Patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality in Indonesian Public Hospital

by Ilkafah Ilkafah

Submission date: 14-Feb-2023 05:28PM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 2013923743

File name: ion_towards_healthcare_quality_in_Indonesian_Public_Hospital.pdf (338.7K)

Word count: 3284

Character count: 16906



Enfermería Clínica



www.elsevier.es/enfermeriaclinica

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality in Indonesian Public Hospital[★]



Andi Rizani Catur Wulandaria, Rini Rachmawatya,*, Ilkafah Ilkafah b, Erfina Erfinaa



- ^a Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar, Indonesia
- ^b Nursing Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

Received 4 January 2021; accepted 19 July 2021

KEYWORDS

Healthcare quality; Inpatient care; Inpatient survey; Length of hospital Patient satisfaction

Abstract



Objective: This study aims to evaluate patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality in Indonesian public hospital.

Method: The study design was quantitative with an analytic observational approach. A total of 39 respondents were included using proportional stratified random sampling. The modified Press Ganey inpatient survey was used in this study and has been translated into the Indonesian language using cross-cultural adaptation.

Results: The patient satisfaction with healthcare quality was significantly different based on the type of inpatient class (p = 0.000) 121 d the differences were found in four dimensions: effectiveness (p = 0.009), accessibility (p = 0.001), patient-centeredness (p = 0.003), and equity (p = 0.001). Meanwhile, no statistical difference was found in patient satisfaction with healthcare quality based on patients' length of stay.

Conclusion: Patients' satisfaction was similar towards healthcare quality regardless of the various length of stays, but divergent according to inpatient class types. These findings would provide information for healthcare managers and hospital policymakers to enhance their healthcere services.

© 2021 Elsevier España, S.L.U. All rights reserved.

Peer-review process of the 3rd International Nursing & Health Sciences Students & Health Care Professionals Conference (INHSP) 2019 is under the responsibility of the scientific committee of the 3rd International Nursing & Health Sciences Students & Health Care Professionals ference (INHSP). Full-text and the content of it is under the responsibility of authors of the article. corresponding author.

E-mail address: rini.rachmawaty@unhas.ac.id (R. Rachmawaty).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enfcli.2021.09.006

1130-8621/© 2021 Elsevier España, S.L.U. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Patient satisfaction has become an indicator of healthcare quality. Results of patient satisfaction with the quality of healthcare services are essential feedback for quality and access improvement. As confirmed by the previous study that patient evaluation on healthcare services was significant for gap identification and action plan development for healthcare quality improvement. Hence, hospitals are recommended to consider patient satisfaction as one of their healthcare quality outcome measures.

Patient satisfaction is measured by evaluating several factors experienced by patients, and the results of the evaluation can be examined by researchers to implement new programs and policies that may improve patient satisfaction for better health care outcomes. The abovement oned factors include all healthcare services delivered by the employees, including nurses and doctors; and also they reflect the patients' thoughts about the general appearance, cleanliness, quietness, and waiting time. 5.6

Nowadays, quality involves a sense of superiority and excellence that attaches the acquisition of goods or uses of services due to their outstanding features. The Institute of Medicine and the World Health Organ 17 ion had suggested a health system to improve six dimensions of healthcare quality, consisting of safety, effectiveness, patient-centeredness, timeliness, efficiency, and equity. 8,9 Quality in health care seems to be a complex issue and significant variation regarding the interpretation of quality both patients' and healthcare professionals' perspectives. Patient satisfaction is a result of addressing patients' expectations and degree of needs to which healthcare is a 11-pted. 10

Conducting a study of patient satisfaction would be a valuable source of indications for the area of healthcare quality improvement. Several studies had been conducted in Indonesia, focusing only on patients' satisfaction based on their health insurance programs. Anone of those so dies evaluated patient satisfaction on healthcare quality based on the type of inpatient class and length of hospital stays. In fact, the majority of patients in Indonesia are hospitalized in public hospitals, which offer services based on types of health insurance and inpatient class. Hence, this study aimed to evaluate patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality in Indonesian public hospital.

