Article can be accessed online at http://www.publishingindia.com

PATIENT SATISFACTION TOWARDS THE SERVICE MARKETING MIX: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS OPERATING IN UDAIPUR DIVISION

Dharmesh Motwani*, Devendra Shrimali, Khushbu Agarwal*****

Abstract: *The Indian healthcare industry which was valued at US$ 79 billion in 2012 is expected to reach US $160 billion by 2017. It shows that the Indian healthcare industry has the potential to become a global hub for healthcare services. This scenario has given rise to Hospital service marketing which is a specialised field that deals with connecting patients, physicians, and hospitals in mutual relationships. The study is aimed to compare the patient satisfaction levelstowards the service marketing mix offered by public and private hospitals operating in Udaipur division. To serve the purpose descriptive research design is used and a structured questionnaire based on Likert scale is applied to 142 public and 337 private hospital patients. These patients were chosen by stratified purposive sampling method from Udaipur division. The analysis highlighted the significant difference between the patient satisfactions towards the various parameters of service marketing mix.*

Keywords: *Service Marketing Mix, Customer Satisfaction, Hospital*

INTRODUCTION

A hospital is an extremely complex service organisation as it provides essential services which must be available 24 hours a day for 7 days in a week. Every hospital deals with the problems of life and death. Healthcare organisation comes under the purview of services.For example, one cannot avail oneself of the services of staying in a hospital without using other services like catering services, paramedical services, clinical services, etc. The services offered by healthcare organisation do not exist. They are generated as and when required.

These all complexities are raising a major problem for hospital management that how to satisfy patients and their attendants.In the growing trend of marketing, now hospitals are also working regressively on marketing mix, but still there is a significant difference in the offerings of public and private hospitals. In this view this paper is an attempt to study the patient satisfaction towards the service marketing mix of hospitals operating in Udaipur division.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Plsek (2003) identified that there are so many complex issues associated with innovation in healthcare systems. Within the healthcare system, we can conceptualise three interrelated processes of generation, implementation, and widespread adoption of innovative ideas. The generation process involves creative thinking that leads to the birth and initial pilot testing of an innovative clinical, business, or service delivery process idea. Implementation refers to the processes and challenges associated with putting a concept into action and embedding it into the day-to-day routine within a healthcare organisation. The spread process involves those things that we do (or fail to do) that accelerate (or impede) the adoption of the new practices across many organisations, and eventually throughout the entire healthcare system. While creative thinking and adaptation are most naturally considered in the generation of an innovative idea, further creative development and enhancement of the idea also occurs during local implementation within an organisation, and as the idea spreads across organisations.

Thurau (2004) reported that service employees' level of customer orientation is a key driver for customers' satisfaction with the service firm, the level of emotional commitment of these customers to the firm, and, most importantly, their degree of retention. Therefore, employing customer-oriented service personnel, although not guaranteeing economic

* Assistant Professor, Pacific Business School, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India. Email: dharmeshmotwani9@gmail.com

** Associate Professor, Pacific Business School, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India. Email:shrinathexpo@gmail.com

*** Assistant Professor,Pacific Business School, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India. Email:khushbu.agarwal6@gmail.com

success, does represent a crucial step towards it.

Lyon and Powers (2004) explained that satisfaction in terms of structure and process attributes is important, particularly in the healthcare industry where providers are evaluated based on satisfaction rather than service quality so they developed a model to test global satisfaction, intention to return, and intention to recommend as equal outcomes of structure and process elements. Model indicated that satisfaction with both structure and process attributes of a healthcare service contribute equally to global satisfaction. Global satisfaction, in turn, directly influences intention to return and intention to recommend a healthcare service provider. So service providers should focus on both structure and process attributes of service delivery.

Tam (2007) explained that patient satisfaction is one of the key performance indicators in the healthcare industry. It should be monitored regularly, and incorporated into planning and quality improvement programmes. He provided support for the positive impact of quality improvement on patient satisfaction and intention to revisit. He also suggested that using patient feedback as an input for quality improvement improves performance on both dimensions.

