of information, males were more satisfied as compared to females for clarity of information given by reception staff, respondents who were above 50 years of age, married, graduates, who were self financing their medical expenses, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000 ₹ and those who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.16-22). 86 percent respondents appreciated the convenience to reach OPD reception, males were more satisfied as compared to females, and respondents who were below 20 years, married, whose academic qualification was below 10th, who were self financing their medical expenses, whose family income was 50000-100000 ₹ and above 100000 ₹, those who had visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.23-29). 97 percent respondents appreciated the warmth of reception by customer care executives. For politeness of communication of customer care executives, males were more satisfied as compared to females, respondents who were above 50 years, married, had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those who self financed their medical expenses, whose family income was below 20000 ₹ and who visited for follow

up showed greater level of satisfaction when compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.30-36). 93 percent respondents appreciated the responsiveness to queries, males were more satisfied as compared to females for responsiveness to queries by customer care executive, respondents above 50 years, who were married, had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those who self financed their medical expenses, whose family income was 50000-100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.37-43). 87.5 percent respondents appreciated the clarity of information by customer care executives, males showed a higher level of satisfaction, respondents above 50 years were more satisfied as compared to other groups, who were married, had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was below 20000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.44-50). 85.75 percent respondents were satisfied with appointment system females were more satisfied as compared to males, respondents below 20 years of age, those who were unmarried, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose monthly family income was 20000-50000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.51-57). Overall satisfaction was 87 percent (approx 86.7 percent). The observations compare with those reported in the literature⁽¹³⁾

OPD Registration Counter:

100 percent respondents appreciated the presence of receptionist. 71 percent respondents appreciated the warmth of reception by OPD registration counter. 80.7 percent respondents appreciated warmth of reception. 83 percent respondents appreciated the politeness of communication, this observation compare with those reported in the literature^(1, 12), females showed greater level of satisfaction for politeness of communication by staff present at OPD registration counter, respondents above 50 years of age, married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those who self financed their medical expenses, whose family income was 50000-100000□ and those who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.58-64). 93.2 percent respondents appreciated the attentiveness of receptionist to their queries. 85 percent respondents appreciated the clarity and brevity of information. There was a unanimous level of satisfaction for clarity of information given by staff present at OPD registration for both genders, and respondents above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization whose family income was 50000-100000□ per month, those who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.65-71). 83 percent respondents were satisfied with time taken for OPD registration, females showed greater level of satisfaction when compared to males, respondents above 50 years of age, who were unmarried, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was 20000-50000□ per month, those who had visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.72-78). Overall satisfaction was 87 percent (approx 87.3 percent), this observation compare with those reported in the literature⁽¹³⁾

Waiting area:

96 percent respondents appreciated the cleanliness of waiting area, this observation when compared with those reported in the literature ^(1, 11, 12), males were more satisfied as compared to females, respondents above 50 years of age, those were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those who self financed their medical expenses, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.79-85). 93 percent respondents appreciated the ambience of waiting area, males were more satisfied as compared to females, respondents above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those who self financed their medical expenses, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹, those who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.86-92.).

79 percent respondents appreciated the Information display, males were more satisfied as compared to females on opinion on Information display, respondents above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization whose monthly family income was 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.93-99).

89 percent respondents appreciated the sitting arrangement, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ^(1, 11, 12), equal level of satisfaction was there for both genders, respondents above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was below 20000₹, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.100-106).

45.5 percent respondents appreciated the entertainment facility, males were more satisfied as compared to females, above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses insurance, whose monthly family income was 20000-50000₹, who visited for the first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups (107-113)

70 percent respondents appreciated the drinking water, snacks and beverages arrangement, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹¹⁾, males were more satisfied as compared to females and respondents above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.114-120).

79.7 percent respondents appreciated the arrangement for waste disposal, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹¹⁾, males were more satisfied as compared to females and respondents above 50 years of age, who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000₹ and above 100000₹ were more satisfied

as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.121-127).

Overall satisfaction was 79 percent.