Method

A quantitative design with observational analytic was used in this study to evaluate patient satisfaction towards health-care services in Indonesian public hospital. The data were obtained using a Press Ganey inpatient survey that has been modified and translated into the Indonesian language using cross-cultural adaptation. ¹⁵ Some steps of adaptation and translation were implemented in this study included forward translation, forward review translation, and expert panel. ¹⁶ The final agreement for questionnaire translation from the panel experts was used for data collection. The modified questionnaire consisted of six dimensions of patient satisfaction towards healthcare services, including efficiency, effectiveness, accessibility, patient-centeredness, equity,

and safety. Another questionnaire was used to retrieve information from the patient medical records about patients' social-economic characteristics and length of hospital stays.

Stratified random sampling was applied in this study. The researcher initially identified the relevant inpatient units and the representativeness of this population. Next, the population was stratified into seven inpatient units. Then, a sufficient number of samples from each unit were randomly selected using the medical record number. The sample size was calculated according to numbers of the population, and proportionate size was applied to represent the patients from each inpatient unit (inpatient unit A=5, B=6, C=9, D=6, E=2, F=5, G=6). Thus, a total of 39 samples were included in this study.

Frequencies (n) and percentages (%) were calculated for patient social-economic characteristics, while mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) were analyzed for patient satisfaction scores. One-way ANOVA test was performed to compare patient satisfaction scores among different inpatient classes, and the independent t-test was computed to evaluate patient satisfaction scores based on patients' length of hospital stays. The significant level was set at 0.013

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the 16 ulty of Medicine, Hasanuddin University (1026/H.4.8.4.5.31/PP36-KOMETIK/2017). The study was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. Participants were explained about the study aims and procedures before signing the informed consent.

Results

A total of 39 respondents were included in this study. As shown in Table 1, more than half of the participants were males, graduated from High School and above had a job, and hospitalized in the 3rd inpatient class. The majority of respondents were covered by the National Health Insurance Agency. The average respondents' age was 40.8, and the length of stay was 3.6 days.

Table 2 summarizes the comparison of patient satisfaction with the quality of health services based on types of inpatient ward. As can be clearly seen in Table 2, there were significant differences in patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality based on types of inpatient ward (p = 0.000). Respondents hospitalized in the VIP room had the highest level of satisfaction (M = 248.5; $SD = \pm 0.7$), followed by those hospitalized in the VVIP (M = 248; $SD = \pm 11.2$), firstclass $(M = 229; SD = \pm 10.6), 2^{nd}$ class $(M = 227.6; SD = \pm 4.6),$ and 3^{rd} class wards (M = 209.4; $SD = \pm 14.1$), accordingly. Regarding the dimensions of healthcare quality, this study found that there were significant differences in four dimensions of patient satisfaction depending on the types of inpatient ward as follows, effectiveness (p = 0.009), accessibility (p = 0.001), patient-centeredness (p = 0.003), and equity (p = 0.001). Respondents who stayed in the VIP room had the highest mean score for effectiveness (M = 44); $SD = \pm 1.4$) and accessibility (M = 48; $SD = \pm 1.4$), while those hospitalized in the VVIP had the highest mean score for patient-centeredness $(M = 47.5; SD = \pm 3.4)$ and equity (M = 45.7; SD = +0.8).

Characteristics	n	%	$M\pm SD$	Min-max
4 ge (year)			40.8 <u>+</u> 14.9	18-65
Gender				
Male	21	53.8		
Female	18	46.2		
Education level				
Elementary school	9	23.1		
Middle school	7	17.9		
High school	15	38.5		
College/University	7	17.9		
No education	1	2.6		
Occupation				
Civil servant	3	7.7		
Entrepreneur	9	23.1		
Farmers	10	25.6		
Housewife	9	23.1		
Students	5	12.8		
Unemployed	1	2.6		
Others	2	5.1		
Types of the inpatient ward				
Third class	21	53.8		
Second class	5	12.8		
First-class	5	12.8		
VIP	2	5.1		
VVIP	6	15.4		
Types of health insurance				
National health insurance	38	97.4		
Other types of health insurance	1	2.6		
Length of hospital stays (day)			3.6 + 0.9	3-7

Table 3 depicts the comparison of patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality based on patients' length of stay. As shown in Table 3, there were no differences in patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality between respondents who were hospitalized for three days, and those who stayed more than three days (p = 0.376). Likewise, no discrepancies were reported in all dimensions of patient satisfaction.

