

## Decoding Patient Satisfaction: Examining the Hospital Facilities, Staff Behavior, and Accessibility<sup>1</sup>

Pushkar Singh Raikhola

### Abstract

**Background:** This study explores patients' perceptions of hospital facilities, staff behavior, and accessibility, with the aim to assess their relationships and impacts on overall patient satisfaction. As healthcare quality and patient experience become critical components of service delivery, this research investigates how different hospital factors contribute to patient satisfaction levels.

**Research Methods:** Adopting a descriptive and causal-comparative research design, this study utilized a deductive approach to test hypotheses based on literature. Data were collected through structured surveys with 200 patients, using a four-point Likert scale to measure responses.

**Results:** The study found that hospital staff behavior significantly influenced patient satisfaction, with 96% of participants rating the staff as friendly, respectful, and prompt in attending to their needs. Cleanliness and maintenance of hospital facilities were also positively perceived, with 52% of respondents highlighting that facilities were well-maintained. Furthermore, accessibility to medical services, including appointment scheduling and timely care, had a positive correlation with overall satisfaction, as 79.5% of respondents found it easy to schedule appointments and receive care. A small minority reported dissatisfaction with either facilities or service responsiveness, signaling areas for potential improvement.

**Conclusion:** The research demonstrates that patient satisfaction is strongly influenced by positive perceptions of staff behavior, hospital facilities, and service accessibility.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cite this article as: Raikhola, P. S. (2025). *Contemporary Research: An Interdisciplinary Academic Journal*, vol. 8 (1), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/craiaj.v8i1.79897>

Pushkar Singh Raikhola, Associate Professor, Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3434-0594>. Email: [pushkar\\_raikhola@yahoo.com](mailto:pushkar_raikhola@yahoo.com)

Article history: Received on April 30, 2025; Accepted on June 3, 2025; Published on June 7, 2025.

Peer reviewed under the authority of CRAIAJ, academic journal of Ghodaghodi Multiple Campus, Kailali, Nepal, with ISSN 2717-4611 (Print) and ISSN 2717-462X (Online).

© 2025 CRAIAJ, A JPPS Star Rated Journal Indexed in Nepjol



Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>

Ensuring consistent staff professionalism, maintaining hospital cleanliness, and enhancing accessibility can significantly improve overall patient satisfaction. These findings suggest that hospitals aiming to enhance patient experiences should prioritize these factors, particularly focusing on staff training, facility management, and streamlining patient access to care.

**Keywords:** Accessibility, Behavior, Facilities, Patient, Satisfaction

## Introduction

### Background of the study

Patient satisfaction is a vital indicator of healthcare quality, reflecting how well medical services meet patient expectations and needs (Thapa & Nyaupane, 2024). It goes beyond clinical outcomes, encompassing aspects such as communication with healthcare providers, hospital environment, waiting times, and overall service delivery. A high level of patient satisfaction indicates that a healthcare facility is not only providing effective treatments but also ensuring a positive and comfortable experience for patients (Ferreira et al., 2023). Satisfied patients are more likely to adhere to prescribed treatments, trust medical professionals, and engage in preventive care, leading to better health outcomes. Conversely, dissatisfied patients may delay seeking care, disregard medical advice, or switch healthcare providers, potentially worsening their conditions (Green et al., 2014). As a result, hospitals and policymakers prioritize patient satisfaction as a key performance metric to assess service quality and implement necessary improvements.

### Importance of hospital facilities

Hospital facilities play a crucial role in ensuring patient well-being by providing a safe, comfortable, and supportive environment for treatment and recovery (Tufael & Sunny, 2022). The quality of infrastructure, cleanliness, availability of medical equipment, and accessibility of essential services significantly influence patient satisfaction. Well-maintained facilities with modern diagnostic tools, hygienic inpatient rooms, and efficient administrative systems enhance patient experiences and contribute to better health outcomes (Aryal et al., 2024). Additionally, patient-centric amenities such as waiting areas, cafeterias, and digital healthcare solutions (e.g., telemedicine and electronic records) further improve service efficiency and accessibility (Zhang & Saltman, 2022).