Consuegra, Molina and Esteban (2007) examined the relationship between price fairness, customer satisfaction, loyalty and price acceptance. They found that price acceptance is directly influenced by satisfaction judgements and loyalty. In addition, price fairness influences price acceptance indirectly through customer satisfaction and loyalty. They suggested keeping price transparency and reliability when prices are increased.

Pollack (2009) analysed that ambient conditions, design and social factors derive the quality of physical environment which ultimately decides the customer satisfaction towards the service. Physical environment quality is one of the primary dimensions of service quality so a marketer is advised to take care of this dimension thoroughly.

Moliner (2009) analysed that monetary and non-monetary cost has significant impact on patient satisfaction and loyalty towards hospital. In the case of public hospital non-monetary costs have substantial influence on trust and satisfaction of patients while the same is true for monetary costs in the case of private hospitals. He suggested private hospitals to focus on marketing communication highlighting its low non-monetary costs and the quality of the service offered.

Laohasirichaikul, Chaipoopirutana and Combs (2009) indicated that 'doctor concern' is the most important factor affecting customer satisfaction and customer loyalty and the second most important factor affecting corporate image. Therefore, the management should hire the right people as experts and well-known doctors to serve their patients as they lead to reputation and positive image of the hospital. Moreover, the doctors should be trained on interpersonal skills so as to provide politeness, comfort, and individual attention to their patients. 'Staff concern' is the second most important factor affecting customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. For nursing staff, the management should hire a service minded nursing staff. The nursing staff and other hospitals staff should be trained on interpersonal skill to provide care, empathy, and courtesy to patients.

According to Dhanda and Kurian (2012) provision of quality healthcare is a team work jointly carried out by physicians, nurses, patients, and the state that should provide the laws. Doctors and nurses should show care and concern if even there is nothing they could do at that particular moment. Patients have the responsibilities toward the provision of quality health service by teaming up with the health workers by complying with the prescribed treatment or rehabilitation procedures. There is a strong correlation between the patients' awareness level and their satisfaction level

OBJECTIVE

The proposed study is done to compare the patient satisfaction levels towards the service marketing mix offered by public and private hospitals operating in Udaipur division.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

To serve the purpose of research paper descriptive research design was used. Primary data were collected with the help of close ended questionnaire.

Sample Design

Our target population involves the patients of public and private hospitals. 479 patients of public (142) and private (337) hospitals were selected through stratified purposive sampling from Udaipur division. Udaipur Division was divided into six strata i.e. Udaipur, Dungarpur, Banswara, Pratapgarh, Rajsamand, and Chittorgarh and then patients were selected purposively from 9 public and 21 private hospitals.

Reliability of Data Collection Instrument

Researchers commonly use the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for establishing scale reliability. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient is an indicator of internal consistency of the scale. A value of Cronbach's alpha above 0.60 can be used as a reasonable test of scale reliability. Questionnaire used for

hospitals was based on nominal scale so reliability results cannot be generated for this questionnaire. Reliability results for patients' questionnaire are presented in Table 1 and 2

Table 1: Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	479	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	479	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Dimension	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Patient Satisfaction	44	0.947

Table 2 shows that the value of the Cronbach's alpha is 0.947. As suggested by previous researchers that an acceptable level of reliability for psychometric test is starts from 0.60. This indicates a good internal consistency of the items in the scale.