Discussion

This study aimed at evaluating patient satisfaction towards health care quality in Indonesian public hospital. The principal indings of this study were that the level of satisfaction varied depending on types of an inpatient ward but conformed regardless of the length of hospital stays. This study also found that there were variations in patient satisfaction dimensions, especially in terms of effectiveness, accessibility, patient-centeredness, and equity, when patients were hospitalized in diverse inpatient units. This study revealed that patients hospitalized in the VIP room had the highest level of satisfaction compared to those hospitalized in other types of inpatient ward. These discrepancies probably occurred due to the implication of the Indonesian public financing schemes through which a

certain scheme will offer different benefits for the patients. For instance, patients who are civil servants (rank 1) and covered by the National Health Insurance Agency, can be admitted to the second class ward, ¹⁴ which has more luxurious facilities and more comfortable than the third-class ward. ¹⁸ In line with this study, a previous study has proved that patients who were admitted to the higher health facilities with basic amenities feeling more satisfied than those at the lower level facilities. ¹⁰ Hospital cost is also considered as a determinant factor for inpatient class admission, health service access, and utilization, and patient satisfaction. ¹⁹

Another finding from this study was that the level of patient satisfaction regarding the patient-centeredness dimension was reported significantly different. This study outcome is relevant to the previous study result, which revealed that nurses delivered nursing care to patients fairly and professionally regardless of their condition. ^{20,21} The previous study explained that nurses' courtesy, respect, active listening, and easy access to care were particularly the determinant factors for attaining patient satisfaction. ²⁰ Similarly, another study discovered that patients felt more satisfied with nurses who performed nurse caring behavior, including promptly responded to their needs or complaints. ^{22,23}