**Role of staff behavior in patient satisfaction**

Staff behavior is a key determinant of patient satisfaction, as interactions with healthcare professionals shape patients' perceptions of care quality (Ferreira et al., 2023). Effective communication, empathy, and professionalism from doctors, nurses, and administrative staff foster trust and comfort. Conversely, poor communication, dismissive attitudes, or inefficiency can lead to frustration and dissatisfaction (Rai et al., 2024). Courteous and attentive staff contribute to a positive hospital experience, while neglect or rudeness may discourage patients from seeking timely care (Yinusa & Faezipour, 2023).

**Significance of hospital accessibility**

Hospital accessibility—determined by location, transportation, affordability, and operational efficiency—directly impacts patient satisfaction (Tian, 2023). Conveniently located hospitals with good transport links reduce delays in care, especially in emergencies (Mseke et al., 2024). Affordability and streamlined administrative processes (e.g., shorter wait times, digital appointment systems) further enhance accessibility, ensuring that financial or logistical barriers do not prevent patients from receiving necessary care.

**Objectives of the Study**

This study aims to comprehensively evaluate patient experiences by assessing their perceptions of three critical healthcare dimensions: hospital facilities, staff behavior, and accessibility. The research seeks to examine the interrelationships between these key factors and their collective influence on patient satisfaction levels. By analyzing how facility quality, staff-patient interactions, and service accessibility jointly impact overall satisfaction, the study will provide valuable insights for healthcare providers to enhance service delivery and improve patient-centered care. The findings will contribute to a better understanding of the determinants of patient satisfaction, enabling healthcare institutions to implement targeted improvements in infrastructure, staff training, and service accessibility to optimize patient experiences and outcomes.

**Research Methods**

The study employed a descriptive and causal-comparative research design to examine patient perceptions and satisfaction with hospital services, while exploring potential relationships between factors such as staff behavior, facility cleanliness, and accessibility. A deductive approach was used, where hypotheses were derived from

existing literature and tested using empirical data, allowing for a structured analysis of predefined variables.

**Population and sampling**

The study population consisted of patients who visited selected hospitals during the data collection period. A sample of 200 patients was selected using convenience sampling, ensuring diverse representation across different demographics and hospital departments. The sample size was determined based on feasibility and the need for sufficient statistical power in regression and correlation analyses. The study included three hospitals to capture varied patient experiences.

**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

Participants were included if they were adult patients (18 years or older) who had received services at the hospital within the past month. Patients who were unwilling to participate, critically ill, or unable to provide informed consent were excluded.

**Data collection process**

Data was collected over a two-month period (June to July 2023) using a structured survey questionnaire with a four-point Likert scale. Trained research assistants administered the surveys in person to ensure clarity and consistency. To maintain uniformity, standardized instructions were provided to both data collectors and participants, and a pilot test was conducted to refine the questionnaire.

**Ethical considerations**

Prior to data collection, ethical approval was obtained from the hospital administrations. Informed consent was secured from all participants, ensuring they understood the study's purpose and their voluntary participation. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the study.

**Data analysis**

The collected data was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean) were used to summarize patient perceptions, while correlation and regression analyses explored relationships between variables. The survey instrument demonstrated high reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.815, indicating strong internal consistency.

**Results**

This section highlights demographic information, perceptions of hospital facilities, staff behavior, and accessibility. It also explores the relationship between independent and dependent variables and their impact on patient satisfaction.

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>

**Table 1**  
Demographic Information

		<b>Age</b>	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	20-24 years	50	25.0
	25-29 years	49	24.5
	30-34 years	56	28.0
	35 and above	45	22.5
	Total	200	100.0
		<b>Sex</b>	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	71	35.5
	Female	129	64.5
	Total	200	100.0
		<b>Education</b>	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Secondary	108	54.0
	Above secondary	92	46.0
	Total	200	100.0
		<b>Religion</b>	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Hindu	153	76.5
	Buddhist	27	13.5
	Christian	16	8.0
	Islam	4	2.0
	Total	200	100.0

The table presents the demographic distribution of the sample population based on age, sex, education, and religion. For age, the sample is distributed across four groups. The largest group falls in the 30-34 years category, comprising 56 participants or 28.0% of the total sample. The 20-24 years group follows closely with 50 participants (25.0%), while 25-29 years contains 49 participants (24.5%). The smallest group is 35 and above, which includes 45 participants (22.5%). Cumulatively, these percentages total 100%, showing the full distribution of age in the sample.

