

https://africanjournalofbiomedicalresearch.com/index.php/AJBR

Afr. J. Biomed. Res. Vol. 27 (September 2024); 1197-1202

Research Article

To evaluate the effect of doctors' communication on patients' overall health recovery outcomes.

Pratiksha Rai Thapa^{1*}, Anurag Kushwaha²

Abstract:

Communication is the essential means of transferring information from one location to another. In the realm of healthcare, effective communication holds utmost importance, particularly when it concerns a person's well-being. Health communication involves the interaction between a patient and a healthcare professional. Patients desire to express their thoughts and feelings regarding their health, encompassing both physical and mental aspects. In this context, a doctor's communication skills play a vital role in comprehending the needs and demands of patients, ultimately contributing to their overall health improvement. This research primarily focuses on examining the impact of a doctor's communication and relationship on a patient's overall recovery. The study encompasses 424 patients in public & private hospitals located in Dehradun. To gather data, a questionnaire-based approach has been employed. This research is classified as an explanatory study and adopts a quantitative methodology. The survey results will assist public hospital managers in comprehending the significance of communication and maintaining relationships with patients. Furthermore, these findings will aid in formulating effective strategies to promote factors that contribute to the overall healthcare recovery of patients.

Keywords: Health communication, doctor -patient relationship, patient recovery

Received: 12/06/2024, Accepted: 20/07/2024

DOI: https://doi.org/10.53555/AJBR.v27i1S.1203

© 2024 *The Author(s)*.

This article has been published under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0), which permits noncommercial unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the following statement is provided. "This article has been published in the African Journal of Biomedical Research"

Review of literature:

Benedetti F (2013) talks about communication in his research that how an effective communication between doctors & patients plays a crucial role in influencing patient outcomes by enabling patients to participate in well-informed decision-making, ultimately enhancing their compliance with treatment. By fostering transparent dialogue on a patient's socioeconomic background and lifestyle choices, physicians can gain a deeper insight into the patient's medical background, prescribed medications and concerns related to specific treatments. Van Zanten (2007) also states that effective communication by doctors enables doctor's to gather necessary information, offer

suitable advice to patients, provide therapeutic guidance, and establish compassionate relationships with patients.

In the research done by Duffy,(2004) it has been found that developing a reliable rapport by physicians enables to offer suitable guidance and suggest treatment alternatives that are most suitable for patients. In addition (Street RL Jr 2007) adds that Patients who inquire, articulate their worries, and communicate their preferences are more inclined to establish a productive rapport with their doctor. Hence (Haidet, 2006) to include communication training in the medical education of physicians to ensure they possess the essential skills required for enhancing the overall patient experience.

Arora, (2003) additionally has also discovered that effective doctor-patient communication possesses the ability to effectively manage a patient's emotions and facilitate the exchange of medical information. This improved communication allows for a better understanding of the patient's needs, perceptions, and expectations. Patients who maintain a strong rapport with their doctors tend to express higher levels of satisfaction with the care and treatment they receive. Wang .J (2008) also discovered that the bond between a doctor and a patient can be classified as a consumer relationship. Furthermore, the competition among patients is influenced by the consumer-doctor dynamic.

Leisen B (2004) found in his research that an interaction between physician and patient is depicted as a dialogue that goes both ways. This involves the exchange of social and economic factors that result in lasting relationships and mutual reliance. In the study conducted by Kleeburg, (2008) It has been discovered that the level of satisfaction a patient feels towards their doctor is a direct indicator of the doctor's proficiency and effectiveness in delivering healthcare services. Further more Di Matteo MR (1998) noted in research that sometimes patients refrained from expressing their need for explanations and details due to the negative attitude of the physician and the dynamics of the doctor-patient communication.

Kaplan SH, (1989) while conducting his study, noted that effective communication between doctors and patients is a crucial aspect of healthcare delivery. This emphasizes the significant role and authority that doctors hold in the medical field. Hippocrates, the ancient Greek physician, suggested that doctors can positively impact their patients' well-being through the means of encouragement, motivation, and support, all of which can be achieved through effective doctor-patient communication.

Gordon GH (1995) The connection between physicians and their patients has been a topic of interest in various fields such as philosophy, sociology, and literature since the time of Hippocrates. It has been extensively studied and discussed in the modern medical literature, with over 8,000 articles, monographs, chapters, and books dedicated to this subject. Developing a strong understanding of the doctor-patient encounter and relationship can greatly assist in making informed decisions regarding healthcare plans.