M±SD Min-max M±SD	Variable					Types of inpatient ward	atient ward					р
tt 248.0+11.2 234-262 248.5±0.7 248-249 229.0±10.6 213-239 227.6±4.6 220-232 209.4±14.1 190-234 sfaction ard litty of ttp of teredness 43.2±1.8 34-46 44.0±1.4 45-46 42.8±5.4 35-49 41.0±3.7 35-46 37.8±4.4 44-53 47.0±1.4 46-48 40.8±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 42.8±4.0 34-43 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 42.8±4.0 34-43 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 42.8±4.0 34-43 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 42.8±4.0 34-43 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-47 37.8±4.3 33-		5	/IP		VIP	First	class	Second	d class	Thirc	l class	
tr 248.0+11.2 234-262 248.5±0.7 248-249 229.0±10.6 213-239 227.6±4.6 220-232 209.4±14.1 190-234 and lity of the lith sizes 43.2±1.8 34-46 44.0±1.4 45-46 42.8±5.4 35-49 41.0±3.7 35-44 38.7±5.3 32-49 is littly 47.5±3.4 44-53 48.0±1.4 46-48 40.8±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 teredness 45.7±0.8 45.0±1.4 44-46 38.8±4.0 34-43 41.4±3.8 35-44 38.2±3.8 34-47 22.3±0.8 22-24 19.0±4.2 16-22 22.2±1.3 21-24 20.0±2.8 17-23 18.6±2.2 16-23		M±SD	Min-max	M±SD	Min-max	M±SD	Min-max	M ± SD	Min-max		Min-max	
ard lity of the hickors 43.2±1.8 34-46 44.0±1.4 43-45 43.4±2.5 39-45 39.4±4.9 34-43 38.2±3.9 34-46 hickors 41.8±5.3 35-46 45.5±0.7 45-46 42.8±5.4 35-49 41.0±3.7 35-44 38.7±5.3 32-49 hickors 47.5±3.4 44-53 48.0±1.4 46-48 40.0±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 36-46 hickors 47.5±3.4 44-53 47.0±1.4 46-48 41.0±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 hickors 45.7±0.8 45-47 45.0±1.4 44-46 38.8±4.0 34-43 41.4±3.8 35-44 38.2±3.8 34-47 22.3±0.8 22-24 19.0±2.2 16-22 22.2±1.3 21-24 20.0±2.8 17-23 18.6±2.2 16-23	Patient	248.0+11.2	234-262	248.5 ± 0.7	248-249	229.0±10.6		227.6 ± 4.6	220-232	209.4±14.1	190-234	0.000a,*
ard lity of tth hices 43.2±1.8 34-46 44.0±1.4 43-45 43.4±2.5 39-45 39.4±4.9 34-43 38.2±3.9 34-46 ides 34.4±5.3 34-45 34.2±3.9 34-43 38.2±3.9 34-46 34.0±3.7 35-44 38.7±5.3 32-49 34.0±3.7 35-44 38.7±5.3 32-49 32-46 33-48 47.5±3.4 44-53 47.0±1.4 46-48 41.0±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 31-46 37.8±4.3 37.8	satisfaction											
lity of the lity of the holds of the lity of the lity of the little litt	toward											
itch ices iveness 43.2±1.8 34-46 44.0±1.4 43-45 43.4±2.5 39-45 39.4±4.9 34-43 38.2±3.9 34-46 iveness 41.8±5.3 35-46 45.5±0.7 45-46 42.8±5.4 35-49 41.0±3.7 35-44 38.7±5.3 32-49 ibility 47.5±3.4 44-53 48.0±1.4 46-48 40.8±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 36-46 it. 47.5±3.4 44-53 47.0±1.4 46-48 41.0±6.6 33-48 41.4±3.8 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 it. 45.7±0.8 45-47 45.0±1.4 44-46 38.8±4.0 34-43 41.4±3.8 35-44 38.2±3.8 34-47 22.3±0.8 22-24 19.0±4.2 16-22 22.2±1.3 21-24 20.0±2.8 17-23 18.6±2.2 16-23	quality of											
