
Comparative analysis of health care facilities in government and corporate hospitals: With special reference to Hadauti Region in Rajasthan

Shalini Chittora (Research scholar in University of Kota, Kota)

Abstract: This paper attempts to conduct a comparative study between Government and Corporate Hospitals in Hadauti region. Four Government and four corporate hospitals are selected and along with the secondary data, some primary data are collected by interviewing 100 patients of Government and 100 from Corporate hospital to reveal the differences on the basis of Quality of services, cost and benefits, good infrastructure facilities, accreditation, corporate sector has an edge over the government sector services, and also to offer suggestions to make overall service quality in corporate and government hospitals more effective and efficient. The major finding we get through t -test suggests that the overall healthcare facilities are better in the corporate hospitals. In spite of that, this study reveals that the government hospitals still act as a pillar of expectation for the poor and middle-class people, who cannot bear the high cost of the treatment in the corporate hospitals.

KEYWORD: healthcare facilities, infrastructural facilities, high cost of the treatment, accreditation, edge over.

India has emerged as a global economic force, and this has led the public to demand changes within India's health care system. Health is a most significant issue in for every human being. India, a country of open farms, crowded villages, and tumultuously active cities, India possesses a seemingly endless pool of human capital and growing economic capital but relatively little of its spent on healthcare (Baru, R., & Nundy, M., 2008). The government pays only 1.1 % of its GDP on public healthcare and an additional 3.7 % is privately financed, for a total 4.8 % of GDP on health spending (Bhat, R., 1999). In the absence of a change in governmental approach, the private sector seems to offer the best hope for improving the healthcare in India. This paper examines Kolkata's government and private hospital sectors. It is analyzing the size, infrastructure, performances, facilities, distributions of hospitals, and the differences about them between government and private sectors. It also identifies the strategies to improve performance and accessibility to the hospital facilities.

SCOPE:

The study focuses on Patients' perceptions about health care systems in developing countries. Patient satisfaction depends up on many factors such as: Quality of clinical services provided, availability of medicine, behavior of doctors and other health staff, cost of services, hospital infrastructure, physical comfort, emotional support, and respect for patient preferences. An attempt has been made to elicit the opinions from patients, because every human being carries a particular set of thoughts, feelings and needs. The wishing list might be of value for those who want to know the real person within the patient. It gives new ideas and suggestions. One must admit that there are lots of things which could be altered.

In the next step mismatch between patient expectation and the service received is related to decreased satisfaction. Therefore, assessing patient perspectives gives them a voice, which can make public health services more responsive to people's needs and expectations.

Through this study we can find out the profile of patients coming to hospital every day, whether they are satisfied of all these services or not & After all these facilities is there any preference of corporate hospitals over government hospitals or vice versa.

STUDY AREA:

To study the difference in healthcare facilities between government and corporate hospitals, my study area was conducted in the hadauti region. Four Government hospitals and four corporate hospital of this region were selected for the study.

Government hospitals	Corporate hospitals
Pandit Brij Sundar Sharma government hospital, Bundi. Maharav Bhim Singh hospital, Kota. Government district hospital, Baran. Rajendra Prasad hospital, Jhalawar.	Anurag Nursing home, Bundi. Sudha hospital, Kota. Goyal Nursing Home, Baran. Sanjeevani Vyas hospital, Jhalawar.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To understand the differences of the healthcare facilities between government and corporate hospitals and their causes are also analyzed.

METHODOLOGY:

In this study, the methodology that has been adopted involves a number of stages: **Firstly**, the data were collected in two ways. One was structural questionnaire used to collect primary data directly through interview schedule from the patients. 200 patients are interviewed at the time of the primary survey. Second one was the secondary data collected directly from the Superintendent Offices and Data Record Departments of the hospitals.

Secondly, all statistical data were calculated and were represented by some cartographic techniques to attain the ultimate objective.

Finally, consult with some books, e-books, articles, journals, e-paper and newspaper to finish my paper and reach the final goal.

HEALTH-CARE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURAL FACILITIES OF HOSPITALS:

Patients Admitted in Hospitals: Admissions of patients are high in government hospitals than the corporate hospitals. Government hospitals receive mainly poor and middle class patients whereas corporate hospitals mainly receive higher class patients and some middle class patients also. It is because of difference in cost or payment structure between government and corporate hospitals.

