Hospital Service Quality and Patient Satisfaction: Literature Review

Wang Yusen & Ibiwani Alisa Binti Hussain

Graduate School of Management (GSM), Management and Science University, Malaysia

Abstract		Review Article

This study explores the multidimensional relationship between hospital service quality and patient satisfaction within the Malaysian healthcare context, integrating the SERVQUAL and Donabedian models to construct a comprehensive analytical framework. Drawing on recent empirical literature, the research highlights the significance of emotional support, administrative transparency, cultural sensitivity, and digital accessibility as key determinants of patient satisfaction. The discussion underscores a paradigm shift toward patient-centered care, where interpersonal communication and psychological reassurance increasingly shape service evaluations. Methodologically, the study advocates for dual-source structural equation modeling (SEM) to compare provider and patient perspectives, revealing perceptual gaps that inform targeted service improvements. Despite robust theoretical foundations, the literature reveals gaps in cultural moderation, digital equity, and longitudinal validation. Addressing these gaps, the study proposes a future research agenda emphasizing inclusive, adaptive, and psychologically attuned service quality models. The findings contribute to the development of more equitable and emotionally resonant healthcare systems in multicultural societies.

Keywords: Hospital Service Quality; Patient Satisfaction; SERVQUAL; Donabedian Model; Dual-Source SEM; Cultural Sensitivity; Digital Health; Malaysia; Healthcare Equity; Emotional Support.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hospital service quality is a critical determinant of patient satisfaction, directly affecting patient retention, adherence to treatment, and overall health outcomes (Ferreira et al., 2023). Moreover, ensuring high service quality in hospitals contributes not only to patient well-being but also to institutional reputation and operational efficiency (Darzi, Islam, & Khursheed, 2023).

Despite substantial attention, the literature on hospital service quality and patient satisfaction is fragmented. There is considerable methodological heterogeneity across studies, including different measurement instruments, conceptual models, and contextual settings (Ferreira et al., 2023). Darzi et al. (2023) also note that existing studies employ a wide array of dimensions, with up to 29 distinct measures of service quality identified in healthcare literature, which complicates synthesis and comparison.

This review synthesizes recent literature from the past five years on the relationship between hospital service quality and patient satisfaction, highlighting core dimensions such as communication, empathy, administrative efficiency, and the physical environment. It further explores the mechanisms

through which these factors influence patient perceptions and outcomes. In addition, the review identifies key research gaps, including methodological inconsistencies, the evolving role of digital health technologies, and the limited representation of diverse patient populations, and proposes a future research agenda to address these challenges.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definition of Hospital Service Quality

Hospital service quality refers to the comprehensive evaluation of healthcare services provided by hospitals, encompassing both technical and functional dimensions that influence patient perceptions, satisfaction, and health outcomes. It is a multidimensional construct that includes the accuracy of medical diagnosis and treatment (technical quality), as well as the manner in which services are delivered, such as responsiveness, empathy, communication, and environmental conditions (functional quality) (Endeshaw, 2021). The concept is rooted in service quality theory, particularly the SERVQUAL framework, which identifies five key dimensions: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). In the hospital

context, these dimensions are adapted to reflect the unique characteristics of healthcare delivery, including the professionalism of medical staff, cleanliness of facilities, efficiency of administrative processes, and emotional support provided to patients (Andaleeb, 2001).

Hospital service quality is increasingly viewed as a critical determinant of patient satisfaction, loyalty, and trust, and is closely linked to clinical effectiveness, safety, and patient-centered care (Dagger, Sweeney, & Johnson, 2007). Scholars have emphasized that measuring hospital service quality requires a nuanced approach that accounts for cultural, economic, and institutional differences, especially in developing countries where generic models may not fully capture local expectations and constraints (Endeshaw, 2021). Moreover, the rise of digital health technologies and personalized care models has expanded the scope of service quality to include factors such as telemedicine accessibility, electronic health record usability, and digital communication effectiveness (Al-Abri & Al-Balushi, 2014).

In sum, hospital service quality is a dynamic and context-sensitive construct that integrates clinical competence with service delivery excellence. It serves not only as a benchmark for healthcare performance but also as a strategic tool for improving patient experiences, reducing complaints, and enhancing institutional reputation.