Lipkin M Jr(1995) talks about doctor-patient relationship and how it is fundamental to healthcare, serving as the platform for collecting data, formulating diagnoses and treatment plans, ensuring adherence, and delivering support for healing, patient engagement, and well-being. In addition Skea Z (2004) mentions that a strong doctor-patient relationship has the potential to enhance job satisfaction and foster patients' drive, confidence, and positive perspective towards their well-being, all of which can influence their overall health results. Lazare A (1995) Mentions that there are three primary functions in doctor-patient relationship include collecting data, establishing and sustaining a therapeutic bond, and conveying information.

Kaplan SH (1989) mentions that the quality and comprehensiveness of information obtained and understood are directly influenced by the relationship. This relationship plays a crucial role in ensuring practitioner and patient satisfaction, which in turn contributes to the maintenance of effective practice and prevents practitioner burnout and turnover. Gerteis M (1993) also talks about the doctor-patient relationship can be influenced by various organizational or system factors. These factors include the accessibility and courtesy of administrative and clinical personnel, which can make patients feel valued and respected. Additionally, reasonable waiting times and attention to personal comfort contribute to this perception. In conclusion to this Wang Y (2022) found that the doctor-patient bond is essential for providing medical treatment and plays a extremely important part in the healthcare system.

Research Methodology:

The research tool of the study, has been drafted with reference to related literature. The published scales questions are used which includes 2 dimensions, i.e. doctor's communication and patient recovery. The 5 point likert scale from Strongly disagree/ disagree/strongly disagree/ disagree/not sure/agree/ strongly agree questionnaire for the data collection. The higher the score is, the better the patient's over all recovery.

The demographic information includes gender, age etc are also collected for reference.

Collected data were analyzed by using statistical tools such as Mean, standard deviation, Regression, Correlation and ANOVA to analyze the impact of Communication on Recovery

| S. No. | Content | Data |
|--------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | Data type | Primary data |
| 2 | Samples | Public hospitals & Private Hospital |
| 3 | Sample Size | 424 |
| 4 | Research Tool used | Questionnaire (5 point Likert scale) |
| 5 | Research Type | Analytical and descriptive research |
| 6 | Method of Data Collection | Survey |
| 7 | Area of Research | Dehradun |
| 8 | Statistical Technique | Mean, Standard deviation, Regression, Correlation. |

Objective:

To evaluate the effect of doctors' communication on patients' overall health recovery outcomes.

Hypothesis:

H0: There is no significant effect of doctors' communication skills on patients' recovery outcomes.

H1: There is a significant effect of doctors' communication skills on patients' recovery outcomes.

To evaluate the effect of doctors' communication on patients' overall health recovery outcomes.

Analysis and Interpretation:

Questionnaire

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| Did the doctor listen to you carefully during the consultation? | 3.95 | .841 | 424 |
| Did the doctor allow you to talk without interrupting you? | 3.85 | .772 | 424 |
| Was it easy to understand what the doctor said? | 3.96 | .680 | 424 |
| Did the doctor examine you thoroughly? | 3.92 | .717 | 424 |
| Did the doctor encourage you to express yourself / talk? | 3.94 | .732 | 424 |
| Do you feel you were given all the necessary information? | 3.83 | .721 | 424 |
| Did the doctor explain the advantages and disadvantages of the treatment or care strategy? | 3.90 | .767 | 424 |
| Did the doctor involve you in the decision-making? | 3.79 | .812 | 424 |
| I started observing relief in my condition after visiting my doctor. | 3.87 | .830 | 424 |
| I feel energetic and active after treatment. | 3.83 | .866 | 424 |
| I could get back to the daily activities very soon. | 3.92 | .800 | 424 |
| I feel fit not just physically but mentally too. | 3.95 | .824 | 424 |
| I see myself engaging more in social activities after treatment. | 3.81 | .849 | 424 |
| I experienced no additional health problems (laziness, drowsiness, hypersomnia /insomnia, vomiting etc) a s a result of my treatment. | 3.97 | .840 | 424 |
| I feel satisfied with my treatment by my doctor. | 3.97 | .806 | 424 |
| I feel that my doctor was very much competent in treating me. | 3.88 | .826 | 424 |
| I feel that I received the best possible care from my doctor. | 3.98 | .775 | 424 |
| I am completely satisfied with the treatment I have received from my doctor. | 3.91 | .803 | 424 |

Demographic data:

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of the demographic variables (gender, age, hospital type, department of hospital) of

research sample (n=424) of patients in private hospital and public hospital Dehradun. The sample size was sufficient to meet the need of the survey.