Analysis

The data collected were analysed with the help of Arithmetic Meanand t-test.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Customer satisfaction is the ultimate goal of every organisation, for hospital industry it becomes patient satisfaction. To measure the patients' satisfaction towards public and private hospital services, patients were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction towards marketing mix elements of hospitals on five point scale starting from highly satisfied (5) highly dissatisfied (1). To get concrete results mean is calculated for each element and in addition following criteria is used for analysis part:-

The score among 1.00-1.80 means Highly Satisfied

The score among 1.81-2.60 means Satisfied

The score among 2.61-3.40 means Neutral

The score among 3.41-4.20 means Dissatisfied

The score among 4.21-5.00 means Highly Dissatisfied

Patients' Satisfaction towards Product Mix of Hospitals

Product mix of any hospital includes all the core and supplementary services offered by the hospital. Satisfaction level of patients towards product mix is listed in Table 3. It is clear from the table that public hospital patients are satisfied with diagnostic services, availability of doctors and supporting staff, ambulatory services, emergency services, laboratory and pharmacy facility. Patients of public hospitals are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with accommodation, diet chart, mobile hospital, and visiting doctors' facility. On the counter side private hospital patients are satisfied with all the elements of product mix. Overall satisfaction mean scores for public and private hospital patients are found to be 3.46 and 3.88 respectively, which projects that patients of both types of hospitals are satisfied with product mix of hospitals.

Table 3: Patients' Satisfaction towards Product Mix of Hospitals

Product	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Diagnostic Services	3.87	Satisfied	3.98	Satisfied
Availability of Doctors and supporting Staff	3.90	Satisfied	4.11	Satisfied
Accommodation	3.34	Neutral	3.90	Satisfied
Ambulatory Services	3.49	Satisfied	3.89	Satisfied
Diet Chart	3.09	Neutral	3.89	Satisfied
Emergency and ICU	4.05	Satisfied	4.06	Satisfied
Laboratory	3.53	Satisfied	3.85	Satisfied
Mobile Hospital	2.75	Neutral	3.46	Satisfied
Pharmacy	3.41	Satisfied	3.87	Satisfied
Visiting Doctors from outside hospital	3.20	Neutral	3.79	Satisfied
Overall Score	3.46	Satisfied	3.88	Satisfied

The responses from both public and private hospital patients have been recorded and in order to know that whether there is any significant difference lies in responses, t-test has been carried out. The test results are mentioned in Table 4.

Table 4: t-test Results to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards Product Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

Product	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Diagnostic Services	3.87	0.86	3.98	0.83	1.31	0.1907	Not Significant
Availability of Doctors and supporting Staff	3.90	0.75	4.11	0.84	2.577	0.0103	Significant
Accommodation	3.34	0.89	3.90	0.82	6.653	0.000	Extremely Significant
Ambulatory Services	3.49	0.92	3.89	0.89	4.447	0.000	Extremely Significant
Diet Chart	3.09	0.87	3.89	0.89	9.044	0.000	Extremely Significant
Emergency and ICU	4.05	0.94	4.06	0.95	0.106	0.916	Not Significant
Laboratory	3.53	1.03	3.85	0.94	3.306	0.001	Significant
Mobile Hospital	2.75	1.02	3.46	1.07	6.724	0.000	Extremely Significant
Pharmacy	3.41	1.07	3.87	0.92	4.756	0.000	Extremely Significant
Visiting Doctors from outside hospital	3.20	1.04	3.79	1.02	5.748	0.000	Extremely Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

No significant difference is found between satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients for diagnostic, emergency and ICU services. For degree of freedom 477 and 5% level of significance there is a significant difference between satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients for availability of medical staff and laboratory services. Extreme significant difference has been found in satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients for six services i.e. accommodation, ambulatory, diet chart, mobile hospital, pharmacy, and visiting doctors from outside hospitals.

For all the product mix elements mean satisfaction scores of private hospital patients are more than the scores of public hospital patients, which indicates that private hospital patients are more satisfied that public hospital patients with product mix of hospitals.