Table 1. – Showing comparison between better quality service providers:

Better quality service	Number of patients			
	Government		Corporate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly disagree	5	5%	1	1%
Disagree	10	10%	3	3%
Undecided	16	16%	0	0%
Agree	47	47%	71	71%
Strongly agree	22	22%	25	25%

Total	100	100%	100	100%
--------------	------------	-------------	------------	-------------

Output Table 1:

Group Statistics

Government/Corporate		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Service	1.00	100	3.7100	1.07586	.10759
Provider	2.00	100	4.1600	.66241	.06624

Source: Field Survey.

Independent Samples Test:

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
									Lower Upper
Service Provider	Equal variances assumed	25.045	.000	-3.562	198	.000	-.45000	.12634	-.69915 -.20085
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.562	164.628	.000	-.45000	.12634	-.69946 -.20054

Table no.1 give better **quality-wise service distribution** of the Respondents distribution of Government and Corporate hospitals Respondents selected for Field Survey.

- 5% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are strongly disagree with this statement, 10% of the government hospital respondents and 1% corporate hospitals respondents are disagree with this statement, 16% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are undecided with this statement, 47% of the government hospital respondents and 71% corporate hospitals respondents were agree with this statement, 22% of the government hospital respondents and 28% corporate hospitals respondents were strongly agree with this statement.

Table no. 2: Showing comparison between cost and benefits service providers:

Cost and benefits	Number of patients			
	Government		Corporate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly disagree	24	24%	0	0%
Disagree	48	10%	1	0%

Undecided	11	11%	6	6%
Agree	10	10%	68	66%
Strongly agree	7	7%	25	27%
Total	100	100%	100	100%

Source: Field Survey.

Output Table no.2:

Group Statistics

Government/Corporate		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Cost and Benefit dimension1	1.00	100	2.2800	1.14662	.11466
	2.00	100	4.1700	.56951	.05695

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Cost and Benefit	Equal variances assumed	32.370	.000	-14.763	198	.000	-1.89000	.12803	-2.14247	-1.63753
	Equal variances not assumed			-14.763	145.044	.000	-1.89000	.12803	-2.14304	-1.63696

Table no.2 give better **cost and benefits distribution** of the Respondents distribution of Government and Corporate hospitals Respondents selected for Field Survey.

- 23% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are strongly disagree with this statement, 49% of the government hospital respondents and 1% corporate hospitals respondents are disagree with this statement, 11% of the government hospital respondents and 6% corporate hospitals respondents are undecided with this statement, 10% of the government hospital respondents and 66% corporate hospitals respondents were agree with this statement, 7% of the government hospital respondents and 27% corporate hospitals respondents were strongly agree with this statement.

Table no.3: Showing comparison between good infrastructure facilities providers:

Good Infrastructure facilities	Number of patients			
	Government		Corporate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent

Strongly disagree	5	5%	0	0%
Disagree	10	10%	1	1%
Undecided	7	7%	2	2%
Agree	54	54%	49	49%
Strongly agree	24	24%	48	48%
Total	100	100%	100	100%

Source: Field Survey.

Group Statistics

Government/Corporate			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Infrastructure dimension1	1.00		100	3.8200	1.06723	.10672
	2.00		100	4.4400	.59152	.05915

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Infrastructure	Equal variances assumed	8.136	.005	-5.081	198	.000	-.62000	.12202	-.86063	-.37937
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.081	154.581	.000	-.62000	.12202	-.86104	-.37896

Table 3 give **good infrastructure facilities distribution** of the Respondents distribution of Government and Corporate hospitals Respondents selected for Field Survey.

- 5% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are strongly disagree with this statement, 10% of the government hospital respondents and 1% corporate hospitals respondents are disagree with this statement, 16% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are undecided with this statement, 47% of the government hospital respondents and 71% corporate hospitals respondents were agree with this statement, 22% of the government hospital respondents and 28% corporate hospitals respondents were strongly agree with this statement.

Total Respondents (N) =200

Table no. 4: Showing comparison regarding accreditation.

Accreditation	Number of patients
---------------	--------------------

	Government		Corporate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly disagree	5	5%	0	0%
Disagree	10	10%	10	1%
Undecided	7	7%	4	1%
Agree	54	54%	51	63%
Strongly agree	24	24%	35	35%
Total	100	100%	100	100%

Source: Field Survey.

Group Statistics

Government/Corporate		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Accredited dimension1	Government	100	3.7200	1.21506	.12151
	Corporate	100	4.1100	.88643	.08864

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Accredited	Equal variances assumed	23.463	.000	-2.593	198	.010	-.39000	.15040	-.68660	-.09340
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.593	181.119	.010	-.39000	.15040	-.68677	-.09323

Source: Field Survey.