In terms of sex, the sample comprises more females than males. 129 females (or 64.5%) and 71 males (or 35.5%) participated in the study. This gender distribution indicates a higher representation of women in the sample.

Regarding education, the majority of the participants (108 or 54.0%) have secondary education. The remaining 92 participants (46.0%) reported having an education above secondary, demonstrating a nearly equal split between those with higher and secondary-level education.

Finally, the religion variable reveals that the predominant religion among the sample is Hinduism, with 153 participants (76.5%) identifying as Hindu. Buddhism follows with 27 participants (13.5%), while Christianity and Islam have fewer representations, with 16 (8.0%) and 4 (2.0%) participants, respectively. This shows a clear dominance of Hindu participants in the sample, with smaller groups of Buddhist, Christian, and Muslim participants.

### Patients' perception of hospital facilities

**Table 2**

Staff Behavior-1

#### Were the hospital staff friendly, respectful, and attentive?

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	23	11.5
Somewhat Friendly and Respectful	77	38.5
Unfriendly and Disrespectful	4	2.0
Yes, they were very Friendly and Respectful	96	48.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Were the hospital staff friendly, respectful, and attentive?" reveal a predominantly positive perception of the staff's behavior. Of the 200 participants, 48.0% (96 individuals) reported that the staff was very friendly and respectful, highlighting a strong positive response. Additionally, 38.5% (77 participants) indicated that the staff was somewhat friendly and respectful, suggesting that while they generally had a good experience, it was not as remarkable. However, 11.5% (23 participants) expressed a neutral stance, meaning they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. On the contrary, a small portion of the respondents, 2.0% (4 participants), felt that the hospital staff was unfriendly and disrespectful, indicating a negative experience. Overall, the data shows that most patients perceived the staff as friendly and respectful, with a small minority expressing dissatisfaction.

**Table 3**

Staff Behavior-2

#### Did they treat you with dignity and compassion?

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	29	14.5
No, they did not treat with dignity at all	4	2.0
Somewhat	57	28.5
Yes, they treat with dignity and compassion	110	55.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Did they treat you with dignity and compassion?" indicate that most participants felt positively about their treatment by hospital staff. Among the 200 respondents, 55.0% (110 participants) confirmed that they were treated with dignity and compassion, reflecting a highly positive experience. Additionally, 28.5% (57 participants) felt the treatment was somewhat dignified and compassionate, although perhaps not to a remarkable degree. 14.5% (29 participants) expressed a neutral view, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement. A small minority, 2.0% (4 participants), felt they were not treated with dignity at all, indicating a negative experience. Overall, the majority of patients 83.5% either had a neutral or positive perception of being treated with dignity and compassion, while a small fraction felt otherwise.

**Table 4**

Staff Behavior-3

**Did they respond promptly to your needs and requests?**

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	33	16.5
No, they did not respond promptly at all	6	3.0
Somewhat promptly	73	36.5
Yes, very promptly	88	44.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Did they respond promptly to your needs and requests?" indicate a generally positive perception of the hospital staff's responsiveness. Among the 200 respondents, 44.0% (88 participants) reported that the staff responded to their needs very promptly, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. Additionally, 36.5% (73 participants) felt the staff was somewhat prompt, indicating a generally satisfactory experience but not exceptional. 16.5% (33 participants) expressed a neutral opinion, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the promptness of the staff's response. A small

group, 3.0% (6 participants), felt that the staff did not respond promptly to their needs at all, representing a negative response. Overall, 80.5% of participants were satisfied with the promptness of the hospital staff in addressing their needs, with only 3.0% expressing dissatisfaction.