Patients' Satisfaction towards Price Mix of Hospitals

Public hospitals adopt government regulated pricing while pricing of private hospitals vary according to cost and competition. As far as satisfaction level of patients is concerned it is clear from Table 5 that public hospital patients are highly satisfied with the total cost of hospital while

Table 5: Patients' Satisfaction towards Price Mix of Hospitals

Price	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Total Cost of Hospital Services	4.36	Highly Satisfied	3.34	Neutral

Table 6: t-test Result to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards Price Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

Price	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Total Cost of Hospital Services	4.36	0.85	3.34	1.00	10.641	0.00	Extremely Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

Table 7: Patients' Satisfaction towards Place Mix of Hospitals

Place	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Location of Hospital	4.39	Highly Satisfied	4.09	Satisfied
24X7 hospital facility	4.15	Satisfied	4.02	Satisfied
Overall Score	**4.27**	**Highly Satisfied**	**4.05**	**Satisfied**

Table 8: t-test Results to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards Place Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

Place	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Location of Hospital	4.39	0.64	4.09	0.92	3.541	0.0004	Extremely Significant
24X7 hospital facility	4.15	0.93	4.02	1.00	1.326	0.185	Not Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

private hospital patients are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied or in other words they have neutral opinion on it.

It is clear that public and private hospitals' patient satisfaction level for price mix differ but to check the significance of difference t-test is applied as shown in Table 6.

For degree of freedom 477 and at 5% level of significance extreme significant difference is found between the satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients towards price mix. Public hospital patients are more satisfied (Mean score = 4.36) with price mix than private hospital patients (Mean score = 3.34)

Patients' Satisfaction towards Place Mix of Hospitals

Public hospital patients are highly satisfied with the location of hospital and satisfied with the 24X7 hospital facility while private hospital patients are satisfied with both the points. Overall public hospital patients are highly satisfied (Mean score = 4.27) with the place mix and private hospital patients are satisfied (Mean score = 4.05) with the place mix adopted by the hospital.

To identify the difference between opinion of public and private hospital patients t-test is applied as shown in Table 8.

There is extreme significant difference in satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients with regard to location of hospital, and they are equally satisfied with the 24X7 hospital facility offered by public and private hospital patients.

Patients' Satisfaction towards Promotion Mix of Hospitals

Satisfaction level of patients towards promotion mix of hospitals is presented in Table 9. Results show that public hospital patients are dissatisfied with the advertisements and publicity of hospitals. They are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with special promotional campaigns and tie ups

Table 9: Patients' Satisfaction towards Promotion Mix of Hospitals

Promotion	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Advertisements and Publicity	2.60	Dissatisfied	3.60	Satisfied
Tie-ups with other hospitals	2.83	Neutral	3.51	Satisfied
Special Promotional Campaign (Blood Camp, Free health checkup camp etc.)	3.10	Neutral	3.67	Satisfied
Overall Score	**2.84**	**Neutral**	**3.59**	**Satisfied**

of public hospitals. Private hospital patients are satisfied with the promotion mix of hospitals.

As shown in Table 10 t-test is applied to measure significant difference between opinion of public and private hospital patients.

It is clear from the results that extreme significant difference is found between satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients towards promotion mix of hospitals. As for all the elements of promotion mix mean scores of private hospitals are greater than the scores of public hospitals, which mean private hospitals' patients are more satisfied with promotion mix of hospitals as compare to public hospitals' patients.

Patients' Satisfaction towards People Mix of Hospitals

Satisfaction level of patients towards people mix of hospitals were asked in two parts, first whether they are satisfied with doctors' services, second what their satisfaction level is with services of supporting staff i.e. nursing and administrative staff. As per results shown in Table 11 private hospital patients are highly satisfied with doctors' services and satisfied with supporting staff services. Public hospital patients are satisfied with both kinds of staff.

Overall mean satisfaction score projects that public hospital patients are satisfied (Mean score = 3.73) with people mix of hospitals and private hospital patients are highly satisfied (Mean score = 4.24) with people mix of hospitals.