iveness 43.2±1.8 34-46 44.0±1.4 43-45 43.4±2.5 39-45 39.4±4.9 34-43 38.2±3.9 34-46 ncy 41.8±5.3 35-46 45.5±0.7 45-46 42.8±5.4 35-49 41.0±3.7 35-44 38.7±5.3 32-49 ncy 41.8±5.3 44-53 48.0±1.4 46-48 40.8±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 36-46 1.0±6.6 33-48 42.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.4 35-46 37.8±4.3 33-46 1.0±2.2 4 19.0±4.2 16-22 22.2±1.3 21-24 20.0±2.8 17-23 18.6±2.2 16-23	health											
inveness 43.2 ± 1.8 $34-46$ 44.0 ± 1.4 $43-45$ 43.4 ± 2.5 $39-45$ 39.4 ± 4.9 $34-43$ 38.2 ± 3.9 $34-46$ 40.2 ± 1.4 $45-46$ 42.8 ± 5.4 $35-49$ 41.0 ± 3.7 $35-49$ 43.7 ± 5.3 $32-49$ 31.2 ± 3.9 $34-46$ inbility 47.5 ± 3.4 $44-53$ 48.0 ± 1.4 $46-48$ 40.8 ± 6.6 $33-48$ 43.0 ± 4.4 $35-46$ 37.8 ± 4.4 $36-46$ 37.8 ± 4.4 $46-48$ 41.0 ± 6.6 $33-48$ 42.8 ± 4.4 $35-46$ 37.8 ± 4.4 $35-46$ 37.8 ± 4.4 $33-46$ iteredness 45.7 ± 0.8 $45-47$ $46-48$ 41.0 ± 6.6 41	services											
ncy 41.8 ± 5.3 $35-46$ 45.5 ± 0.7 $45-46$ 42.8 ± 5.4 $35-49$ 41.0 ± 3.7 $35-49$ 41.0 ± 3.7 $35-49$	Effectiveness	43.2 ± 1.8	34-46	44.0 + 1.4	43-45	43.4+2.5	39-45	39.4+4.9	34-43	38.2 ± 3.9	34-46	0.009a,*
ibility 47.5 ± 3.4 $44-53$ 48.0 ± 1.4 $46-48$ 40.8 ± 6.6 $33-48$ 43.0 ± 4.4 $35-46$ 37.8 ± 4.4 $36-46$ 47.5 ± 3.4 $44-53$ 47.0 ± 1.4 $46-48$ 41.0 ± 6.6 $33-48$ 42.8 ± 4.4 $35-46$ 37.8 ± 4.3 $33-46$ teredness 45.7 ± 0.8 $45-47$ 45.0 ± 1.4 $44-46$ 38.8 ± 4.0 $34-43$ 41.4 ± 3.8 $35-44$ 38.2 ± 3.8 $34-47$ 22.3 ± 0.8 $22-24$ 19.0 ± 4.2 $16-22$ 22.2 ± 1.3 $21-24$ 20.0 ± 2.8 $17-23$ 18.6 ± 2.2 $16-23$	Efficiency	41.8 ± 5.3	35-46	45.5±0.7	45-46	42.8 + 5.4	35-49	41.0 ± 3.7	35-44	38.7 ± 5.3	32-49	0.129 ^a
trendeness 47.5 \pm 3.4 44-53 47.0 \pm 1.4 46-48 41.0 \pm 6.6 33-48 42.8 \pm 4.4 35-46 37.8 \pm 4.3 33-46 teredness 45.7 \pm 0.8 45-47 45.0 \pm 1.4 44-46 38.8 \pm 4.0 34-43 41.4 \pm 3.8 35-44 38.2 \pm 3.8 34-47 22.3 \pm 0.8 22-24 19.0 \pm 4.2 16-22 22.2 \pm 1.3 21-24 20.0 \pm 2.8 17-23 18.6 \pm 2.2 16-23	Accessibility	47.5 ± 3.4	44-53	48.0 + 1.4	46-48	40.8 ± 6.6	33-48	43.0 + 4.4	35-46	37.8 ± 4.4	36-46	0.001a,*
teredness 45.7 ± 0.8 $45-47$ 45.0 ± 1.4 $44-46$ 38.8 ± 4.0 $34-43$ 41.4 ± 3.8 $35-44$ 38.2 ± 3.8 $34-47$ 22.3 ± 0.8 $22-24$ 19.0 ± 4.2 $16-22$ 22.2 ± 1.3 $21-24$ 20.0 ± 2.8 $17-23$ 18.6 ± 2.2 $16-23$	Patient-	47.5 ± 3.4	44-53	47.0 ± 1.4	46-48	41.0 ± 6.6	33-48	42.8 + 4.4	35-46	37.8 ± 4.3	33-46	0.003a, *
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	centerednes											
$22.3\pm0.8 \qquad 22-24 \qquad 19.0\pm4.2 \qquad 16-22 \qquad 22.2\pm1.3 \qquad 21-24 \qquad 20.0\pm2.8 \qquad 17-23 \qquad 18.6\pm2.2 \qquad 16-23 \qquad 18.6\pm2.2 \qquad 16-23 \qquad 18.6\pm2.2 \qquad 18.6\pm2.2 \qquad 16-23 \qquad 18.6\pm2.2 \qquad 18.6\pm2.2$	Equity	45.7 ± 0.8	45-47	45.0 ± 1.4	44-46	38.8 ± 4.0	34-43	41.4+3.8	35-44	38.2 ± 3.8	34-47	0.001a,*
	Safety	22.3 ± 0.8	22-24	19.0 ± 4.2	16-22	22.2 ± 1.3	21-24	20.0 ± 2.8	17-23	18.6 ± 2.2	16-23	0.183^{a}

