

The Impact of Hospital Accreditation on the Patients Satisfaction of Haemodialysis Department Services

Dr. Zuber Mujeeb Shaikh

FISQua (Ireland), PhD, MPhil, MHM, Director, Corporate Quality Improvement, Dr. Sulaiman Al-Habib Medical Group, Riyadh-11643, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract:

The quality of hospital Haemodialysis Department Service is one of the most relevant items of health care quality perceived by patients and by their families. Patient satisfaction is considered a way of measuring the quality of services provided. **Objectives:** To study the impact of National Accreditation Board for Hospitals & Healthcare Providers (NABH) Accreditation, India on Haemodialysis Department Service patient satisfaction. **Methods:** It is a quantitative, descriptive and inferential research based case study in which sample of a population was studied by structured satisfaction survey questionnaires (before and after the accreditation) in a private tertiary care hospital at Secunderabad, Telangana State, India to determine its characteristics, and it is then inferred that the population has the same or different characteristics. **Significance of Research:** It was observed initially before the accreditation that there was a lower patient satisfaction rate of the hospital Haemodialysis Department Services, which was affecting the study hospitals' business. **Hypothesis:** Null Hypothesis (H_0) and Alternative Hypothesis (H_1) were used and tested to compare the before and after impact of accreditation by applying to each question in the questionnaire. **Study Design:** The closed ended questionnaire was developed considering the Haemodialysis Department Services and incorporated the six dimensions of quality Safe, Timely, Effective, Efficient, Equitable, and Patient-centred (STEEP) and tested prior to implementing. **Questionnaires** were given to the patients' families for completion upon using the Haemodialysis Department Services two months before and two months after the accreditation. The data were collected in order to cover all three shifts of the Haemodialysis Department Services. **Study Population:** Simple random sampling method was selected, the researcher had involved all conscious patients (clinical conditions) from all age groups. **Data Collections:** Primary data were collected from the survey questionnaires. Secondary data were collected from relevant published journals, articles, research papers, academic literature and web portals. **Conclusion:** At the 5 % level of significance, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses between before ($M=51.11$, $SD=21.89$) and after accreditation ($M=58.56$, $SD=17.28$) with p -value <0.001 . The mean satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation.

Keywords: Patient Satisfaction, National Accreditation Board for Hospitals & Healthcare Providers (NABH) Accreditation, Haemodialysis Department Services

I. INTRODUCTION

Quality has become a fundamental requirement for all healthcare organizations in order to survive and succeed in this competitive, demanding and challenging healthcare service industry. Today, developed and developing nations are working towards continuous quality improvement and patient safety by achieving the national and or international healthcare accreditation and providing safe, effective, patient-centred, timely, efficient and equitable health care services to all their patients, families and caretakers. Accreditation of a health care organization is an external evaluation of the level of compliance against a set of organizational standards. Healthcare accreditation standards are advocated as an important means of improving structure, process and outcome.¹

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The increased international focus on improving patient outcomes, safety and quality of care has led stakeholders, policy makers and health care provider organizations adopt standardized processes for measuring health care systems. Patient satisfaction has become a key criterion by which the quality of health care services is evaluated. The literature emphasizes that patients who are satisfied with the provision of health care tend to be more compliant to their treatment plan, maintain their follow up visits; and are more willing to recommend the hospital to others.² The literature emphasizes that hospital accreditation and patient satisfaction are both considered important quality indicators of healthcare delivered.³ The results of patient satisfaction surveys can be used to monitor the quality of health care provided,⁴ to find out any shortages, to provide the necessary interventions, and as a valuable source of strategic planning of health services.⁵

III. DATA ANALYSIS

Association analysis of Demographic variables:

Table 1. Patient participation before and after accreditation

Groups	Frequency	Percentage
Before Accreditation	200	45.5
After Accreditation	240	54.5
Total	440	100.0

Table 1 depicts that there were 200 patients participated before accreditation and 240 patients participated after accreditation. The participation of patients had increased only after accreditation.