Table 1

| | | Number of Participants | % |
|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Department of | IPD(On the basis of admission) | 99 | 23.3% |
| Hospital | OPD(Day care/consultation) | 325 | 76.7% |
| Hospital Type | PUBLIC HOSPITAL/GOVERNMENT | 196 | 46.2% |
| | HOSPITAL | | |
| | PRIVATE HOSPITAL | 228 | 53.8% |
| Gender | FEMALE | 181 | 42.7% |
| | MALE | 237 | 55.9% |
| | OTHERS | 6 | 1.4% |
| Age | 21-30 | 179 | 42.2% |
| | 31-40 | 115 | 27.1% |
| | 41-50 | 59 | 13.9% |
| | 51-60 | 71 | 16.7% |

Reliability Scale:

| Variables | Cronbach's Alpha | No. of Items |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| Communication | .947 | 8 |
| Recovery | .959 | 10 |

Cronbach's Alpha of 0.947 indicates a high level of internal consistency reliability among the 8 items that measure the Communication variable. Cronbach's Alpha of 0.959 indicates a very high level of internal consistency reliability among the 10 items that measure the Recovery variable.

Both variables (Communication and Recovery) have Cronbach's Alpha coefficients well above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70, indicating excellent internal consistency reliability.

To evaluate the effect of doctors' communication on patients' overall health recovery outcomes.

Descriptive Statistics:

| Variable | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|--------------------------------------|--------|----------------|-----|
| Recovery (Dependent variable) | 3.7781 | 0.74932 | 424 |
| Communication (Independent variable) | 3.7759 | 0.73396 | 424 |

- ❖ The sample size is 424 for both variables
- ❖ Mean: The average score for RECOVERY is 3.7781, and for COMMUNICATION, it is 3.7759.
- ❖ Standard Deviation: The spread of the scores around the mean is 0.74932 for RECOVERY and 0.73396 for COMMUNICATION.

Correlations:

| | RECOVERY | COMMUNICATION |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------------|
| Recovery (Dependent variable) | 1.000 | 0.764 |
| Communication (Independent variable) | 0.764 | 1.000 |

- ❖ The value of correlation ranges from -1 to +1. Where -1 denotes negative correlation and +1 denotes perfect positive correlation.
- According to above mentioned data there is a strong positive correlation (0.764) between communication and recovery.

ANOVA:

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------|
| Regression | 138.718 | 1 | 138.718 | 592.569 | 0.000 |
| Residual | 98.788 | 422 | 0.234 | | |
| Total | 237.506 | 423 | | | |

- ❖ P value must be less 0.05
- F-value: The F-value of 592.569 indicates that the regression model is statistically significant.
- ❖ Significance : The p-value of 0.000 shows the model's significance.

Coefficients:

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | В | Std. Error | |
| CONSTANT | 0.832 | 0.123 | |
| COMMUNICATION | 0.780 | 0.032 | |

- ❖ The intercept value is 0.832, indicating the expected value of RECOVERY when COMMUNICATION is zero.
- ❖ The coefficient for COMMUNICATION is 0.780, showing that each unit increase in COMMUNICATION results in a 0.780 unit increase in RECOVERY.

Residuals Statistics:

| Statistic | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|----------------------|----------|---------|---------|----------------|-----|
| Predicted Value | 1.6122 | 4.7331 | 3.7781 | 0.57266 | 424 |
| Residual | -1.75288 | 1.82735 | 0.00000 | 0.48326 | 424 |
| Std. Predicted Value | -3.782 | 1.668 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 424 |
| Std. Residual | -3.623 | 3.777 | 0.000 | 0.999 | 424 |

- ❖ The predicted values for RECOVERY range from 1.6122 to 4.7331, with a mean of 3.7781.
- ❖ The residuals (differences between observed and predicted values) range from -1.75288 to 1.82735, with a mean of 0.