Table 3 Comparison of patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality based on the length of hospital stays at Indonesian public hospital (n=39).

Variable		Length of	hospital stays		р
	3 days		>3	days	
	$M \pm SD$	Min-max	M±SD	Min-max	
Patient satisfaction toward quality of health services	223.0 <u>+</u> 18.7	-	221.0 <u>+</u> 20.9	-	0.376ª
Effectiveness	40.4 <u>+</u> 4.1	34-46	39.7 <u>+</u> 4.3	34-45	0.306a
Efficiency	40.4 <u>+</u> 5.4	32-49	40.3 <u>+</u> 5.0	33-49	0.457a
Accessibility	40.7 <u>+</u> 5.5	33-50	41.1 <u>+</u> 6.0	33-53	0.431a
Patient-centeredness	40.7 ± 5.7	33-50	41.0 ± 5.9	33-53	0.436a
Equity	40.4 + 4.5	34-47	39.9 + 4.3	34-46	0.366a
Safety	20.4+2.6	16-24	19.1 + 2.5	16-24	0.066a

The last finding of this study indicated no significant differences in patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality based on the length of hospital stays. This is mainly due to there were various factors affecting patient satisfaction.³ This study has a similar result with the previous study, which confirmed that patient satisfaction was not correlated with the length of hospital stays, but it was associated with the nursing staff's clinical performances.²⁴

Conclusion

This study concluded that patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality varied across inpatient class wards. This finding provides the opportunity for healthcare managers and hospital policymakers to obtain a better understanding of patients' views and perceptions and to apply the patient evaluation for healthcare quality improvement.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Xesfingi S, Vozikis A. Patient satisfaction with the healthcare system: assessing the impact of socio-economic and healthcare provision factors. BMC Health Serv Res. 2016;16:1-7, http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1327-4.
- Cosma SA, Bota M, Fleşeriu C, Morgovan C, Văleanu M, Cosma D. Measuring patients' perception and satisfaction with the Romanian healthcare system. Sustain. 2020;12:1-16, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su12041612.
- Al-Abri R, Al-Balushi A. Patient satisfaction survey as a tool towards quality improvement. Oman Med J. 2014;29:3-7, http://dx.doi.org/10.5001/omj.2014.02.
- Bjertnaes OA, Sjetne IS, Iversen HH. Overall patient satisfaction with hospitals: effects of patient-reported experiences and fulfilment of expectations. BMJ Qual Saf. 2012;21:39-46, http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000137.
- Owaidh AO, Atiah AA, Abadi AS, Ali AM, Abdullah AM, Abdullah AA, et al. Patients satisfaction with health care

- services in Southern Saudi Arabia. Egypt J Hosp Med. 2018;72(July):3857-60, http://dx.doi.org/10.12816/0047757.
- Dahyanto D, Arofiati F. The analysis of inpatients satisfaction on service quality at Yogyakarta Respira Hospital. J Medicoeticol Manaj Rumah Sakit. 2018;7:162-9, http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/jmmr.7269.
- 8 aralambous M, Health P, Talias MA. Assessment of patients' satisfaction with care provided in public and private hospitals of the republic of cyprus: a comparative study. Int J Caring Sci. 5 2018:11:125–35.
- 8. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 15,001.
- World Health Organization. Quality of care: a process for making strategic choices in health systems. WHO Library Cataloguing-Publication Data. 2006.
- 10. 10 ani PR, Kumar RK, Srivastava J, Sharma L. Measuring patient satisfaction: a case study to improve quality of care at public health facilities. Indian J Community Med. 2010;35:52–6, 4.p://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.62554.
- 11. Pekacz A, Kądalska E, Skoczylas A, Targowski T. Patient disfaction as an element of healthcare quality a single-center Polish survey. Reumatologia. 2019;57:135–44, http://dx.doi.org/10.5114/reum.2019.86423.
- Indarwati M, Phuoc TP. Evaluation of administrative service quality towards JKN patient satisfaction. J Kesehat Masy. 2018;14:41-8, http://dx.doi.org/10.21109/kesmas.
- Pasinringi A, Wandy S, Fakianti I, Ameliyah A. The level of patient satisfaction with hospital services under National Health Insurance Program in Makassar City, Indonesia. Int J Heal Sci Res. 2015:5:468-74.
- Mahendradhata Y, Trisnantoro L, Listyadewi S, Soewondo P, MArthias T, Harimurti P, et al. The Republic of Indonesia health system review. vol. 7: 2017.
- 15. Ganey P. Inpatient (IN) survey psychometrics report; 2010.
- 16. Hariati S, McKenna L, Lusmilasari L, Reisenhofer S, Sutomo R, Febriani ADB, et al. Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants. J Pediatr Nurs. 2020, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2020.05.010.
- Pallant JF. SPSS survival manual, a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS. Nwe South Wales: Allen & Unwin; 2013.