Table 2. Group and Age distribution

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the Age categories between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the Age categories between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Age Group					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	<17yrs	17-25yrs	25-55yrs	55-65yrs	>65yrs	
Before Accreditation	25	57	44	45	29	0.066, 0.999
After Accreditation	30	68	54	52	36	
Total	55	125	98	97	65	

Table 2 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the age distribution between before and after accreditation groups. Hence, H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected.

Table 3. Group and Gender Distribution

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the gender distribution between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the gender distribution between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Gender		Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Male	Female	
Before Accreditation	92	108	0.003, 0.958
After Accreditation	111	129	
Total	203	237	

Table 3 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the gender distribution between before and after accreditation groups. Hence, H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected.

Table 4. Group and geographical states (of India) Distribution

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the geographical status of patients between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the geographical status of patients between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Geographical states		Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Same State	Other States	
Before Accreditation	126	74	0.005, 0.942
After Accreditation	152	88	
Total	278	162	

Table 4 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the geographical states between before and after accreditation groups. Hence, H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected.

Table 5. Distribution of patients who speak Telugu, Non-Telugu and Group

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the language patients speak between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the language patients speak between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Language		Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Telugu	Non-Telugu	
Before Accreditation	142	58	0.052, 0.819
After Accreditation	168	72	
Total	310	130	

Table 5 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between those who speak Telugu and those don't speak people who have visited the hospital and before and after accreditation groups. Hence, H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected.

Table 6. Type of payment and Group

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the type of payment made between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the type of payment made between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Payment type			Chi square tests statistic, p-value
	Cash	Insurance	Government	
Before Accreditation	71	110	19	0.001, 0.999
After Accreditation	85	132	23	
Total	156	242	42	

Table 6 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test performed indicates, there is no significant difference between the type of payment between before and after accreditation groups. Hence, H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected.

Association analysis of Questionnaire responses:

Table 7. Satisfaction with respect to the courtesy you received at the reception desk and between Groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to courtesy received at the reception desk before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to courtesy received at the reception desk between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the courtesy you received at the reception desk					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	31	37	14	58	60	26.576, <0.001
After Accreditation	21	17	9	109	84	
Total	52	54	23	167	144	

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

Table 7 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to courtesy received at the reception desk between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=193 (Satisfied=109, Highly satisfied= 84) from N=118 (Satisfied = 58, Highly satisfied=60). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 8. Satisfaction with respect to the duration of waiting time after registration and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the Satisfaction with respect to the duration of waiting time after registration before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the Satisfaction with respect to the duration of waiting time after registration between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the duration of waiting time after registration					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	38	39	13	52	58	43.586, <0.001
After Accreditation	28	10	7	112	83	
Total	66	49	20	164	141	

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

Table 8 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the duration of waiting time after registration between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=195 (Satisfied=112, Highly satisfied= 83) from N=110 (Satisfied = 52, Highly satisfied= 58). Hence, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table 9. Satisfaction with respect to the professionalism/friendliness of the staff and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H_0 : There is no significant difference in the Satisfaction with respect to the professionalism/friendliness of the staff between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1 : There is a significant difference in the Satisfaction with respect to the professionalism/friendliness of the staff between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the professionalism/friendliness of the staff					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	37	35	10	57	61	40.237, <0.001
After Accreditation	17	13	8	121	81	
Total	54	48	18	178	142	

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

Table 9 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the professionalism/friendliness of the staff between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=202 (Satisfied=121, Highly satisfied= 81) from N=118 (Satisfied = 57, Highly satisfied= 61). Hence, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table 10. Satisfaction with respect to the doctors involved in the patient's care and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H_0 : There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the doctors involved in the patient's care between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H_1 : There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the doctors involved in the patient's care between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the doctors involved in the patient's care					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	38	37	17	50	58	42.126, <0.001
After Accreditation	19	16	7	96	102	
Total	57	53	24	146	160	

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

Table 10 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the doctors involved in the patient's care between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=198 (Satisfied=96, Highly satisfied= 102) from N=108 (Satisfied = 50, Highly satisfied= 58). Hence, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Table 11. Satisfaction with respect to the nurses involved in the patient's care and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the nurses involved in the patient's care between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the nurses involved in the patient's care between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the nurses involved in the patient's care					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	36	35	14	62	53	37.357, <0.001
After Accreditation	10	26	9	125	70	
Total	46	61	23	187	123	

