

Effect of Family Physician Qualification on Patient Satisfaction in King Abdul-Aziz National Guard Hospital Al-Ahsa, Saudi Arabia 2017

Dr. Ahmad Khalid Al Khayyal¹, Dr. Abdullah Thamir Al Rasheed², Dr. Mohammed Al Jamaan³

¹King Abdul-Aziz Hospital, Al-Ahsa Family Medicine Post-Graduate Program, Al-Ahsa Alhafuf Saudi Arabia

²Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal hospital, Dammam Family Medicine Post-Graduate Joint Program, Dammam Saudi Arabia

³Assistant Consultant, Saudi Board Community Medicine, Al-AhsaAlhafuf Saudi Arabia

Abstract: *This cross-sectional study was conducted at the Family Medicine department at King Abdul-Aziz Hospital in Al-Ahsa between January 15 and February 8, 2018. It aimed to measure patient satisfaction with health services and physicians, and to assess the effect of physician qualification on patient satisfaction via a self-administered questionnaire. In total, 351 randomly selected questionnaires, completed during the printing of discharge summary papers, were analyzed. Proportions of patients who were satisfied with primary healthcare services and physicians were 88.6% and 96.4%, respectively. Patient satisfaction with primary healthcare services provided by board-certified physicians was higher relative to that observed for noncertified physicians (AOR: 2.4, P = .04, 95% CI: 1.04–5.55). Patients treated by board-certified physicians were significantly more satisfied with their physicians relative to those treated by noncertified physicians (AOR: 2.7, P = .04, 95% CI: 1.03–7.2). These results indicated that physician qualification influenced patient satisfaction.*

Keywords: Patient satisfaction, physician qualification, primary healthcare services, Saudi Arabia

1. Introduction

Primary healthcare (PHC) is an important aspect of healthcare systems that deliver comprehensive services (Bener et al., 1993). Saudi Arabia uses the “Almaata” declaration to formulate its healthcare system and aims to provide healthcare services for all citizens. In 1980, it adopted the World Health Organization’s “Health for All” policy, which promotes the application of PHC as a superior means of reaching goals (Bener et al., 1993; Billingham and Whitfield, 1993). The plan for PHC improvement aims to increase PHC availability and its role in co-ordination between all sectors of the Ministry of Health (Al-Mazrou et al., 1990).

The public sector enhances preventive medicine, reduces infectious diseases, and encourages people to seek PHC as a first step (Saudi Arabia Vision, 2016). Further, it emphasizes the importance and improves the quality of preventive care and therapeutic services, as they aim to enhance and optimize facilities at hospitals and healthcare centers (Saudi Arabia Vision, 2016). Physicians are one of the cornerstones of patient satisfaction. Pascoe defined patient satisfaction as “a health care beneficiary’s reaction to important factors of all aspects of the service provided in PHC” (1983, pp. 185–210). Satisfaction generally refers to the patient’s feeling that PHC services are not deficient and meet his or her needs and expectations (Avis et al., 1995).

The World Health Organization (2008) proposed five factors for attaining this goal: excluding exceptions and differences between people in health, formulating health services based on people’s needs and expectations, contributing to health in all other sectors, following

collaborative styles of policy dialog, and raising the participation of stakeholders (Almutairi, 2016).

Numerous studies have been conducted in Saudi Arabia to assess patient satisfaction, but most do not focus on satisfaction with healthcare providers. Moreover, measuring the effect of physician qualification on patient satisfaction is a novel approach in this field, which will improve the quality of PHC services. This study aimed to measure the rate of satisfaction with family medicine (FM) physicians and to assess the relationship between physician qualification and patient satisfaction.

2. Methodology

A cross-sectional study was conducted at the FM and PHC departments of King Abdul-Aziz National Guard Hospital in Al-Ahsa, between January 15 and February 8, 2018. The department treats National Guard dependents, employees, or employees’ dependents. The study included 36 physicians from FM, employee, business, and general practice clinics, distributed as follows: two consultants, eight assistant consultants, two board-certified physicians, 21 staff physicians, and three R4 residents. The study also included 351 patients aged ≥ 18 years (mean age: 45.6 ± 15.9) who visited the clinics during regular working hours within the study period.

The investigators collected data at the nursing station while printing discharge summary papers, assisted patients in completing the questionnaire, and answered queries. Random sampling was used to select every other patient who fulfilled the study criteria. A required sample size of 350 was estimated, using the one proportion equation for sample size estimation. Based on Almutairi’s study, we assumed a rate of

66% for patient satisfaction with PHC(Sebo et al., 2015), a type I error of 5%, and an accuracy of proportions estimate of 5%.