Washrooms:

91.9 percent respondents appreciated the adequacy of washrooms. 82.25 percent respondents appreciated the cleanliness of washrooms. 82 percent respondents appreciated the ambience of washrooms. This observation compare with those reported in the literature ^(11, 12)

86.1 percent respondents appreciated the availability of soaps and tissue papers, 77 percent respondents denied the leakage of taps and siphons.

Overall satisfaction was 84 percent.

Doctor's consultation room:

75.6 percent respondents appreciated the presence of doctor in the consultation room. 95.5 percent respondents appreciated the cleanliness in consultation room. Males were more satisfied, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, who self financed their medical expenses, whose family income was 50000-100000□ and above 100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.128-134). 93 percent respondents appreciated the sitting arrangement in consultation room. Males were more satisfied, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those who self financed their medical expenses, whose monthly family income was below 20000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.135-141). 100 percent respondents appreciated the doctor's compassion towards their problems. 100 percent respondents appreciated the availability of examination couch. 88.8 percent respondents appreciated the clinical examination by the doctor; this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾, 100 percent respondents appreciated the explanation given by the doctor of their illness. 99 percent respondents appreciated the explanation of their illness (diagnosis and differential diagnosis) they might be suffering from, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾, 97.7 percent respondents appreciated the explanation by doctor about the plan of treatment. 98 percent respondents appreciated the explanation of medicines given by the doctor. 68.75 percent respondents appreciated the waiting time before consultation, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹¹⁾, females were more satisfied, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was 20000-50000□ and above 100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.142-148). 87 percent respondents appreciated the time given by doctor, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ^(12, 13), males showed a higher level of satisfaction than males, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose family income was above 100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.149-155).

Overall satisfaction was 91 percent.

Procedure room:

93.7 percent respondents appreciated the accessibility to procedure room. Females were more satisfied as compared to males for accessibility to procedure room, respondents who were 20-50 years of age, who were unmarried, who were postgraduates, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000□ and above 100000□, who visited for first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.156-162). 93.5 percent respondents appreciated the presence of nurse in the procedure room. 100 percent respondents appreciated the presence of examination couch. 71 percent respondents appreciated ready availability of equipments/instruments. 97 percent respondents appreciated the cleanliness of procedure room, females were more satisfied as compared to males, respondents who were 20- 50 years of age, who were unmarried, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose monthly family income was 50000-100000□ and above 100000□, who visited for first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment. (Table No.163-169).100 percent respondents appreciated the procedure details explained to them. 100 percent respondents appreciated empathy of staff while attending them. 100 percent respondents appreciated the comfort during the procedure, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾

Overall satisfaction was 97 percent.

Laboratory services:

79.75 percent respondents appreciated the accessibility to laboratory, males were more satisfied than females, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, who were post graduates, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was 20000-50000□, who visited for the first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.170-176). 55 percent respondents appreciated the warmth of reception. 90.3 percent respondents appreciated that the cost of test was told before registering them. 87 percent respondents appreciated that the test was explained to them. 78.2 percent respondents appreciated the politeness of communication of staff, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹²⁾, females were more satisfied than males, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, those who were graduates, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose family income was 20000-50000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.177-183).

87.1 percent respondents appreciated staff's empathetic attitude. 74.25 percent respondents appreciated clarity of information given by the staff, females were more satisfied than males, respondents belonging 20-50 years of age, those who were unmarried, those who were graduates, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was 20000-50000□, who visited for the first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups (Table no.184-190).

81.7 percent respondents appreciated explanation given for preparation required before test, females were more satisfied, respondents belonging 20-50 years of age, those who were married, those who were post graduates, whose medical expenses were incurred by

organization, whose family income was above 100000□, who visited for the first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups (Table No.191-197).

79 percent respondents appreciated waiting time before test, females were more satisfied than males, respondents belonging 20-50 years of age, those who were married, those who were post graduates, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was 20000-50000□ and 50000-100000□, who visited for the first time were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.198-204).

Overall satisfaction was 80 percent.

Imaging services:

100 percent respondents appreciated that the cost of technique was told to them. 97 percent respondents appreciated that the preparation required before the technique was told to them. 68.7 percent respondents appreciated waiting time for the technique, females were more satisfied than males, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose family income was above 100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.205-211).