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

Table 11 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the nurses involved in the patient's care with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=195 (Satisfied=125, Highly satisfied= 70) from N=115 (Satisfied =62, Highly satisfied= 53). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 12. Satisfaction with respect to the way staff explained the procedure to the patient between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the way staff explained the procedure to the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the way staff explained the procedure to the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the way staff explained the procedure to the patient					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	34	34	11	57	64	44.074, <0.001
After Accreditation	30	10	1	124	75	
Total	64	44	12	181	139	

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

Table 12 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the way staff explained the procedure to the patient between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=199 (Satisfied=124, Highly satisfied= 75) from N=121 (Satisfied =57, Highly satisfied= 64). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 13. Satisfaction with respect to the level of privacy and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the level of privacy between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the level of privacy between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the level of privacy					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	33	35	13	57	62	41.872, <0.001
After Accreditation	21	14	7	135	63	
Total	54	49	20	192	125	

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

Table 13 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the level of privacy between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=198 (Satisfied=135, Highly satisfied= 63) from N=119 (Satisfied =57, Highly satisfied= 62). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 14. Satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety within the unit and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety within the unit between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety within the unit between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety within the unit					Chi-square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	25	35	14	58	68	33.258, <0.001
After Accreditation	19	17	5	126	73	
Total	44	52	19	184	141	

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

Table 14 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the cleanliness and safety within the unit between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=199 (Satisfied=126, Highly satisfied= 73) from N=126 (Satisfied =58, Highly satisfied= 68). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 15. Satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the doctors spent with the patient and between the before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the doctors spent with the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the doctors spent with the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the doctors spent with the patient					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	25	31	15	61	68	22.956, <0.001
After Accreditation	23	12	9	111	85	
Total	48	43	24	172	153	

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

Table 15 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the doctors spent with the patient between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=196 (Satisfied=111, Highly satisfied= 85) from N=129 (Satisfied =61, Highly satisfied= 68). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 16. Satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the nurses spent with the patient and between before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the nurses spent with the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the nurses spent with the patient between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the nurses spent with the patient					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	32	27	12	66	63	28.143, <0.001
After Accreditation	26	13	3	129	69	
Total	58	40	15	195	132	

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

Table 16 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the amount of time the nurses spent with the patient between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=129 (Satisfied=66, Highly satisfied= 63) from N=196 (Satisfied =129, Highly satisfied= 69). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=198 (Satisfied=129, Highly satisfied= 69) from N=129 (Satisfied =66, Highly satisfied= 63). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 17. Satisfaction with respect to the response of the dialysis staff when the patient is in pain/uncomfortable and between before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the response of the dialysis staff when the patient is in pain/uncomfortable between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the response of the dialysis staff when the patient is in pain/uncomfortable between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with respect to the response of the dialysis staff when the patient is in pain/uncomfortable					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	34	29	15	63	59	38.316, <0.001
After Accreditation	11	21	11	138	59	
Total	45	50	26	201	118	

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

Table 17 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi-square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with respect to the response of the dialysis staff when the patient is in pain/uncomfortable between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=197 (Satisfied=138, Highly satisfied= 59) from N=122 (Satisfied =63, Highly satisfied=59). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 18. Satisfaction with regards to the process in place in haemodialysis department and between before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the process in place in the haemodialysis department between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the process in place in the haemodialysis department between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with regards to the process in place in haemodialysis department? (Efficient)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	29	31	19	61	60	31.531, <0.001
After Accreditation	18	19	5	119	79	
Total	47	50	24	180	139	

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

Table 18 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the process in place in the haemodialysis department between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=198 (Satisfied=119, Highly satisfied= 79) from N=121 (Satisfied =61, Highly satisfied=60). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 19. Satisfaction with regards to the comfort provided to you during the procedure and between before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the comfort provided to you during the procedure between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the comfort provided to you during the procedure between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with regards to the comfort provided to you during the procedure?					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	33	42	6	56	63	47.150, <0.001
After Accreditation	24	10	6	129	71	
Total	57	52	12	185	134	