A self-administered questionnaire was used to measure patient satisfaction with the service and healthcare providers. During the questionnaire's creation, the study investigators reviewed previous studies(Al-Doghaither et al., 2001; Alaiban et al., 2003; Al-Sakkaket al., 2008;Almoajel et al. 2014; Mohamed et al., 2015; Sebo et al., 2015), translated the original version into Arabic, and performed backtranslation. The questionnaire was reviewed by three FM consultants and a biostatistics expert, who assessed validity and reliability and modified it accordingly. A pilot study with 21 participants was conducted in the same department. The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed, and it demonstrated good internal consistency between items (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$).

The questionnaire included three sections: Section 1 collected demographic data (six items), Section 2 measured satisfaction with healthcare settings and providers, and Section 3 collected visit-related data.

The dependent variable was patient satisfaction, divided into satisfaction with healthcare settings and providers. Responses were provided using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent). Independent variables included age, sex, marital status, employment status, residence, reason for visit, clinic, physician's qualification, physician's sex, and time of visit. Physicians were classified as board-certified physicians or general practitioners (GPs) depending on certification, following completion of a board training program recognized by the Saudi Commission of Health Specialties.

During data analysis, all variables were coded before entry and checked using SPSS. Frequency tables were created with percentages for categorical variables. Central tendency, dispersion, and distribution were assessed for continuous variables. Physician qualification was assessed using chi-square tests, bivariate analysis, and logistic regression as a multivariate analysis. Adjusted odds ratios (AORs) were calculated, and the significance level was set at .05, with a 95% confidence interval that did not cross the null hypothesis ($H_0=1$).

The study was approved by the Saudi Commission for Health Specialties, King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, and related departments. All information gained via

the questionnaire remained confidential, and all participants provided written informed consent.

3. Results




Figure 1: Patient distribution according to clinic
 FM = family medicine, GP = general practice

Table 1 shows the general characteristics of patients and physicians.

Table 1: Distribution of general characteristics

Variable	Category	n (N = 351)	%
Age (years)	18–40	142	40.5%
	41–59	132	37.6%
	≥60	77	21.9%
Sex	Male	168	47.9%
	Female	183	52.1%
Marital status	Married	290	82.6%
	Single	46	13.1%
	Divorced	4	1.1%
Employment status	Widowed	11	3.1%
	Student	29	8.3%
	Homemaker	116	33%
Residence	Employed	107	30.5%
	Retired /Unemployed	99	28.2%
	Outside	325	92.6%
Reason for visit	Housing	26	7.4%
	New visit	97	27.6%
	Follow-up	234	66.7%
	Refill	13	3.7%
Physician's qualification	Other	7	2%
	Board certified	169	48.1%
Physician's sex	Nonboard certified	182	51.9%
	Male	187	53.3%
	Female	164	46.7%

Table 2 shows patient satisfaction with PHC services and physicians.

Table 2: Proportions of patients satisfied with healthcare services

Questionnaire item	Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	n	%	n	%
A) Patient satisfaction with primary healthcare service				
1 Easy access to primary healthcare services	220	62.60%	131	37.30%
2 Working hours of primary healthcare service	331	94.30%	20	5.70%
3 Waiting time between nursing screening and consultation with physician	265	75.50%	86	24.50%
4 Total time spent from entering to exiting primary healthcare service (missed=1)	268	76.60%	82	23.40%
5 Comfortableness of waiting area	259	73.80%	92	26.20%
6 No problems or constraints encountered during visit to primary healthcare service	288	82.10%	63	17.90%
7 Overall satisfaction with primary healthcare service	311	88.60%	40	11.40%
B) Patient satisfaction with physicians				

8	Physician's friendliness and politeness	335	95.40%	16	4.60%
9	Physician's explanation regarding patient's current condition or health problem	326	92.90%	25	7.10%
10	Physician's concern regarding patient's questions and worries	331	94.30%	20	5.70%
11	Physician's efforts to include patient in decisions about treatment	323	92.00%	28	8.00%
12	Physician's explanation regarding management plan and prescribed medications	325	92.60%	26	7.40%
13	Physician's instructions regarding follow-up and referral to another specialty or physician	329	93.70%	22	6.30%
14	Patient's understanding of the physician's words and explanation	337	96.00%	14	4.00%
15	Total time spent with physician in the clinic	336	95.70%	15	4.30%
16	Likelihood of recommending the physician to other patients	326	92.90%	25	7.10%
17	Overall satisfaction with the physician	328	93.40%	23	6.60%