To measure significant difference between satisfaction level of public and private hospitals' patients for people mix t-test is administrated as shown in Table 12.

For degree of freedom 477 and at 5% level of significance extreme significant difference is found between the satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients towards people mix. Private hospital patients are more satisfied with people mix than public hospital patients.

Patients' Satisfaction towards Process Mix of Hospitals

Patients were asked to indicate their satisfaction level towards registration process, patient health review process, discharge process, case history maintenance, quick response system, and emergency discharge process. Private hospital patients are satisfied with all these processes, on the counter side public hospital patients are satisfied with registration, patient health review, discharge, and emergency discharge process and neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with case history maintenance and quick response system.

The mean satisfaction score for public and private hospital patients is found 3.46 and 3.72 respectively which projects that all type of patients are satisfied with process mix of hospitals.

Table 10: t-test Results to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards Promotion Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

Promotion	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Advertisements and Publicity	2.60	0.94	3.60	0.93	10.713	0.000	Extremely Significant
Tie-ups with other hospitals	2.83	0.91	3.51	0.94	7.299	0.000	Extremely Significant
Special Promotional Campaign (Blood Camp, Free health checkup camp etc.)	3.10	1.02	3.67	1.05	5.472	0.000	Extremely Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

Table 11: Patients' Satisfaction towards People Mix of Hospitals

People	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Doctors' Services	3.87	Satisfied	4.35	Highly Satisfied
Supporting Staff Services	3.59	Satisfied	4.12	Satisfied
Overall Score	**3.73**	**Satisfied**	**4.24**	**Highly Satisfied**

Table 12: t-test Results to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards People Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

People	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Doctors' Services	3.87	0.86	4.35	0.78	5.964	0.000	Extremely Significant
Supporting Staff Services	3.59	1.02	4.12	0.82	5.994	0.000	Extremely Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

Even though with people mix patients of both the hospitals are satisfied but to check the significant difference between satisfaction levels, t-test is applied and results are listed in Table 14.

Public and private hospital patients are equally satisfied with discharge and emergency discharge process. There is significant difference between satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients for patient health review process. For 477 degree of freedom and at 5% level of significance extreme significant difference has been found between satisfaction level of patients for registration process, case history maintenance process, and quick response system. Wherever significant difference is found, private hospital patients are more satisfied than public hospital patients.

Table 13: Patients' Satisfaction towards Process Mix of Hospitals

Process	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Registration Process	3.61	Satisfied	3.86	Satisfied
Patient health review Process	3.48	Satisfied	3.79	Satisfied
Discharge Process	3.53	Satisfied	3.49	Satisfied
Case history maintenance	3.36	Neutral	3.88	Satisfied
Quick response system	3.31	Neutral	3.86	Satisfied
Emergency discharge process	3.50	Satisfied	3.42	Satisfied
Overall Score	**3.46**	**Satisfied**	**3.72**	**Satisfied**

Table 14: t-test Results to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards Process Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

Process	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Registration Process	3.61	1.00	3.86	0.86	2.765	0.0059	Extremely Significant
Patient health review Process	3.48	0.86	3.79	0.77	3.884	0.001	Significant
Discharge Process	3.53	0.90	3.49	1.04	0.40o	0.6897	Not Significant
Case history maintenance	3.36	0.89	3.88	0.86	5.981	0.000	Extremely Significant
Quick response system	3.31	1.02	3.86	0.95	5.66	0.000	Extremely Significant
Emergency discharge process	3.50	0.83	3.42	0.94	0.88	0.379	Not Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