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

Table 19 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the comfort provided to you during the procedure between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=296 (Satisfied=135, Highly satisfied= 161) from N=179 (Satisfied =88, Highly satisfied=91). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 20. Satisfaction with regards to the effectiveness of the dialysis services provided by the Hospital and between before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the effectiveness of the dialysis services provided by the Hospital between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the effectiveness of the dialysis services provided by the Hospital between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Satisfaction with regards to the effectiveness of the dialysis services provided by Hospital? (Effective)					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	33	42	10	52	63	44.722, <0.001
After Accreditation	23	15	4	125	73	
Total	56	57	14	177	136	

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

Table 20 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the effectiveness of the dialysis services provided by Dr. Sulaiman Al Habib Hospital between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=198 (Satisfied=125, Highly satisfied= 73) from N=115 (Satisfied =52, Highly satisfied=63). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 21. Overall experience of our haemodialysis and between before and after accreditation groups

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the overall experience of haemodialysis before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the overall experience of haemodialysis between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Groups	Overall experience of haemodialysis					Chi square test statistic, p-value
	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Before Accreditation	29	35	10	63	63	31.606, <0.001
After Accreditation	24	10	8	123	75	
Total	53	45	18	186	138	

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

Table 21 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the chi square test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction with regards to the overall experience of our haemodialysis between before and after accreditation with p-value <0.001. The responses of satisfaction have improved from N=198 (Satisfied=123, Highly satisfied= 75) from N=126 (Satisfied =63, Highly satisfied=63). Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Table 22. Overall satisfaction score by combining the responses: (Higher the score the better the satisfaction lowers the score poorer the satisfaction level with the ambulance service)

Hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the overall satisfaction by combining the responses between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

H₁: There is a significant difference in the overall satisfaction by combining the responses between before the accreditation group and after accreditation group

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ttest statistic, p-value
Before Accreditation	200	51.1050	21.89775	-3.908, <0.001
After Accreditation	240	58.5625	17.28025	

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

Table 22 depicts that at the 5 % level of significance, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses between before (M=51.11, SD=21.89) and after accreditation (M=58.56, SD=17.28) with p-value <0.001. The mean satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation. Hence, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

IV. CONCLUSION

At the 5 % level of significance, the t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the responses between before (M=51.11, SD=21.89) and after accreditation (M=58.56, SD=17.28) with p-value <0.001. The mean satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation. The satisfaction score has improved from before accreditation compared to after accreditation which indicated that the accreditation has a positive impact on the satisfaction of Haemodialysis Department Services of the study hospital.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

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

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH:

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

SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR THE STUDY:

This research was self financed by the author himself.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS:

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The author would like to thank the leadership, all patients and staff of Krishna Institute of Medical Science (KIMS), Secunderabad, Telangana State, India, who had participated in this research study. KIMS Hospital is a 750-bed multi-specialty hospital with ISO 9000:2001, NABL and NABH accreditations, strategically located on a sprawling 5-acre campus in the heart of the city, having accessibility from all major landmarks and as well from all major public transport junctions, serving all classes of the population and international patients.

DISCLAIMER:

This publication contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reasonable effort has been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of the use.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission, in writing, from the publisher or the author.

REFERENCES

-
- [1] ¹Luis Bohigaset all. A comparative analysis of surveyors from six hospital accreditation programmes and a consideration of the related management issues, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 1998; Volume 10, Number 1: pp. 7-13.
 - [2] ²Saeed AA, Mohammed BA, Magzoub ME, Al-Doghaither AH (2001). Satisfaction and correlates of patients' satisfaction with physicians' services in primary health care centers. *Saudi Med J*. Mar; 22(3): 262-7.
 - [3] ³Heuer AJ (2004). Hospital accreditation and patient satisfaction: testing the relationship. *J Healthc Qual*. Jan-Feb; 26(1):46-51.
 - [4] ⁴Al-Habdan I (2004). Survey of satisfaction of patients attending pediatric orthopedic clinics at King Fahd Hospital of the University, al-Khobar. *Saudi Med J*. 25(3):388-389.
 - [5] ⁵Saeed AA, Mohamed BA (2002). Patients' perspective on factors affecting utilization of primary health care centers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Medical J*. 23(10): 1237-1242.