### Facilities

**Table 5**

Facilities-1

<b>Were the hospital facilities clean and well-maintained?</b>		
Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	25	12.5
Somewhat clean and Well-maintained	63	31.5
Unclear and Poorly maintained	8	4.0
Yes, it was Clean and Well-maintained	104	52.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Were the hospital facilities clean and well-maintained?" reveal a generally positive perception of the hospital's cleanliness and maintenance. Among the 200 respondents, 52.0% (104 participants) confirmed that the hospital facilities were clean and well-maintained, indicating a high level of satisfaction. Additionally, 31.5% (63 participants) felt that the facilities were somewhat clean and well-maintained, suggesting a satisfactory experience but with some room for improvement. 12.5% (25 participants) expressed a neutral view, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement. A smaller proportion, 4.0% (8 participants), reported that the facilities were unclear and poorly maintained, reflecting a negative perception. Overall, 83.5% of the respondents reported that the facilities were either clean and well-maintained or somewhat so, with only 4.0% expressing dissatisfaction.

**Table 6**

Facilities-2

### **Did you have access to necessary amenities, like comfortable beds and clean bathroom?**

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	41	20.5
Not at all	2	1.0
Somewhat access to necessary amenities, like comfortable beds and clean bathroom	63	31.5
Yes, there was access to necessary amenities, like	94	47.0

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>



comfortable beds and clean bathroom

Total	200	100.0
-------	-----	-------

The responses to the question "Did you have access to necessary amenities, like comfortable beds and clean bathroom?" reflect a generally positive experience regarding the availability of essential facilities. Among the 200 respondents, 47.0% (94 participants) reported having full access to necessary amenities like comfortable beds and clean bathrooms, suggesting a high level of satisfaction with these facilities. Additionally, 31.5% (63 participants) indicated that they had somewhat access to these amenities, indicating a satisfactory experience but with potential for improvement. 20.5% (41 participants) expressed a neutral opinion, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement. A very small proportion, 1.0% (2 participants), stated that they did not have access to these necessary amenities at all, reflecting a negative experience. Overall, 78.5% of the respondents were satisfied with their access to necessary amenities, with only 1.0% expressing complete dissatisfaction.

**Table 7**

Facilities-3

**Were the waiting areas organized and comfortable?**

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	43	21.5
Not at all	4	2.0
Somewhat organized and comfortable	61	30.5
Yes, it was organized and comfortable	92	46.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Were the waiting areas organized and comfortable?" indicate a generally positive view of the hospital's waiting areas. Among the 200 respondents, 46.0% (92 participants) reported that the waiting areas were both organized and comfortable, indicating a high level of satisfaction with the waiting environment. Additionally, 30.5% (61 participants) felt that the waiting areas were somewhat organized and comfortable, suggesting a satisfactory experience with some room for improvement. 21.5% (43 participants) expressed a neutral opinion, neither agreeing nor disagreeing about the comfort and organization of the waiting areas. A small group, (2.0%, i.e. 4 participants), felt that the waiting areas were not organized or comfortable at all, reflecting a negative perception. Overall, 76.5% of respondents were

satisfied with the organization and comfort of the waiting areas, with only 2.0% expressing complete dissatisfaction.

### Accessibility

**Table 8**

Accessibility-1

**Were you able to easily schedule appointments or obtain timely medical care?**

Perception	Frequency	Percent
It was difficult	10	5.0
Neutral	31	15.5
Somewhat easy to schedule appointments or obtain timely medical care	57	28.5
Yes, it was easy to schedule appointments or obtain timely medical care	102	51.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Were you able to easily schedule appointments or obtain timely medical care?" suggest that most participants had a positive experience with scheduling and accessing medical care. Among the 200 respondents, 51.0% (102 participants) reported that it was easy for them to schedule appointments or obtain timely medical care, indicating a high level of satisfaction with the availability and convenience of healthcare services. Additionally, 28.5% (57 participants) found it somewhat easy to schedule appointments or receive timely care, suggesting that, while the experience was generally positive, there could still be minor delays or issues. 15.5% (31 participants) expressed a neutral opinion, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the ease of scheduling and receiving care. A small group, 5.0% (10 participants), found it difficult to schedule appointments or obtain timely medical care, indicating dissatisfaction. Overall, 79.5% of respondents had a positive or neutral experience with scheduling and obtaining care, while only 5.0% found it difficult.