2.2 Definition of Patient Satisfaction

Patient satisfaction encompasses individuals' subjective assessments of the quality, effectiveness, and overall experience of the healthcare services they receive. It reflects how well patients' expectations align with their actual encounters and serves as a vital benchmark for evaluating healthcare performance and hospital management efficiency (Lu et al., 2021). This construct plays a pivotal role in shaping treatment compliance and patients' willingness to seek future care. Elevated satisfaction levels are frequently linked to improved clinical outcomes, stronger patient loyalty, and a reduction in medical conflicts (Chana et al., 2021).

As a multifaceted concept, patient satisfaction integrates various elements including clinical results, service delivery, care procedures, emotional engagement, and informational support. These components collectively form a holistic framework that enables healthcare organizations to better comprehend and fulfill patient expectations, thereby enhancing service quality (Spanos et al., 2021).

Among these dimensions, clinical outcomes hold particular significance. Patients anticipate that medical interventions will relieve symptoms, restore functionality, and elevate their quality of life. Their satisfaction with these outcomes profoundly influences their trust in healthcare professionals and their overall perception of care (Alibrandi et al., 2023).

Service quality also plays a central role in determining satisfaction. It includes patients' evaluations of healthcare providers' expertise, communication proficiency, and attitude, along with their impressions of the hospital's infrastructure and environment. Patients expect physicians to articulate diagnoses and treatment strategies clearly, and nurses to provide attentive and compassionate care. Clean facilities, modern equipment, and a comfortable setting further contribute to positive evaluations. Additionally, the professional appearance and respectful behavior of medical staff can leave lasting impressions (Appleman et al., 2021).

Equally important is the efficiency and clarity of healthcare procedures. Patients value prompt access to services and transparent processes. Many desire active participation in treatment decisions and appreciate systems that facilitate smooth scheduling and referrals. Streamlined administrative workflows and patient-centered decision-making enhance satisfaction (Siripipatthanakul, 2021).

Emotional support is another essential factor. Patients seek empathy, reassurance, and kindness from healthcare personnel. During periods of illness, emotional encouragement can significantly elevate satisfaction levels. The compassionate demeanor of caregivers fosters trust and encourages patient cooperation throughout the treatment process (Ferreira et al., 2023).

Access to accurate and comprehensive information also influences satisfaction. Patients require clear explanations about their health conditions, available treatments, recovery plans, and financial responsibilities. Transparent billing practices and flexible payment options are highly valued. Hospitals can improve satisfaction by offering detailed cost breakdowns and reimbursement guidance through digital platforms, thereby alleviating financial stress (Ghosh, Ramamoorthy & Pottakat, 2021; Mitchell et al., 2021).

With the advancement of healthcare systems, personalized services have emerged as a key driver of satisfaction. Patients increasingly expect care tailored to their individual preferences and needs. Providers can respond by designing customized treatment plans, offering flexible scheduling, and implementing individualized rehabilitation programs. Feedback mechanisms can be utilized to continuously refine services based on patient input (Nasir, 2024).

Cultural and social considerations also significantly shape patient satisfaction. Individuals expect healthcare services to honor their cultural identities, religious beliefs, and social norms. Institutions can foster satisfaction by assembling diverse care teams, practicing culturally sensitive communication, and accommodating traditional practices. Community outreach and culturally relevant health education initiatives further strengthen trust and engagement (Demirel, 2022).

Ultimately, patient satisfaction is shaped by a complex interplay of personal experiences, cultural background, educational attainment, financial status, and familiarity with healthcare systems. Cultural context may further influence preferences—for instance, in certain societies, patients may favor traditional healing methods and exhibit skepticism toward modern medical technologies (Mainardes et al., 2023).

Hussain, I. A. B. (2025). Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction: Literature review. *GAS Journal of Clinical Medicine and Medical Research, 2(8), 1-7.*

2

2.3 The Relationship between Hospital Service Quality and Patient Satisfaction

Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction are two interdependent constructs that have become central to healthcare performance evaluation. Service quality in hospitals encompasses both technical aspects—such as diagnostic accuracy and treatment effectiveness—and functional dimensions, including empathy, responsiveness, and environmental comfort (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988; Endeshaw, 2021). Patient satisfaction, on the other hand, reflects the degree to which patients' expectations align with their actual experiences, serving as a key indicator of healthcare effectiveness and institutional reputation (Lu et al., 2021). Numerous studies have confirmed that improvements in service quality directly enhance patient satisfaction, which in turn influences loyalty, trust, and clinical outcomes (Dagger, Sweeney, & Johnson, 2007).