Patients' Satisfaction towards Physical Evidence Mix of Hospitals

Satisfaction level of patients was asked for the 20 elements of physical evidence and results are shown in Table 15. Public hospital patients are satisfied with documents (Mean score = 3.58), parking (Mean score = 3.57), registration counter (Mean score = 3.48), specialised wards and cottages (Mean score = 3.84) and wheel chairs and stretchers (3.51). The same patients of public hospitals are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with canteen (Mean score = 2.95), communication (Mean score = 3.20), drinking water (Mean score = 2.91), electricity back up (Mean score = 3.26), enquiry counter (Mean score = 3.35), garden (Mean score = 3.10), lifts and elevators (Mean score = 2.70), lightening and ventilation (Mean score = 3.21), modern equipment (Mean score = 3.27), patient case study report (Mean score = 3.39), proper sanitation (Mean score = 2.73), security (Mean score = 3.15), service certificates won by hospital (Mean score = 3.39), signage (Mean score = 3.25), and waiting rooms (Mean score = 3.08).

Private hospital patients are highly satisfied with electricity back up (Mean score = 4.24). They are satisfied with canteen (Mean score = 3.63), communication (Mean score = 3.82), documents (Mean score = 4.01), drinking water (Mean score = 4.09), enquiry counter (Mean score = 4.11), lifts and elevators (Mean score = 3.62), lightening and ventilation (Mean score = 4.16), modern equipments (Mean score = 4.10), parking (Mean score = 3.86), patient case study report (Mean score = 4.02), proper sanitation (Mean score = 3.96), registration counter (Mean score = 4.04), security (Mean score = 3.93), service certificates won by hospital (Mean score = 3.70), signage (Mean score = 3.75), specialised wards and cottages (Mean score = 3.98), waiting rooms (Mean score = 3.69), and wheel chairs and stretchers (4.01). Only with garden (Mean score = 3.36) patients of private hospitals are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

From the overall mean score interpretation can be drawn that public hospital patients are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Mean score = 3.25) and private hospital patients are satisfied (Mean score = 3.90) with physical evidence of hospitals.

Table 15: Patients' Satisfaction towards Physical Evidence Mix of Hospitals

Physical Evidence	Public Hospitals		Private Hospitals	
	Mean	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Satisfaction Level
Canteen / Mess	2.95	Neutral	3.63	Satisfied
Communication	3.20	Neutral	3.82	Satisfied
Documents (Registration slip, medical transcription, bill etc.)	3.58	Satisfied	4.01	Satisfied
Drinking water	2.91	Neutral	4.09	Satisfied
Electricity backup	3.26	Neutral	4.24	Highly Satisfied
Enquiry Counter	3.35	Neutral	4.11	Satisfied
Garden	3.10	Neutral	3.36	Neutral
Lifts and elevators	2.70	Neutral	3.62	Satisfied
Lightning and Ventilation	3.21	Neutral	4.16	Satisfied
Modern Equipment	3.27	Neutral	4.10	Satisfied
Parking	3.57	Satisfied	3.86	Satisfied
Patient Case Study report	3.39	Neutral	4.02	Satisfied
Proper sanitation	2.73	Neutral	3.96	Satisfied
Registration Counter	3.48	Satisfied	4.04	Satisfied
Security	3.15	Neutral	3.93	Satisfied
Service certificates won by hospital	3.39	Neutral	3.70	Satisfied
Signage	3.25	Neutral	3.75	Satisfied
Specialised wards andCottages	3.84	Satisfied	3.98	Satisfied
Waiting Rooms	3.08	Neutral	3.69	Satisfied
Wheel Chairs, Stretchers	3.51	Satisfied	4.01	Satisfied
Overall Score	**3.25**	**Neutral**	**3.90**	**Satisfied**

Table 16: t-test Results to Measure Difference between Patients' Satisfactions towards Physical Evidence Mix of Public and Private Hospitals