Total Variance Explained:

| | Component | Initial E | igenvaluesa | | Extraction | Sums of Squared Loadi | ngs |
|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| Raw | 1 | 8.787 | 64.667 | 64.667 | 8.787 | 64.667 | 64.667 |
| | 2 | 1.217 | 8.953 | 73.620 | 1.217 | 8.953 | 73.620 |
| | 3 | .489 | 3.597 | 77.217 | | 7.7.7 | |
| | 4 | .433 | 3.183 | 80.400 | | | |
| | 5 | .313 | 2.304 | 82.704 | | | |
| | 6 | .292 | 2.152 | 84.857 | | | |
| | 7 | .282 | 2.075 | 86.931 | | | |
| | 8 | .249 | 1.836 | 88.767 | | | |
| | 9 | .216 | 1.591 | 90.358 | | | |
| | 10 | .204 | 1.500 | 91.858 | | | |
| | 11 | .179 | 1.315 | 93.173 | | | |
| | 12 | .171 | 1.257 | 94.430 | | | |
| | 13 | .155 | 1.139 | 95.569 | | | |
| | 14 | .147 | 1.085 | 96.654 | | | |
| - | 15 | .136 | 1.004 | 97.658 | | | |
| | 16 | .122 | .898 | 98.556 | | | |
| | 17 | .115 | .844 | 99.400 | | | |
| | 18 | .082 | .600 | 100.000 | | | |
| Rescaled | 1 | 8.787 | 64.667 | 64.667 | 11.638 | 64.656 | 64.656 |
| | 2 | 1.217 | 8.953 | 73.620 | 1.617 | 8.985 | 73.641 |
| | 3 | .489 | 3.597 | 77.217 | | | |
| | 4 | .433 | 3.183 | 80.400 | | | |
| | 5 | .313 | 2.304 | 82.704 | | | |
| | 6 | .292 | 2.152 | 84.857 | | | |
| | 7 | .282 | 2.075 | 86.931 | | | |
| | 8 | .249 | 1.836 | 88.767 | | | |
| | 9 | .216 | 1.591 | 90.358 | | | |
| | 10 | .204 | 1.500 | 91.858 | | | |
| | 11 | .179 | 1.315 | 93.173 | | | |
| | 12 | .171 | 1.257 | 94.430 | | | |
| | 13 | .155 | 1.139 | 95.569 | | | |
| | 14 | .147 | 1.085 | 96.654 | | | |
| | 15 | .136 | 1.004 | 97.658 | | | |
| | 16 | .122 | .898 | 98.556 | | | |
| | 17 | .115 | .844 | 99.400 | | | |
| | 18 | .082 | .600 | 100.000 | | | |

Result:

| Hypothesis | Regression Weights | Beta Coefficient | R2 | F | p-value | Hypothesis Supported |
|------------|------------------------|------------------|-------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| H1 | Communication-Recovery | 0.780 | 0.584 | 592.569 | 0.000 | Yes |
| | | | | | | |

Note *p<0.05.

- ❖ There is a strong positive correlation between COMMUNICATION and RECOVERY.
- ❖ The regression model explains 58.4% of the variability in RECOVERY, indicating a good fit.
- ❖ The relationship between COMMUNICATION and
- * RECOVERY is statistically significant.
- ❖ Improving COMMUNICATION is likely to result in better RECOVERY outcomes for patients, as indicated by the significant positive coefficient.
- ❖ The coefficient for COMMUNICATION is 0.780, showing that each unit increase in COMMUNICATION results in a 0.780 unit increase in RECOVERY.
- F-value: The F-value of 592.569 indicates that the regression model is statistically significant.

Conclusion:

The purpose of this research was to see the impact of doctor's communication on over all recovery of patient. The result shows co relation between all the variables. The results revealed that doctor's communication has a significant positive effect on recovery of the patient. The correlation analysis reveals a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between communication and recovery. This underscores the importance of effective communication in fostering better recovery outcomes across different settings. Further research could delve

into specific aspects of communication (e.g., clarity, empathy, patient-provider interaction styles) to better understand how they influence recovery processes. The theoretical and practical implications of the research can be applied in a variety of ways to improve existing theories and contribute to solutions in the developing better approach in health care delivery . Healthcare providers and practitioners may consider focusing on enhancing communication strategies to potentially improve patient outcomes and recovery. Communication training and interventions could be implemented to ensure clearer

information dissemination, better patient understanding, and increased adherence to treatment plans

References:

Arora. N. K. (2003). Interacting with cancer patients: the significance of physicians' communication behavior. *Social science & medicine* (1982), 57(5), 791–806.