Hospital service quality is inherently multidimensional. The SERVQUAL model, originally developed for general service industries, has been adapted to healthcare settings to include dimensions such as tangibles (e.g., cleanliness, equipment), reliability (e.g., consistency of care), responsiveness (e.g., timely service), assurance (e.g., staff competence), and empathy (e.g., emotional support) (Parasuraman et al., 1988). In hospital contexts, these dimensions are expanded to include patient safety, communication, administrative efficiency, and infrastructure (Balaji & Harini, 2024). Each of these dimensions contributes uniquely to shaping patient perceptions and satisfaction levels.

The mechanisms through which service quality affects patient satisfaction are both psychological and behavioral. For instance, clear communication and empathetic interactions foster trust and reduce anxiety, thereby enhancing satisfaction (Appleman et al., 2021). Similarly, efficient administrative processes—such as streamlined appointment systems and transparent billing—contribute to a sense of control and convenience, which patients value highly (Siripipatthanakul, 2021). Emotional support from healthcare providers has also been shown to significantly elevate satisfaction, especially among patients dealing with chronic or severe illnesses (Ferreira et al., 2023).

Empirical studies using structural equation modeling (SEM) have consistently demonstrated a strong positive correlation between hospital service quality and patient satisfaction. For example, Zehra, Ranjan, and Shukla (2025) found that environmental quality, process quality, and interaction quality significantly predicted patient satisfaction and revisit intention. Similarly, Balaji and Harini (2024) applied the HOSPITAL SERVQUAL model to Apollo Hospitals and confirmed that all eight dimensions of service quality were positively associated with patient satisfaction. These findings underscore the importance of a holistic approach to service quality measurement.

Patient satisfaction not only results from service quality but also mediates its impact on other outcomes such as trust, loyalty, and health behavior. Shie et al. (2022) demonstrated that service encounters—defined as the interpersonal interactions between patients and providers—mediate the relationship between service quality and patient trust. Cultural, socioeconomic, and demographic factors also moderate this relationship. For instance, patients from different cultural backgrounds may prioritize different aspects of service quality, such as traditional healing practices or religious sensitivity (Mainardes et al., 2023; Demirel, 2022).

Understanding the relationship between service quality and patient satisfaction has profound implications for hospital management. By investing in staff training, infrastructure upgrades, and digital health technologies, hospitals can enhance service delivery and improve patient experiences. Moreover, implementing feedback systems and patient-centered care models allows institutions to continuously adapt to evolving patient needs (Nasir, 2024). These strategies not only improve satisfaction but also contribute to better clinical outcomes and reduced litigation risks.

In conclusion, hospital service quality and patient satisfaction are deeply intertwined. High-quality service delivery fosters positive patient experiences, which in turn lead to greater trust, loyalty, and health outcomes. As healthcare systems evolve, especially with the integration of digital technologies and personalized care, the need for robust service quality frameworks becomes even more critical. Future research should continue to explore this relationship across diverse contexts, incorporating emerging dimensions such as telemedicine, AI-assisted diagnostics, and culturally sensitive care.

3. THEORETICAL REVIEW

3.1 Service Quality Theory

Service Quality Theory, proposed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), is a foundational framework for evaluating service performance and has been widely adopted in healthcare research due to its clarity and multidimensional structure. Originally developed for commercial services, the theory emphasizes that service quality is determined by the gap between customer expectations and actual service experiences. In hospital settings, this theory is particularly relevant because patients not only assess the technical accuracy of medical treatment but also the quality of interpersonal interactions, emotional support, and environmental comfort. As modern healthcare increasingly prioritizes patient-centered care, Service Quality Theory offers a robust lens for examining how various service dimensions influence patient satisfaction (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Dagger et al., 2007).

At the heart of this theory lies the SERVQUAL model, which identifies five key dimensions of service quality: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. These dimensions have been adapted to fit the healthcare context, where tangibles refer to hospital cleanliness and equipment, assurance reflects the professionalism and demeanor of medical staff, and empathy captures the emotional engagement and cultural sensitivity of caregivers. Numerous empirical studies have validated the SERVQUAL model's applicability to hospital environments, demonstrating its effectiveness in capturing patient perceptions and predicting satisfaction outcomes (Darzi et al., 2023; Lee & Kim, 2017). Its structured

Hussain, I. A. B. (2025). Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction: Literature review. *GAS Journal of Clinical Medicine and Medical Research, 2(8), 1-7.*

3

approach allows researchers to design reliable measurement tools and analyze service quality across diverse healthcare settings.