87 percent respondents received their reports on the appointed time. 71 percent respondents appreciated the warmth of reception by the staff. 83 percent respondents appreciated politeness of communication by the staff. Females were more satisfied than males for politeness of communication by the staff, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, those who were post graduates, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose family income was 50000-100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.212-218).

85.5 percent respondents appreciated the clarity of information given by staff, females were more satisfied than males, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were married, and those who were post graduates, who self financed their medical expenses, whose family income was 50000-100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.219-225).

Overall satisfaction was 86 percent.

Pharmacy:

71.5 percent respondents appreciated the accessibility to pharmacy, females were more satisfied than males, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were unmarried, who had an academic qualification below 10th standard, whose medical expenses were incurred by organization, whose family income was 50000-100000□ and above 100000□, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was discordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.226-232).

67.2 percent respondents appreciated waiting time to get medicines, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾, females showed greater level of satisfaction, respondents below 20 years of age, who were unmarried, who were graduates, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose family income was 20000-50000□ and those who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was

concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.233-239). 95.7 percent respondents appreciated the presence of pharmacist.

86 percent respondents appreciated the availability of prescribed drugs, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ^(11, 13). 51.7 percent respondents appreciated the explanation given by the pharmacist of dosing and periodicity of taking medicine, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾, 53.4 percent respondents appreciated the explanation of method of taking medicines in the language they understood. 84.3 percent respondents appreciated the warmth of reception by the pharmacist. 86 percent respondents appreciated the politeness in communication by the pharmacist, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾, males were more satisfied than females, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were unmarried, who were post graduates, those whose expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose monthly family income was below 20000₹, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.240-246). 86.5 percent respondents appreciated the clarity and brevity of instructions by the pharmacist, males were more satisfied than females, respondents above 50 years of age, those who were unmarried, who were post graduates, who self financed their medical expenses, whose monthly family income was below 20000₹, who visited for follow up were more satisfied as compared to other groups. There was concordance between subjective and objective assessment (Table No.247-253).

Overall satisfaction was 75 percent.

100 percent of respondents said that they would like to visit this hospital again, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹⁾ and 100 percent said they would refer this hospital to their family and friends, this observation compare with those reported in the literature ⁽¹¹⁾

However the in-depth analysis conducted during this study has not been found on the internet and other publications which were available. The correlation between subjective and objective assessment conducted in this study could not be found elsewhere in studies.

CONCLUSION:

Males were satisfied more when compared to females, unmarried respondents, those whose academic qualification was below 10th standard and those who were graduates, respondents above 50 years of age, whose medical expenses were borne by third party assurers, whose monthly family income was below 20000₹ and 20000₹-50000₹, those who came for a follow up showed consistent levels of satisfaction as compared to other groups.

The parameters where concordance between subjective and objective assessment were politeness of communication of reception staff, clarity of information given by reception staff, convenience to reach OPD, politeness of communication of customer care executives, clarity of information given by customer care executives, time taken for OPD registration, politeness of communication of OPD registration staff, clarity of information given by OPD registration staff, cleanliness, ambience, information display, sitting arrangement, entertainment facility, arrangement of drinking water, snacks, beverages and waste disposal arrangement in waiting area, cleanliness and sitting arrangement of consultation room, waiting time before consultation, time given by doctor, accessibility to reach procedure room, accessibility to reach laboratory, waiting time for test in laboratory, politeness of communication of laboratory staff, clarity of information given by laboratory staff waiting

time for techniques, politeness of communication of imaging technique staff, clarity of information given by imaging technique staff, politeness of communication of pharmacist, clarity of information given by pharmacist.