**Table 9**

Accessibility-2

**Did you face any challenges in accessing the hospital or its services?**

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Neutral	30	15.0
Not at all	48	24.0
Somewhat	64	32.0
Yes	58	29.0

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>

Total	200	100.0
-------	-----	-------

The responses to the question "Did you face any challenges in accessing the hospital or its services?" show a mixed perception of accessibility. Among the 200 respondents, 24.0% (48 participants) reported that they did not face any challenges in accessing the hospital or its services, indicating a positive experience in terms of accessibility. Additionally, 32.0% (64 participants) faced some challenges but felt they were not overly significant, suggesting moderate concerns with accessing services. A 15.0% (30 participants) expressed a neutral opinion, neither confirming nor denying challenges. On the other hand, 29.0% (58 participants) stated that they did face challenges in accessing the hospital or its services, highlighting a significant portion of respondents who encountered difficulties. Overall, 56.0% of respondents did not face significant challenges or had neutral views, while 29.0% expressed experiencing challenges, indicating room for improvement in hospital accessibility.

**Table 10**

Accessibility-3

**Was the hospital location convenient for you?**

Perception	Frequency	Percent
Difficult and Inconvenient	2	1.0
Neutral	33	16.5
Somewhat easy and convenient	60	30.0
Yes, it was Easy and Convenient	105	52.5
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Was the hospital location convenient for you?" indicate that the majority of respondents found the hospital's location convenient. Among the 200 respondents, 52.5% (105 participants) reported that the hospital's location was easy and convenient, suggesting a high level of satisfaction with its accessibility. Additionally, 30.0% (60 participants) felt that the location was somewhat easy and convenient, indicating a generally positive perception, though some room for improvement remains. 16.5% (33 participants) expressed a neutral opinion, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the convenience of the location. A very small group, 1.0% (2 participants), found the hospital's location difficult and inconvenient, indicating a negative perception. Overall, 82.5% of respondents felt the hospital's location was either convenient or somewhat convenient, while only 1.0% found it inconvenient.

**Patient satisfaction****Table 11**

Accessibility-1

<b>Your overall experience at the hospital</b>		
Perception	Frequency	Percent
Totally dissatisfied	5	2.5
Dissatisfied	41	20.5
Satisfied	101	50.5
Highly satisfied	53	26.5
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Your overall experience at the hospital" reflect a generally positive perception of the hospital experience. Among the 200 respondents, 50.5% (101 participants) reported being satisfied with their overall experience at the hospital, indicating a good level of satisfaction. Additionally, 26.5% (53 participants) expressed that they were highly satisfied with their experience, showing that a significant portion of patients had a very positive experience. 20.5% (41 participants) stated that they were dissatisfied, indicating some degree of dissatisfaction with the hospital experience. A small group, 2.5% (5 participants), were totally dissatisfied with their experience, reflecting the smallest group of respondents. Overall, 77.0% of respondents were satisfied or highly satisfied with their overall hospital experience, while only 23.0% expressed dissatisfaction.

**Table 12**

Accessibility-2

<b>Do you recommend this hospital</b>		
Perception	Frequency	Percent
No, I would not	10	5.0
May be	80	40.0
Yes, definitely	110	55.0
Total	200	100.0

The responses to the question "Do you recommend this hospital?" show a strong inclination toward recommending the hospital. Among the 200 respondents, 55.0% (110 participants) stated that they would definitely recommend the hospital, indicating high satisfaction and positive sentiment toward the hospital's services. 40.0% (80 participants) answered with "maybe," suggesting that while they were generally satisfied, there may have been reservations or areas for improvement that influenced their willingness to fully

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>

recommend the hospital. Only 5.0% (10 participants) responded that they would not recommend the hospital, indicating a small proportion of dissatisfaction or neutral to negative feelings. Overall, 95.0% of respondents were either positive or neutral about recommending the hospital, highlighting a generally favorable opinion of its services.