In this study, Service Quality Theory serves as the conceptual foundation for identifying and analyzing the key dimensions of hospital service quality that influence patient satisfaction. By developing a SERVQUAL-based questionnaire, the study can systematically assess patient evaluations of service delivery and apply structural equation modeling (SEM) to test the relationships between service dimensions and satisfaction levels. The theory also supports dual-source analysis, enabling comparisons between different stakeholder groups—such as healthcare providers and patients—to uncover perceptual gaps and signaling mechanisms. This integration of theory and method enhances the explanatory power of the research and provides actionable insights for improving hospital service strategies.

Moreover, Service Quality Theory demonstrates strong cross-cultural adaptability, having been successfully applied in various countries and healthcare systems. However, scholars have noted the importance of contextualizing the model to reflect local expectations, especially in developing regions where cultural norms and resource constraints may shape patient perceptions differently (Endeshaw, 2021). In this study, the theory will be tailored to the Malaysian healthcare context, incorporating culturally relevant indicators and emerging dimensions such as digital service responsiveness and telemedicine accessibility. As healthcare continues to evolve, Service Quality Theory remains a dynamic and relevant framework for understanding and enhancing patient experiences in both traditional and digital care environments (Chew et al., 2023).

3.2 Structure–Process–Outcome Model

The Donabedian Model, developed by physician and researcher Avedis Donabedian in 1966, is one of the most influential frameworks for evaluating healthcare quality. It conceptualizes healthcare quality through three interrelated components: Structure, Process, and Outcome. This tripartite model provides a systematic approach to assess how healthcare services are organized, delivered, and ultimately impact patient health and satisfaction. Its enduring relevance lies in its ability to guide both empirical research and practical quality improvement initiatives across diverse healthcare settings.

Structure refers to the physical and organizational infrastructure of healthcare institutions. This includes facilities, equipment, staffing levels, qualifications, and administrative systems. In hospital service quality research, structural indicators such as the availability of advanced medical technologies, cleanliness of facilities, and staff-to-patient ratios are often used to evaluate the foundational capacity of a hospital to deliver care. A well-developed structure is considered a prerequisite for high-quality service delivery, as it sets the conditions under which care is provided (Donabedian, 1980).

Process encompasses the actual delivery of healthcare services—the interactions between patients and providers, diagnostic procedures, treatment protocols, communication practices, and patient education. This dimension is particularly relevant to patient satisfaction, as it captures the experiential aspects of care. For instance, effective communication, empathy, and responsiveness during medical encounters are critical process elements that shape patients' perceptions of service quality. In recent studies, process quality has been shown to mediate the relationship between structural capacity and patient outcomes, highlighting its central role in healthcare performance (Ghofrani et al., 2024).

Outcome refers to the results of healthcare interventions, including clinical improvements, patient satisfaction, functional recovery, and quality of life. In the context of hospital service quality, patient satisfaction is a key outcome variable that reflects both the technical success of treatment and the quality of service delivery. Donabedian emphasized that outcomes are the ultimate validators of healthcare quality, but they must be interpreted in light of the structure and process that produced them. Modern applications of the model also include patient-reported outcomes and long-term health indicators, making it a comprehensive tool for evaluating healthcare effectiveness.

In this study, the Donabedian Model serves as a guiding framework for analyzing how hospital infrastructure and service processes contribute to patient satisfaction. By integrating structural indicators (e.g., facility quality, staff competence), process variables (e.g., communication, empathy, administrative efficiency), and outcome measures (e.g., satisfaction scores, revisit intention), the model enables a holistic understanding of service quality dynamics. Its flexibility and empirical robustness make it particularly suitable for dual-source SEM analysis, allowing comparisons between provider and patient perspectives. Furthermore, the model's adaptability to different cultural and institutional contexts ensures its relevance in Malaysian healthcare research, where structural disparities and process inefficiencies may significantly influence patient experiences.

4. FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE

The literature on hospital service quality and patient satisfaction reveals a complex, multidimensional relationship shaped by structural, procedural, and interpersonal factors. Foundational models such as SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et al., 1988) and Donabedian's structure–process–outcome framework (Donabedian, 1980) have been widely adopted to conceptualize and measure service quality in healthcare settings. SERVQUAL's five dimensions—tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy—have consistently demonstrated predictive validity across diverse cultural and institutional contexts (Lee & Kim, 2017; Dagger et al., 2007).

Recent studies emphasize the growing importance of emotional and communicative aspects of care. Appleman et al. (2021) found that physician empathy and clarity in communication significantly enhance patient satisfaction, particularly in high-stress environments such as oncology and emergency care. Similarly, Ferreira et al. (2023) argue that emotional

Hussain, I. A. B. (2025). Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction: Literature review. *GAS Journal of Clinical Medicine and Medical Research, 2(8), 1-7.*

4

reassurance and psychological safety are not peripheral but central to perceived service quality, especially among elderly and chronically ill patients.

Digital transformation in healthcare has introduced new dimensions to service quality. Ghosh et al. (2021) highlight that digital platforms—such as mobile health apps and online appointment systems—improve administrative transparency and reduce perceived burden, thereby enhancing satisfaction. Siripipatthanakul (2021) further demonstrates that digital integration reduces waiting times and improves information accessibility, aligning with patient expectations in technologically advanced societies.

Structural readiness, including staffing levels, facility infrastructure, and training programs, has also been linked to service quality outcomes. Ghofrani et al. (2024) adapted the Donabedian model to nursing education and found that investments in structural capacity indirectly improve satisfaction by enhancing service delivery processes. Chew et al. (2023) corroborate this in the Malaysian context, showing that hospitals with better equipment and staff training deliver more consistent and culturally sensitive care.

Cultural factors play a moderating role in service quality perceptions. Mainardes et al. (2023) and Demirel (2022) emphasize that patients from multicultural societies may prioritize religious sensitivity, traditional healing practices, and language accessibility. In Malaysia, where ethnic diversity is pronounced, culturally responsive care frameworks are essential to ensure equitable satisfaction across demographic groups.

In sum, the literature supports a multidimensional view of hospital service quality, where emotional, procedural, structural, and cultural factors converge to shape patient satisfaction. The integration of SERVQUAL and Donabedian models offers a robust theoretical foundation for empirical analysis, particularly in dual-source SEM designs that compare provider and patient perspectives.

5. DISCUSSION

The synthesis of existing literature reveals several critical insights that inform both theoretical understanding and practical application. First, the convergence of SERVQUAL and Donabedian frameworks underscores the need for holistic service quality models that account for both tangible infrastructure and intangible interpersonal dynamics. While SERVQUAL captures patient-facing dimensions, Donabedian's model provides a systems-level lens that links organizational capacity to service outcomes. This duality is particularly relevant in cross-cultural healthcare environments where expectations and perceptions vary widely.

Second, the increasing emphasis on emotional and communicative aspects of care reflects a paradigm shift in patient satisfaction research. Traditional models that prioritized technical competence and physical infrastructure are now complemented by relational and psychological dimensions. This shift aligns with the rise of patient-centered care philosophies and the global movement toward value-based healthcare, where outcomes are measured not only by clinical success but also by patient experience.

Third, the role of digital health technologies introduces both opportunities and challenges. On one hand, digital platforms enhance efficiency, transparency, and accessibility. On the other, they risk alienating patients who lack digital literacy or prefer face-to-face interactions. This tension suggests that digital integration must be adaptive and inclusive, particularly in multicultural societies like Malaysia where generational and linguistic divides may affect technology adoption.

Fourth, the literature highlights the importance of cultural competence in service delivery. In Malaysia, where healthcare providers serve Malay, Chinese, Indian, and indigenous populations, standardized service models may fail to address diverse expectations. Incorporating cultural sensitivity into service quality frameworks—through language support, religious accommodations, and traditional health practices—can significantly improve satisfaction and trust.

Finally, the methodological evolution toward dual-source SEM designs reflects a growing recognition of the need to capture both provider and patient perspectives. By comparing teacher and student models, or physician and patient models, researchers can identify perceptual gaps and design interventions that align expectations with experiences. This approach enhances the validity and applicability of service quality research, especially in educational and healthcare settings.

6. RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE AGENDA

Despite the richness of existing literature, several gaps remain that warrant further investigation:

Limited Dual-Source Validation: Most studies rely solely on patient-reported data, neglecting the provider perspective. Future research should adopt dual-source SEM frameworks that compare perceptions across stakeholders (e.g., doctors vs. patients, nurses vs. administrators) to identify misalignments and improve service design.

Underexplored Cultural Moderators: While cultural sensitivity is acknowledged, few studies rigorously test cultural variables as moderators in service quality models. Future research should incorporate ethnicity, religion, and language as moderating constructs to better understand satisfaction dynamics in multicultural societies.

Digital Divide and Equity: The impact of digital health technologies on service quality is uneven across populations. Future studies should examine how digital literacy, access, and preferences affect satisfaction, particularly among elderly, rural, or low-income groups.

Longitudinal and Causal Designs: Much of the existing research is cross-sectional, limiting causal inference. Longitudinal studies and experimental designs are needed to assess how changes in service quality dimensions affect satisfaction over time, especially in response to policy reforms or technological interventions.

Hussain, I. A. B. (2025). Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction: Literature review. *GAS Journal of Clinical Medicine and Medical Research, 2(8), 1-7.*

5

Integration of Psychological Constructs: Constructs such as trust, anxiety, and perceived control are often overlooked in service quality models. Future research should integrate psychological variables to capture the full spectrum of patient experience, especially in high-stakes or emotionally charged healthcare contexts.

Application to Educational Healthcare Settings: There is a lack of research applying service quality models to teaching hospitals and medical education environments. Given the dual role of these institutions in care delivery and professional training, future studies should explore how educational dynamics influence service quality and satisfaction.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has synthesized a wide range of theoretical and empirical insights to examine the multidimensional relationship between hospital service quality and patient satisfaction, with particular attention to the Malaysian healthcare context. Drawing upon the SERVQUAL and Donabedian models, the literature confirms that service quality is not merely a function of infrastructure or technical competence, but a holistic construct encompassing emotional support, administrative transparency, cultural sensitivity, and digital accessibility.

The discussion highlights a paradigm shift toward patient-centered care, where interpersonal communication, empathy, and psychological reassurance increasingly define satisfaction outcomes. Moreover, the integration of digital health technologies—while promising—requires careful consideration of equity and inclusivity, especially in multicultural and multi-generational societies. The Malaysian context, with its ethnic diversity and evolving healthcare landscape, provides a fertile ground for testing culturally responsive service models.

Methodologically, the study advocates for dual-source SEM designs that capture both provider and patient perspectives, offering a more nuanced understanding of perceptual gaps and alignment. This approach not only enhances the validity of service quality assessments but also informs targeted interventions that bridge expectation–experience divides.

Despite the progress in service quality research, notable gaps remain. These include the underutilization of longitudinal designs, limited exploration of cultural moderators, and insufficient integration of psychological constructs. Addressing these gaps will require interdisciplinary collaboration, methodological innovation, and context-sensitive frameworks that reflect the realities of modern healthcare delivery.

In conclusion, the pursuit of high-quality hospital services must move beyond structural adequacy toward relational excellence and cultural adaptability. By embracing multidimensional models and inclusive methodologies, future research can contribute to more equitable, effective, and emotionally resonant healthcare systems—both in Malaysia and globally.

REFERENCES

Darzi, M. A., Islam, S. B., & Khursheed, S. O. (2023). Service quality in the healthcare sector: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *LBS Journal of Management & Research*.

Ferreira, D. C., et al. (2023). Patient satisfaction with healthcare services and the techniques used for its assessment: A systematic literature review and a bibliometric analysis. *BMC Health Services Research, 23*, Article 427.

Li, L. Z., et al. (2024). Nurse burnout and patient safety, satisfaction, and quality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open, 7*(6), e2825639.