The results of bivariate analysis of physicians' qualifications are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of general characteristics according to physician qualification

Variable	Category	Board certified (N = 169)		Nonboard certified (N = 182)		P
		n	%	n	%	
Age (years)	18-40	56	33.10%	86	47.30%	0.03
	41-59	71	42%	61	33.50%	
	≥60	42	24.90%	35	19.20%	
Sex	Male	96	56.80%	72	39.60%	0.001
	Female	73	43.20%	110	60.40%	
Marital status	Married	141	83.40%	149	81.90%	0.7
	Unmarried	28	16.60%	33	18.10%	
Employment status	Employed	58	34.30%	49	26.90%	0.001
	Homemaker	39	23.10%	77	42.30%	
	Other	72	42.60%	56	30.80%	
Residence	Outside	159	94.10%	166	91.20%	0.3
	Housing	10	5.90%	16	8.80%	
Reason for visit	Follow-up	116	68.60%	118	64.80%	0.5
	New visit & other	53	31.40%	64	35.20%	
Physician's sex	Male	121	71.60%	66	36.30%	0.001
	Female	48	28.40%	116	63.70%	

Table 4 shows the distribution of patient satisfaction according to physician qualification.

Table 4: Distribution of satisfaction according to physician qualification

	Questionnaire item	Board certified (N = 169)		Nonboard certified (N = 182)		P
		n	%	n	%	
Patient satisfaction with primary healthcare service						
1	Easy access to primary healthcare services	105	62.10%	115	63.20%	0.8
2	Working hours of primary healthcare service	160	94.70%	171	94%	0.8
3	Waiting time between nursing screening and consultation with physician	147	87%	118	64.80%	0.001
4	Total time spent from entering to exiting primary healthcare service (missed=1)	148	88.10%	120	65.90%	0.001
5	Comfortableness of waiting area	136	80.50%	123	67.60%	0.006
6	No problems or constraints encountered during visit to primary healthcare service	145	85.80%	143	78.60%	0.08
7	Overall satisfaction with primary healthcare service	160	94.70%	151	83%	0.001
Patient satisfaction with physician						
8	Physician's friendliness and politeness	165	97.60%	170	93.40%	0.06
9	Physician's explanation regarding patient's current condition or health problem	163	96.40%	163	89.60%	0.01
10	Physician's concern regarding patient's questions and worries	164	97%	167	91.80%	0.03
11	Physician's efforts to include patient in decisions about treatment	159	94.10%	164	90.10%	0.2
12	Physician's explanation regarding management plan and prescribed medications	160	94.70%	165	90.70%	0.2
13	Physician's instructions regarding follow-up and referral to another specialty or physician	160	95.30%	168	92.30%	0.3
14	Patient's understanding of the physician's words and explanation	163	96.40%	174	95.60%	0.7
15	Total time spent with physician in the clinic	162	95.90%	174	95.60%	0.9
16	Likelihood of recommending the physician to other patients	161	95.30%	165	90.70%	0.1
17	Overall satisfaction with the physician	163	96.40%	165	90.70%	0.03

The results of the multivariate analysis are shown in Tables 5 and 6. The AOR for patient satisfaction with PHC services was adjusted for age, sex, employment status, and physician's sex. The AOR for patient satisfaction with physicians was adjusted for patients' sex and employment status.

Table 5: Multivariate analysis of patient satisfaction with healthcare services

Variable	Category	B	AOR	P	95%CI
Age		0.02	1.02	0.23	0.99-1.04
Sex	Male	-0.44	0.7	0.43	0.22-1.91
	Female				
Employment status	Employee	0.06	1.06	0.91	0.41-2.76
	Homemaker	-0.54	0.59	0.32	0.20-1.69

	Other			0.57	
Physician's gender	Male	0.94	2.57	0.02	1.13–5.83
	Female				
Physician's qualification	Board certified	0.88	2.4	0.04	1.04–5.55
	Noncertified				
	Constant	1.06	2.9	0.08	
*-2 Log likelihood=228.410, Cox & Snell R ² =.06, Nagelkerke R ² =.11. AOR = adjusted odds ratio					