Benedetti F. Placebo and the new physiology of the doctorpatient relationship. Physiological Reviews. 2013;93(3):1207-1246. doi:10.1152/physrev.00043.2012.

Di Matteo M. R. (1998). The role of the physician in the emerging health care environment. *The Western journal of medicine*, 168(5), 328–333.

Duffy FD, Gordon GH, Whelan G, et al. Assessing competence in communication and interpersonal skills: the Kalamazoo II report. Acad Med. 2004;79(6):495-507. doi:10.1097/00001888-20040600 0-00002

Dye NE, DiMatteo MR. Enhancing cooperation with the medical regimen. In: Lipkin M Jr, Putnam SM, and Lazare A, eds. The Medical Interview: Clinical Care, Education, and Research. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag; 1995;134–44.

Gerteis M, Roberts MJ. Culture, leadership and service in the patient-centered hospital. In: Gerteis M, Edgman-Levitan S, Daley J, Delbanco TL, eds. Through the Patient's Eyes. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass Publishers; 1993.

Gordon GH, Rost K. Evaluating a faculty development course on medical interviewing. In: Lipkin M Jr, Putnam SM, Lazare A, eds. The Medical Interview: Clinical Care, Education, and Research. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag; 1995;248–53.

Haidet P, Stein HF. The role of the student-teacher relationship in the formation of physicians. The hidden curriculum as process. J Gen Intern Med. 2006;21(Suppl 1):S16-S20. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00304.x

Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Ware JE. Assessing the effects of physician-patient interactions on the outcome of chronic disease. Med Care. 1989;27(suppl.):S110–27.

Kaplan, S. H., Greenfield, S., & Ware, J. E., Jr (1989). Assessing the effects of physician-patient interactions on the outcomes of chronic disease. *Medical care*, 27(3 Suppl), S110–S127.

Kleeberg, U. R., Feyer, P., Günther, W., & Behrens, M. (2008). Patient satisfaction in outpatient cancer care: a prospective survey using The PASQOC questionnaire. Supportive care in cancer: official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer, 16(8), 947–954.

Lazare A, Putnam SM, Lipkin M Jr. Three functions of the medical interview. In: Lipkin M Jr, Putnam SM, Lazare A, eds. The Medical Interview: Clinical Care, Education, and Research. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag; 1995;3–19.

Leisen. B, Hyman. MR, (2004). Antecedents and consequences of trust in a service provider: The case of primary care physicians. *Journal of Business Research*, **57**, (9), 990-999

Lipkin M Jr, Putnam SM, Lazare A, eds. The Medical Interview: Clinical Care, Education, and Research. New York, NY: Springer- Verlag; 1995.

RL Jr, Gordon H, Haidet P. Physicians' communication and perceptions of patients: is it how they look, how they talk, or is it just the doctor? Soc Sci Med. 2007;65(3):586-598. doi:10.1016/j.socscime d.2007.03.036

Skea, Z., Harry, V., Bhattacharya, S., Entwistle, V., Williams, B., MacLennan, G., & Templeton, A. (2004). Women's perceptions of decision-making about hysterectomy. *BJOG: an international journal of obstetrics and gynaecology*, *111*(2), 133–142.

Van Zanten, M., Boulet, J. R., McKinley, D. W., DeChamplain, A., &Jobe, A. C. (2007). Assessing the communication and interpersonal skills of graduates of international medical schools as part of the United States Medical Licensing Exam (USMLE) Step 2 Clinical Skills (CS) Exam. Academic medicine: journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, 82(10 Suppl), S65–S68.

Wang Y, Wu Q, Wang Y, Wang P. The Effects of Physicians' Communication and Empathy Ability on Physician-Patient Relationship from Physicians' and Patients' Perspectives. J Clin Psychol Med Settings. 2022;29(4):849-860. doi:10.1007/s10880-022-09844-1

Wang. C. H., Wang. H., Li. N. N., Zhao. Y. W., Yin. H. Y. (2017). Analysis of the influence of patients' satisfaction degree on loyalty in the county public hospitals in Anhui Province. *ACTA Univ. Medi Nanjing (So. c Sci.)*, 2, 134-137.