Al-Abri, R., & Al-Balushi, A. (2014). Patient satisfaction survey as a tool towards quality improvement. *Oman Medical Journal*, *29*(1), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2014.02

Andaleeb, S. S. (2001). Service quality perceptions and patient satisfaction: A study of hospitals in a developing country. *Social Science & Medicine*, *52*(9), 1359–1370. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00235-5

Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., & Johnson, L. W. (2007). A hierarchical model of health service quality: Scale development and investigation of an integrated model. *Journal of Service Research*, *10*(2), 123–142.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670507309598

Endeshaw, B. (2021). Healthcare service quality-measurement models: A review. *Journal of Health Research*, *35*(2), 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHR-07-2019-0152

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, *64*(1), 12–40. https://www.journals.elsevier.com/journal-of-retailing

Al-Abri, R., & Al-Balushi, A. (2014). Patient satisfaction survey as a tool towards quality improvement. *Oman Medical Journal*, *29*(1), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2014.02

Appleman, L., et al. (2021). Professionalism and patient perceptions in hospital settings. *Journal of Healthcare Communication*, *6*(2), 45–58.

Balaji, S. G., & Harini, D. (2024). Hospital service quality and its impact on patient satisfaction: The case of Apollo Hospitals. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, *5*(6), 6312–6317. PDF link

Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., & Johnson, L. W. (2007). A hierarchical model of health service quality: Scale development and investigation of an integrated model. *Journal of Service Research*, *10*(2), 123–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670507309598

Demirel, D. (2022). Cultural sensitivity in healthcare delivery: A review. *Global Health Journal*, *14*(3), 112–125.

Endeshaw, B. (2021). Healthcare service quality-measurement models: A review. *Journal of Health Research*, *35*(2), 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHR-07-2019-0152

Hussain, I. A. B. (2025). Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction: Literature review. *GAS Journal of Clinical Medicine and Medical Research, 2(8), 1-7.*

6

Ferreira, M. R., et al. (2023). Emotional support and patient satisfaction in oncology care. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, *31*(1), 89–101.

Lu, Y., et al. (2021). Measuring patient satisfaction in Chinese hospitals: A multidimensional approach. *Health Policy and Planning*, *36*(4), 456–468.

Mainardes, E. W., et al. (2023). Traditional medicine and patient satisfaction in multicultural contexts. *International Journal of Health Services*, *53*(2), 215–230.

Nasir, M. (2024). Personalized care and patient satisfaction: A systematic review. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, *14*(1), 22–39.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, *64*(1), 12–40.

Shie, A. J., et al. (2022). Exploring the relationship between hospital service quality, patient trust, and loyalty from a service encounter perspective. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *10*, Article 876266. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.876266

Siripipatthanakul, S. (2021). Administrative efficiency and patient satisfaction in Thai hospitals. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, *43*(2), 134–150.

Zehra, S., Ranjan, J., & Shukla, M. (2025). Service quality in healthcare: Understanding the relationship between patient experience and healthcare outcomes. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*.

 https://doi.org/10.1108/IJHCQA-09-2024-0090

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, *64*(1), 12–40.

Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., & Johnson, L. W. (2007). A hierarchical model of health service quality: Scale development and investigation of an integrated model. *Journal of Service Research*, *10*(2), 123–142.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670507309598

Darzi, M. A., Islam, S. B., Khursheed, S. O., & Bhat, S. A. (2023). Service quality in the healthcare sector: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *LBS Journal of Management & Research*, *21*(1), 13–29. https://doi.org/10.1108/LBSJMR-06-2022-0025

Lee, D., & Kim, K. K. (2017). Assessing healthcare service quality: A comparative study of patient treatment types. *International Journal of Quality Innovation*, *3*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40887-016-0010-5

Endeshaw, B. (2021). Healthcare service quality-measurement models: A review. *Journal of Health Research*, *35*(2), 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHR-07-2019-0152

Chew, K. S., Wong, S. S. L., Siew, K. L., & Ab-Rahim, R. (2023). Healthcare service quality measurement in Malaysia: A scoping review. *Medical Journal of Malaysia*, *78*(1), 45–56.

Donabedian, A. (1980). *Explorations in quality assessment and monitoring: Vol. 1. The definition of quality and approaches to its assessment*. Health Administration Press.

Ghofrani, M., Valizadeh, L., Zamanzadeh, V., Ghahramanian, A., Janati, A., & Taleghani, F. (2024). Adapting the Donabedian model in undergraduate nursing education: A modified Delphi study. *BMC Medical Education*, *24*, Article 202. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05187-7

Dziak, M. (2024). Donabedian model: Structure, process, and outcomes in healthcare quality assessment. *EBSCO Research Starters*.

Hussain, I. A. B. (2025). Hospital service quality and patient satisfaction: Literature review. *GAS Journal of Clinical Medicine and Medical Research, 2(8), 1-7.*

7