The parameters where discordance between subjective and objective assessment were: signage to reach the reception and accessibility to pharmacy.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

There should be a token system for consultation. In case of absence of doctor, the GRE's attending the patients at the OPD registration counter, should give a proper time limit to the patients about the doctor's arrival so that the patient does not have to wait for a longer time. There should be signage for the way to laboratory, which will enhance the accessibility to laboratory, so the patients' don't need to ask to anyone. Respondents were not satisfied with the entertainment facilities provided at the waiting area. We suggest keeping some health magazines, newspapers and a T.V. with cable connection. Our results showed that the distance from OPD to pharmacy was not appreciated by most of the respondents. Before we could suggest any measure, hospital has already taken steps for it. The pharmacist should explain the dosing and periodicity of drugs to the patients and should make them understand in the language they understand.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- 1) Bilkish Patavegar, Sangita Shelke, Prakash Adhav. (2012). A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY OF PATIENT'S SATISFACTION TOWARDS SERVICES RECEIVED AT TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL ON OPD BASIS. *National Journal of Community Medicine*. 3(2)
- 2) Sodani Prahlad Rai, Kumar Rajeev K , Srivastava Jayati , Sharma Laxman (2010). Measuring patient satisfaction: A case study to improve quality of care at public health facilities. *Indian journal of community medicine*. 35 (1), 52-56.
- 3) Ahmad Iftikhar, Nawaz Allah. (2011). PREDICTORS OF PATIENT SATISFACTION. *Gomal Journal of Medical Sciences*. 9 (2)
- 4) Khattak Afshan, Alvi Muhammad Ismail, Yousaf Muhammad Awais, (2012). Patient Satisfaction – A Comparison between Public & Private Hospitals of Peshawar. *International Journal of Collaborative Research on Internal Medicine & Public Health*. 4(5)
- 5) Kumari Ranjita, Bhushan Vidya, Agarwal Monica (2009). Study on Patient Satisfaction in the Government Allopathic Health Facilities of Lucknow District, India. *Indian journal of community medicine*. 34 (1), 35-42.
- 6) Ibrahim Asma, (2008). Patient satisfaction with health services at the outpatient department of Indira Gandhi memorial Hospital, Male' Maldives. *Journal of public health and development*
- 7) T K SIDHU, R KAUSHAL, R KUMAR. (2010). Assessment Of Satisfaction Among Patients Attending Surgical Outpatient. *JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC RESEARCH*.

- 8) Jawahar S. K. (2007). A STUDY ON OUT PATIENT SATISFACTION AT A SUPER SPECIALTY HOSPITAL IN INDIA. *Internet Journal of Medical Update*. 2 (2), 13-17
- 9) Alrubaiee Laith, Alkaa'ida Ferras. (2011). The mediating effect of patient satisfaction in the patients' Perception of the healthcare quality- patient trust relationship. *International journal of marketing studies*. 3(1), 103-127
- 10) Islam Md. Ziaul and Jabbar Md. Abdul. (2008). PATIENTS' SATISFACTION OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES PROVIDED AT OUT PATIENT DEPARTMENT OF DHAKA MEDICAL COLLEGE HOSPITAL. *Patients' satisfaction of OPD services*. 2 (2), 55-57.
- 11) JOHN PAUL T. CUEVAS. (2008). PATIENT SATISFACTION OF THE HEALTH CARE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE ZAMBOANGA CITY MEDICAL CENTER OUT PATIENT DEPARTMENT
- 12) Andrabi Syed Arshad , Hamid Shamila, Rohul, Jabeen, Anjum Fazl. (2012). Measuring patient satisfaction: A cross sectional study to improve quality of care at a tertiary care hospital namely SKIMS, Soura, Srinagar. *healthline* ISSN 2229-337X
- 13) Sreenivas Talluru ,Prasad G. (2012). Patient Satisfaction -A Comparative Study. *Journal of the Academy of Hospital Administration*. 15 (2)
- 14) Muhammad Afzal, Ahmad Khan, Farwa Rizvi, Abrar Umer. (2011). Patients Satisfaction Levels in Out Patient Department of a Teaching Hospital. *Journal of Islamabad Medical & Dental College (IM&DC)*
- 15) State Institute of Health and Family Welfare Rajasthan Jaipur. (2008). End Term Evaluation of Patient Satisfaction across Secondary level Health Facilities in Rajasthan. *SIHFW: an ISO:9001:2008 certified institution End Term Evaluation of Patient Satisfaction*.
- 16) Khan Omar Awwab, Iqbal Muhaamad. (2012). Patients Experience and Satisfaction with Healthcare at Pakistan Railways Hospital, Rawalpindi. *Ann. Pak. Inst. Med. Sci*. 8 (2), 122-124.