### Relationship between independent and dependent variable

**Table 13**

Relationship between Variables

		Correlations			
		Behaviour	FACILITIE S	Accessibility	SATISFACTION
Behaviour	1				
	200				
FACILITIES	.517**	1			
	.000				
	200	200			
Accessibility	.379**	.477**	1		
	.000	.000			
	200	200	200		
SATISFACTIO N	.664**	.682**	.395**	1	
	.000	.000	.000		
	200	200	200	200	

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation results reveal important insights into the relationships between staff behavior, hospital facilities, accessibility, and patient satisfaction. First, there is a strong positive correlation between staff behavior and patient satisfaction ( $r = 0.664$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), indicating that as staff behavior improves, with increased friendliness and attentiveness, patient satisfaction levels also rise. Similarly, a strong positive correlation exists between hospital facilities and patient satisfaction ( $r = 0.682$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), suggesting that when hospital facilities are well-maintained, clean, and equipped with necessary amenities, patients are more likely to report higher satisfaction. Furthermore, accessibility shows a moderate positive correlation with patient satisfaction ( $r = 0.395$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), implying that ease of access to the hospital and its services plays a significant role in influencing patient satisfaction. All of these relationships are statistically

significant at the 0.01 level, highlighting the critical impact of these factors on overall patient contentment.

### Impact of independent variable on dependent variable

**Table 14**

Regression analysis

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square		Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.773 <sup>a</sup>	.597		.591	.37667	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Accessibility, Behaviour, FACILITIES						
ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	41.187	3	13.729	96.766	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	27.808	196	.142		
	Total	68.995	199			
a. Dependent Variable: SATISFACTION						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Accessibility, Behaviour, FACILITIES						
Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.165	.182		.908	.365
	Behaviour	.389	.050	.421	7.825	.000
	FACILITIES	.382	.048	.455	8.032	.000
	Accessibility	.020	.059	.018	.343	.732

a. Dependent Variable: SATISFACTION

The regression analysis provides an overview of the factors impacting patient satisfaction in the hospital setting. The model's R-squared value of 0.597 suggests that approximately 59.7% of the variation in patient satisfaction can be explained by the combined influences of hospital facilities, staff behavior, and accessibility. With an adjusted R-squared of 0.591, the model's goodness of fit remains strong, accounting for the number of predictors used. The standard error of the estimate, at 0.37667, represents the average deviation of observed satisfaction values from the predicted ones.

The ANOVA results demonstrate that the overall regression model is statistically significant, with an F-value of 96.766 and a p-value of 0.000. This indicates that the

independent variables—staff behavior, hospital facilities, and accessibility—collectively play a crucial role in determining patient satisfaction.

In the coefficients table, both staff behavior and hospital facilities emerged as significant predictors of patient satisfaction. Specifically, staff behavior had an unstandardized coefficient of 0.389, indicating that improvements in staff behavior result in a notable increase in satisfaction. With a standardized beta of 0.421, staff behavior was found to have a strong positive influence on satisfaction. Similarly, hospital facilities, with an unstandardized coefficient of 0.382 and a standardized beta of 0.455, had an even stronger impact, making facilities the most influential factor in improving patient satisfaction. Both of these variables demonstrated statistically significant relationships with patient satisfaction, as reflected in their p-values of 0.000.

Conversely, accessibility had a minimal effect on patient satisfaction, with an unstandardized coefficient of 0.020 and a standardized beta of 0.018. The p-value of 0.732 indicates that accessibility was not a statistically significant predictor of satisfaction within this model.

Overall, the analysis underscores the importance of staff behavior and hospital facilities in influencing patient satisfaction, while accessibility showed little effect. The regression model as a whole explains a substantial portion of the variation in patient satisfaction, demonstrating that these hospital factors are critical to improving the patient experience.