- Broughton E, Achadi A, Latief K, Nandiaty F, Nurhaidah. Indonesia hospital accreditation process impact evaluation: midline report. USAID Assist Proj. 2015;(September):1-90.
- Zarei E, Daneshkohan A, Pouragha B, Marzban S, Arab M. An empirical study of the impact of service quality on patient satisfaction in private hospitals, Iran. Glob J Health Sci. 2015;7:1-9, http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v7n1p1.
- Khamis K, Njau B. Patients' level of satisfaction on quality of health care at Mwananyamala hospital in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;14:1-8, http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-400.
- Halvorzen K, Forde R, Nortvedt P. The principle of justice in patient priorities in the intensive care unit: the role of significant others. J Med Ethic. 2009;35:483-7, http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jme.2008.028183.
- Amalina SF, Rachmawaty R, Ilkafah I, Erfina E. Patient experiences of nurse caring behaviors based on Swanson's theory in Indonesian hospital. Enferm Clin. 2020;30:332-6, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enfcli.2019.07.113.
- Othman F, Liu Y, Zhang X, Wang P, Deng L, Cheng X. Perinatal women's satisfaction with nurses caring behaviours in teaching hospitals in China. Scand J Caring Sci. 2020;34:390-400, http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/scs.12740.
- Borghans I, Kleefstra SM, Kool RB, Westert GP. Is the length of stay in hospital correlated with patient satisfaction? Int J Qual Heal Care. 2012;24:443-51, http://dx.doi.org/10. 1093/intqhc/mzs037.

Patient satisfaction towards healthcare quality in Indonesian Public Hospital

ORIGINA	ALITY REPORT			
SIMILA	7% ARITY INDEX	16% INTERNET SOURCES	13% PUBLICATIONS	O% STUDENT PAPERS
PRIMAR	Y SOURCES			
1	WWW.SCi	encedirect.com		3%
2	www.els			2%
3	ejhm.jou	urnals.ekb.eg		1 %
4	eprints.k	oournemouth.ac	c.uk	1 %
5	WWW.NC	bi.nlm.nih.gov		1 %
6	Ilkafah, l experier based o	ita Cahyani, Rini Erfina Erfina. "C nces towards nu n Watson's theo Enfermería Clínio	ancer patient's irse's caring de ory: A qualitati	s emeanor
7	WWW.res	searchsquare.co	om	1 %

8	bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com Internet Source	1 %
9	gacetasanitaria.org Internet Source	1 %
10	www.ijhpm.com Internet Source	1 %
11	Adrian Pękacz, Ewa Kądalska, Agnieszka Skoczylas, Tomasz Targowski. "Patient satisfaction as an element of healthcare quality – asingle-center Polish survey", Rheumatology, 2019 Publication	1 %
12	www.mdpi.com Internet Source	1 %
13	link.springer.com Internet Source	1 %
14	www.e-sciencecentral.org Internet Source	<1%
15	docslib.org Internet Source	<1%
16	mail.scialert.net Internet Source	<1%
17	www.sciencegate.app Internet Source	<1%

19

stiinta.usmf.md
Internet Source

<1%

Exclude quotes

On

Exclude matches

< 10 words

Exclude bibliography On