Table 6: Multivariate analysis of patient satisfaction with physicians

Variable	Category	B	AOR	P	95%CI
Sex	Male	-0.02	0.98	0.98	0.29–3.30
	Female				
Employment status	Employee	-0.81	0.45	0.16	0.14–1.40
	Homemaker	-0.54	0.58	0.45	0.14–2.40
	Other			0.38	
Physician's qualification	Board certified	1.01	2.7	0.04	1.03–7.20
	Noncertified				
	Constant	2.8	15.8	0.001	
*-2 Log likelihood=162.735, Cox & Snell R ² =.02, Nagelkerke R ² =.05. AOR = adjusted odds ratio					

4. Conclusions and Discussion

This study examined the rates of patient satisfaction with primary healthcare services and FM physicians. Rates of satisfaction with healthcare settings in previous studies conducted in Saudi Arabia vary. Mohamed et al. (2015) estimated a patientsatisfaction rate of 82% in AlMajmaah; Almoajel et al. (2014) reported an overall patient satisfaction rate of 77% in AlJubail; and Al-Sakkaket al. (2008) observed an overall satisfaction rate of 64.2% in Riyadh in 2008. The patient satisfaction rate observed in this study was higher relative to those reported in these previous studies; this could be attributed to differences in times, locations, participants, study objectives and methods, and questionnaire content.

Results revealed that patients of board-certified physicians were significantly more likely to be satisfied with the physicians in comparison to those of nonboard-certified physicians. Sebo et al. (2015) assessed 23 GPs' perceptions of 1,637 patients' satisfaction and expectations in primary care in Genevain 2015 and found that a GP's certification status was a significant factor affecting patient satisfaction (odds ratio: 0.6, P = .04, 95% CI: 0.6). These findings are consistent with those of this study, as board-certified physicians are more familiar with patients' needs compared to GPs. Further, they usually possess extensive experience and have studied social and behavioral sciences in higher education.

The results of the bivariate analysis showed differences between board-certified and nonboard-certified physicians according to patient age, sex, employment status, and physician's sex but not marital status, residence, or the reason for the visit. In addition, there were significant results in the satisfaction of time period of the visit, comfortable place, and feasibility process. Patients were more likely to be satisfied with PHC services if physicians were male (AOR: 2.57, P = .02, 95% CI: 1.13–5.83) and board certified (AOR: 2.4, P = .04, 95% CI: 1.04–5.5). Satisfaction with explanations of patients' conditions or health problems was

greater for board-certified physicians relative to that for nonboard-certified physicians (OR: 2.77, P = .01). Further, patients aged 18–40 years reported greater satisfaction with board-certified physicians relative to that reported for nonboard-certified physicians (P = .03).

Mohamed et al. (2015) reported that unsuitable buildings and lack of clean facilities and technical competency in staff members were common reasons for low levels of satisfaction (rates: 33.1%, 24.2%, and 29%, respectively). In comparison, the comfort of the waiting room affected satisfaction rates in this study. In addition, Mohamed et al. (2015) reported a significant association between the level of patient satisfaction with PHC services and high levels of education in respondents. However, sex, marital status, and income did not affect satisfaction levels. In this study, the findings regarding sex were consistent with Mohamed et al.'s (2015) study, in which sex did not affect satisfaction.

Ghorbani et al. (2015) reported that increases of one year in patients' ages were associated with reductions in their satisfaction levels (B=0.12, P = .03), and levels of satisfaction in rural areas were lower relative to those reported in urban areas (B=7.93, P = .03) in Iran in 2015. In this study, younger patients (aged 18–40 years) reported significantly greater satisfaction with board-certified physicians compared to older patients.

Almoajel et al. (2014) assessed patients' satisfaction with various aspects of PHC services and reported a significant relationship between satisfaction levels and patients' sex (P < .05), with higher levels reported in women (94.3%) compared to those observed in men. Further, satisfaction was significantly associated with occupational level, and students reported the greatest satisfaction (100%), followed by workers (75%). These findings showed that PHC providers should pay greater attention to patients' enquiries to improve patient health, and address all of their concerns to ensure high-quality healthcare. Levels of satisfaction with the accessibility of PHC services in Almoajel et al.'s (2014) study were higher compared to those observed in this study. This difference could be attributed to location, as Almoajel et al.'s (2014) study was conducted at a housing compound, increasing accessibility, and this study was conducted at a hospital that is some distance from the most populated areas of the city.