Table 4 give **accreditation distribution** of the Respondents distribution of Government and Corporate hospitals Respondents selected for Field Survey.

- 5% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are strongly disagree with this statement, 10% of the government hospital respondents and 1% corporate hospitals respondents are disagree with this statement, 16% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are undecided with this statement, 47% of the government hospital respondents and 71% corporate hospitals respondents were agree with this statement, 22% of the government hospital respondents and 28% corporate hospitals respondents were strongly agree with this statement.

Table no. 5: Showing comparison regarding edge over:

Edge over	Number of patients			
	Government		Corporate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly disagree	8	5%	0	0%
Disagree	15	10%	0	1%
Undecided	8	7%	1	1%
Agree	33	54%	51	63%
Strongly agree	36	24%	48	35%
Total	100	100%	100	100%

Output table no. 5:**Group Statistics**

Government/Corporate			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Edge Over	dimension	Government	100	3.7400	1.30748	.13075
		1 Corporate	100	4.4700	.52136	.05214

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Edge Over	Equal variances assumed	59.696	.000	-5.186	198	.000	-.73000	.14076	-1.00758	-.45242
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.186	129.707	.000	-.73000	.14076	-1.00848	-.45152

Table no.5. Give **corporate sectors has an edge over the government sector** of the Respondents distribution of Government and Corporate hospitals Respondents selected for Field Survey.

- 5% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are strongly disagree with this statement, 10% of the government hospital respondents and 1% corporate hospitals respondents are disagree with this statement, 16% of the government hospital respondents and 0% corporate hospitals respondents are undecided with this statement, 47% of the government hospital respondents and 71% corporate hospitals respondents were agree with this statement, 22% of the government hospital respondents and 28% corporate hospitals respondents were strongly agree with this statement.

FINDINGS: The findings reveal that in case of health care facilities by cost satisfaction, quality of services, weighing the cost and benefits of medical facilities, infrastructure facilities, accreditation of both sector hospitals, corporate sector has an edge over the government hospitals.

The findings show that corporate hospital has better function rather than in government regarding to quality of services, infrastructure, accreditation, corporate sector has an edge over the government sector.

Besides satisfaction with pricing in government hospital is much satisfactory as compared to corporate hospital.

CONCLUSION: following major points regarding corporate hospital vis-à-vis government hospital has emerged in carrying out the above survey.

The patient satisfaction is the main criteria in carrying out the above said study for both Government and Corporate hospital.

First of all if a hospital wants to improve the quality of services and there by ensure patient satisfaction, it must ensure quality level because quality level of hospital is must for any poor, middle, upper class patients.

Secondly: satisfaction with charges is high in government hospital so poor or middle class persons mostly want to go in Government hospital if there is not any specific reason for that.

Thirdly: Satisfaction with infrastructural facilities is much higher in corporate hospital rather than in government hospitals.

Fourthly: According to respondents accreditation of both hospitals should be there.

Finally: According to respondents corporate hospitals has edge an over the government hospitals.

REFERENCES:

- ❖ Andaleeb, S. S. (2001). Service Quality Perceptions and Patient Satisfaction: A Study of Hospitals in Developing Country. *Social Science & Medicine*, 52(9), 1359-1370.
- ❖ Baru, R., & Nundy, M. (2008). Blurring Boundaries in Public–Private Partnerships in Health Services in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45, 62–71.
- ❖ Bhat, R. (1999). Characteristics of Private Medical Practice in India: A Provider Perspective. *Health Policy and Planning*, 14(1), 26–37.
- ❖ Hoerger, Thomas J. (1991). Profit Variability in For-Profit and Not-For-Profit Hospitals. *Journal of Health Economics*, 10, 259-289.
- ❖ Horwitz, J. R. (2008). Hospital Ownership and Medical Services: Market Mix, Spillover Effects, and Nonprofit Objectives. *Journal of Health Economics*, 28(5), 924-937.
- ❖ Eman Banerjee(2013).Comaparative study on Healthcare facilities produced by government and privately owned hospitals in kolkata municipal corporation, **Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies**, ISSN:2321-8819volume 1,Issue 3,October 2013,7-16.
- ❖ Dr. Vilas V Tergaonkar (2010), A study on the health care facilities provided for below poverty line patients in a selected Government and corporate hospital, Rajiv Gandhi University of health sciences, Karnataka, Bangalore, October, 2010.
- ❖ Interviews from Bundi, Kota, Baran, Jhalawar hospital staff.