### **Conclusion**

This study aimed to assess patients' perceptions of hospital facilities, staff behavior, accessibility, and overall patient satisfaction, examining the relationships among these factors and their impact on overall satisfaction. The findings reveal that patients had a generally positive experience with hospital services. Most patients perceived the hospital staff as friendly, respectful, and responsive, with a majority feeling treated with dignity and compassion. The facilities were mostly rated as clean and well-maintained, and patients had adequate access to necessary amenities. However, there was a small portion who reported dissatisfaction with the staff's behavior, especially regarding respect and responsiveness. In terms of accessibility, the majority of participants found it easy to schedule appointments or access timely medical care, although a few faced challenges in these areas. The hospital's waiting areas were mostly

regarded as organized and comfortable, contributing positively to the overall patient experience.

The regression analysis further supported these findings by revealing that staff behavior was the strongest predictor of patient satisfaction, accounting for a substantial portion of the variability in the overall satisfaction scores. Facility cleanliness and accessibility also emerged as significant predictors, though to a lesser degree than staff behavior.

## References

- Aryal, P., Karki, T. B., Mahat, D., & Neupane, D. (2024). Unravelling the Motivations behind Students' Academic Migrations in Nepal: A Mixed-methods Approach. *NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(1), 1-18. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v1i1.69011>
- Ferreira, D. C., Vieira, I., Pedro, M. I., Caldas, P., & Varela, M. (2023). Patient Satisfaction with Healthcare Services and the Techniques Used for its Assessment: A Systematic Literature Review and a Bibliometric Analysis. *Healthcare (Basel)*, 11(15). doi:10.3390/healthcare11050639
- Green, C. A., Johnson, K. M., & Yarborough, B. J. (2014). Seeking, Delaying and Avoiding Routine Health Care Services: Patient Perspectives. *Am J Health Promot*, 28(5). doi:10.4278/ajhp.120702-QUAL-318
- Karki, T. B., D'Mello, L., Poudel, G., Ghimire, M., Neupane, D., Shrestha, S. K., & Mahat, D. (2024). Exploring the Influence of Family Dynamics on Death Attitude among Elderly People: A Comparative Study of Chitwan and Jhapa District, Nepal. *International Journal of Applied and Scientific Research*, 2(8), 703-716.
- Karki, T. B., Mahat, D., & Kandel, D. R. (2021). Effectiveness of Online Class and Physical Class during Covid-19 Pandemic. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(1), 14-30. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3126/njmr.v4i1.36615>
- Mseke, E., Jessup, B., & Barnett, T. (2024). Impact of distance and/or travel time on healthcare service access in rural and remote areas: A scoping review. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 37. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2024.101819>
- Parajuli, S. K., Mahat, D., & Kandel, D. R. (2023). Strategic Human Resources Management: Study the Alignment of HR Practices with Overall Business Strategy and Its Impact on Organizational Performance. *International Journal for*



- Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 5(5). Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/Personal/Downloads/ssrn-4573180%20(3).pdf
- Rai, N., Khadka, N., Rai, M., Shrestha, P., Lekhak, M., Shrestha, M., & Mahat, D. (2024). Rise of Foreign Employment and Challenges Faced by Nepali Youth in the Domestic Job Market. *International Journal of Applied and Advanced Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(7), 497-508.
- Thapa, S., & Nyaupane, P. (2024). Patients' Satisfaction towards the Treatment and Awareness of Health Facilities in the Hospital. *NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(8), 84-93. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v1i8.73036>
- Tian, Y. (2023). A review on factors related to patient comfort experience in hospitals. *J Health Popul Nutr*, 42(1). doi:10.1186/s41043-023-00465-4
- Tufael, & Sunny, A. R. (2022). Enhancing Patient Outcomes through Innovative Hospital Management Practices. *PRIMEASIA*. doi:10.25163/primeasia.319820
- Yinusa, A., & Faezipour, M. (2023). Optimizing Healthcare Delivery: A Model for Staffing, Patient Assignment, and Resource Allocation. *Appl. Syst. Innov*, 6(5). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3390/asi6050078>
- Zhang, X., & Saltman, R. (2022). Impact of Electronic Health Record Interoperability on Telehealth Service Outcomes. *JMIR Med Inform*, 11(10). doi:10.2196/31837