The study was subject to some limitations. Some patients did not read every questionnaire item carefully and responded inappropriately, which led to missing data. Some patients did not complete the questionnaire because they were sick and responded quickly. Further, many studies examining patient satisfaction have been conducted at different healthcare centers in Saudi Arabia, and it is a common research topic. Every healthcare institution is required to assess employee effectiveness and patient satisfaction via client feedback; moreover, it is a major standard in most accreditation organizations.

Despite these limitations, the study had some strengths. For example, the sample size was estimated scientifically, and the investigators controlled the sampling technique directly. Further, the response rate was high (99.72%) because the

investigators assisted participants in completing the questionnaire. In addition, the questionnaire was reviewed and piloted with 21 participants to ensure validity and reliability. Moreover, satisfaction with services and physicians was assessed separately in the questionnaire.

This study's findings showed that physicians' qualifications played a significant role in patient satisfaction, in that patient satisfaction levels differed between board-certified and non-board-certified physicians.

Further studies should be conducted to address this issue. Specifically, we recommend a case-control study examining differences in patient satisfaction levels with family physicians with different qualifications. Additionally, a larger sample size is required to provide a more accurate demonstration of variations in satisfaction.

5. Acknowledgements

We would like to extend special thanks to the participating patients for their time, and the healthcare facility for allowing us to conduct the study at the hospital. We would also like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

References

- [1] Al-Doghaither, A.H., Abdelrhman, B.M., Saeed, A.A.W., Al-Kamil, A.A. and Majzoub, M.M., 2001. Patients' Satisfaction with Primary Health Care Centers Services in Kuwait City, Kuwait. *Journal of Family and Community Medicine*, 8(3): 59–65.
- [2] Al-Mazrou, Y., Al-Shehri, S. and Rao, M., 1990. Principles and Practice of PHC. General Directorate of Health Centers, 2: 31–42.
- [3] Alaiban K.M., Al-Omar, B., Narine, L., Al-Assaf, A.F. and Javed, F., 2003. A Survey Assessing Patient Satisfaction at Public and Private Healthcare Facilities in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Annals of Saudi Medicine*, 23(6): 417–419.
- [4] Almoajel, A., Fetohi, E. and Alshamrani, A., 2014. Patient Satisfaction with Primary Health Care in Jubail City, Saudi Arabia. *World Journal of Medical Sciences*, 11(2): 255–264.
- [5] Almutairi, K.M., 2016. Satisfaction of Patients Attending in Primary Healthcare Centers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: A Random Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 56(3): 876–883.
- [6] Al-Sakkak, M.A., Al-Nowaiser, N.A., Al-Khashan, H.I., Al-Abdrabulnabi, A.A. and Jaber, R.M., 2008. Patient satisfaction with primary health care services in Riyadh. *Saudi Medical Journal*, 29(3): 432–436.
- [7] Avis, M., Bond, M. and Arthur, A., 1995. Satisfying Solutions? A Review of Some Unresolved Issues in the Measurement of Patient Satisfaction. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 22(2): 316–322.
- [8] Bener, A., Abdullah, S. and Murdoch, J.C., 1993. PHC in the United Arab Emirates. *Family Practice*, 10, 444–448.
- [9] Billinghamurst, B. and Whitfield, M., 1993. Why do Patients Change their General Practitioner? A Postal

- Questionnaire Study of Patients in Avon. *British Journal of General Practice*, 43, 336–338.
- [10] Ghorbani, A., Raeissi, P., Saffari, E. and Reissi, N., 2015. Patient Satisfaction with the Family Physician Program in Sabzevar, Iran. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 8(2): 219–229.
 - [11] Mohamed, E. Y., Sami, W., Alotaibi, A., Alfarag, A., Almutairi, A. and Alanzi, F., 2015. Patients' satisfaction with primary health care centers' services, Majmaah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Health Science (Qassim)*, 9(2): 163–170.
 - [12] Pascoe, G.C., 1983. Patient Satisfaction in PHC: A Literature Review and Analysis. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 6(3–4): 185–210.
 - [13] Saudi Arabia Vision, 2016. Vision 2030 Saudi Arabia. Available from <http://vision2030.gov.sa/>
 - [14] Sebo, P., Herrmann, F.R. and Haller, D.M., 2015. *Advances in Pediatrics*. U.S. National Library of Medicine. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4466691/>
 - [15] World Health Organization, 2008. Primary Health Care. http://www.who.int/topics/primary_health_care/en/