Physical Evidence	Public Hospitals (N=142)		Private Hospitals (N=337)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Canteen/Mess	2.95	1.09	3.63	1.04	6.442	0.000	Extremely Significant
Communication	3.20	0.95	3.82	0.86	6.982	0.000	Extremely Significant
Documents (Registration slip, medical transcription, bill etc.)	3.58	0.82	4.01	0.86	5.066	0.000	Extremely Significant
Drinking water	2.91	1.10	4.09	0.92	12.076	0.000	Extremely Significant
Electricity backup	3.26	0.95	4.24	0.77	11.84	0.000	Extremely Significant
Enquiry Counter	3.35	0.80	4.11	0.84	9.17	0.000	Extremely Significant
Garden	3.10	0.99	3.36	1.18	2.306	0.0216	Significant
Lifts and elevators	2.70	1.11	3.62	1.11	8.284	0.000	Extremely Significant
Lightning and Ventilation	3.21	1.06	4.16	0.78	10.887	0.000	Extremely Significant
Modern Equipment	3.27	0.95	4.10	0.76	10.108	0.000	Extremely Significant
Parking	3.57	0.86	3.86	0.98	3.064	0.0023	Extremely Significant
Patient Case Study report	3.39	0.94	4.02	0.78	7.582	0.000	Extremely Significant
Proper sanitation	2.73	1.22	3.96	0.97	11.707	0.000	Extremely Significant
Registration Counter	3.48	1.02	4.04	0.84	6.24	0.000	Extremely Significant
Security	3.15	1.10	3.93	1.00	7.565	0.000	Extremely Significant
Service certificates won by hospital	3.39	1.03	3.70	0.86	3.392	0.0008	Extremely Significant
Signage	3.25	0.75	3.75	0.80	6.362	0.000	Extremely Significant
Specialised wards and Cottages	3.84	0.91	3.98	0.91	1.538	0.124	Significant
Waiting Rooms	3.08	1.03	3.69	0.95	6.258	0.000	Extremely Significant
Wheel Chairs, Stretchers	3.51	0.94	4.01	0.89	5.522	0.000	Extremely Significant

Degree of Freedom = 477, Level of Significance = 0.05

To measure significant difference between satisfaction level of public and private hospitals' patients for physical evidence mix t-test is administrated as shown in Table 16.

It can be observed from results that there is significant difference between satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients for garden and specialised wards and cottages. For rest 18 elements of physical evidence extreme significant difference is found between satisfaction level of public and private hospital patients. As all the satisfaction means scores of private hospital patients are higher than public hospital patients, which means that patients of private hospitals are more satisfied than public hospital patients with physical evidence.

CONCLUSIONS

It can be concluded from the study that out of the seven components of service marketing mix public hospital patients are more satisfied than private hospital patients with price and place mix of hospitals and on the counter side private hospital patients are more satisfied with promotion, people and physical evidence mix. Both type of patients are equally satisfied with the product and process mix of hospitals.

REFERENCES

Consuegra, D. M., Molina, A., & Esteban, A. (2007). An integrated model of price, satisfaction and loyalty: An empirical analysis in the service sector. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 16(7), 459-468

Dhanda, K. K., & Kurian, S. (2012). An exploratory study on hospital's staff with their patient satisfaction. *Indo Global Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 2(2), 197-202

Laohasirichaikul, B., Chaipoopirutana S., & Combs, H. (2009). Effective customer relationship management of health care: A study of hospitals in Thailand. *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 1-12.

Lyon, D. B., & Powers, L. T. (2004). The impact of structure and process attributes on satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18(2), 114-121.

Moliner, A. M. (2009). Loyalty, perceived value and relationship quality in healthcare services. *Journal of Service Management*, 20(1), 76-97.

Plsek, P. (2003). Complexity and the Adoption of Innovation in Health Care. *National Institute for Health Care Management Foundation, Washington*

Pollack, B. L. (2009).Linking the hierarchical service quality model to customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Services Marketing,* 23(1), 42-50.

Tam, L. M. (2007). Linking quality improvement with patient satisfaction: a study of a health service centre. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 25(7), 732-745.

Thurau, H. T. (2004). Customer orientation of service employees-Its impact on customer satisfaction, commitment, and retention. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(5), 460-478.