medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Perceived Quality of Care in Health Centers Affiliated with a Community-Based Health Insurance Scheme in Two Districts of Northeastern Ethiopia: A Multilevel Analysis

Mohammed Hussien iD[1*], Muluken Azage iD[2] and Negalign Berhanu Bayou iD[3]

[1]Department of Health Systems Management and Health Economics, School of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

[2]Department of Environmental Health, School of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

[3]Department of Health Policy and Management, Faculty of Public Health, Institute of Health, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia.

[*]Correspondence: muhamedun@gmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The purpose of this study was to examine how clients perceived the quality of health care, and to identify related individual and facility-level factors.

Design: Community-based, cross-sectional

Setting: Health centers affiliated with community-based health insurance scheme

Participants: 1081 rural households that had ever been enrolled in community-based health insurance and had visited a health center at least once in the previous 12 months, as well as 194 health care providers working in 12 health centers.

Outcome measures: The outcome variable of interest was the overall perceived quality of score, which was measured using a 17-item scale. Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed on 5-point response items relating to their experiences with health care in the outpatient departments of nearby health centers. A multilevel linear regression analysis was used to identify predictors of quality of care.

Results: The mean perceived quality of care score was 62.85 (SD=10.49). Five quality of care dimensions were extracted from the factor analysis, with patient-provider communication dimension having the highest mean score (M=72.29, SD=12.66) and information provision having the lowest (M=55.83, SD=17.34). Wealth status, current insurance status, perceived health status, presence of chronic illness, time since the most recent visit to a health center, patient volume and health care providers' work experience were significantly associated with the perceived quality of care. An interaction term between patient volume and staff job satisfaction also showed significant association.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusions: Much work remains to be done to improve the quality of care, in particular, on information provision and access to care quality dimensions. People's perceptions of the quality of care differed depending on a variety of individual and health center-level factors. For better quality of care, it is vital to determine an appropriate patient volume per care provider, and improve staff job satisfaction.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- The study tried to assess the quality of care from the clients' point of view using a validated multidimensional scale.
- This is the first cross-sectional study in Ethiopia which considered health center (cluster) level variables that have association with the perceived quality of care.
- We tested for endogeneity between current insurance status and quality of care, but there is still the possibility of endogeneity due to omitted variables, as a result of which active members may report higher care quality due to their desire to remain in the scheme.
- Because of the cross-sectional nature of the study, it is impossible to establish a cause-and-effect relationship.

INTRODUCTION

Health care providers and patients define the quality of care differently and attach varying levels of importance to its attributes. Health care practitioners tend to prioritize technical performance when assessing the quality of care, whereas patients underline the importance of patient-centeredness, amenities, and reputation.[1] The emphasis on health care quality measurement has shifted away from the viewpoints of health care providers to people-centered approaches that rely on patient perceptions.[2-4] Patients' perception of health care quality has become an essential element of quality measurement due to its link with health service utilization. It is based on a mix

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of patient experiences, processed information and rumors.[5] Patient experience surveys elicit information on the transactional aspects of care, which are process-related, and relational aspects of care, which are the interpersonal interactions that occur during the care.[6] Individuals receiving the care are asked about their experiences of a health facility encounter to report whether or not certain processes or events occurred.[7] Patient experience measurements have received increased attention and are widely employed to inform quality improvement, and pay-for-performance.[8] Patient experience is consistently and positively associated with patient safety and clinical effectiveness, the technical quality of care delivery,[9] adherence to prevention and treatment recommendations, and less resource utilization.[9 10]

Quality of health care is vital to the success of universal health coverage (UHC) initiatives, like community-based health insurance (CBHI). The development of CBHI schemes must be accompanied by improvements in the quality of care.[11 12] To build sustainable CBHI schemes, members must believe that the benefits of health care provided via health insurance coverage outweigh the benefits of not being insured.[13] Patients' positive experiences with the quality of care provided under insurance schemes increase their trust in the health system and insurance schemes.[14 15] This in turn enhances the utilization of health care and their decisions to participate in health insurance schemes.[16] If health care facilities fail to deliver high-quality services, clients lose faith in service providers and seek care elsewhere,[17] making insurance members less inclined to pay premiums.[18 19]

The ultimate goal of UHC is to ensure that all people who need health services receive high-quality care without financial strain.[20] Although increased health care coverage is promising with the implementation of CBHI, quality of care remains to be a key barrier to attaining UHC.[20 21] Increasing access to essential health services without improving their quality would not bring the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

intended health outcomes.[2 4] For example, more than eight million deaths amenable to a high quality of care occurred in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), making poor-quality of care a bigger obstacle to mortality reduction than lack of access to care.[21]

Poor quality of care is also a major issue that jeopardizes the long-term viability of many CBHI schemes.[11 22] Findings of systematic reviews revealed that the quality of care was a key factor that influences enrollment and renewal decisions of CBHI membership.[23 24] Some of the quality concerns include 'unavailability and perceived poor quality of prescribed medicines, misbehavior of health professionals and the differential treatment of the insured in favor of the uninsured patients, unclean hospital environment, long queues, lack of diagnostic equipment, and long waiting hours to obtain health care'.[24]

The quality of health care funded by UHC needs to be measured continuously to promote appropriate utilization, stable financing, and better outcomes.[17] Previous studies in Ethiopia focused on surveys of client satisfaction and did not employ multidimensional measurement scales.[25 26] To the best of our knowledge, the quality of care under CBHI in Ethiopia has never been examined from the perspective of service users using multidimensional measurement scales and household surveys. There is also a paucity of literature on facility-level variables that influence the quality of care. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the perceived quality of care (PQOC) from the clients' perspective, and identify individual and facility-level factors.

Improving quality of care and CBHI are among Ethiopia's top priorities in its health sector strategic plan.[27] The findings of this study will inform relevant stakeholders on the current state of clients' perceptions of the quality of care and will be an essential input for quality improvement initiatives. It will also provide useful information for decision-makers to address

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

challenges in the country's endeavor to establish higher-level insurance pools. Furthermore, it will add value to the existing literature, in particular, on factors that influence the quality of care.

METHODS

Study setting

The study was conducted in the rural parts of two neighboring districts in Northeastern Ethiopia, Tehulederie and Kalu. Tehulederie is divided into 20 rural and 7 urban *kebeles* (subdistricts) with an estimated total population of 145,625 of which 87.5% are residing in rural area. In the district, there are five health centers and one primary hospital. Tehulederie was one of the 13 districts in Ethiopia, where CBHI was piloted in 2011. The scheme was introduced in Kalu district after two years, in July 2013 (28). Kalu is divided into 36 rural and 4 urban *kebeles,* and has nine health centers. It is the most populous district in the zone, which has an estimated total population of 234,624, of which 89.11% are living in the rural part.[28]

Study design and population

A community-based cross-sectional study with a quantitative method of data collection was conducted among rural households who have ever been enrolled in CBHI scheme before January 2020. Households that reported no use of health care in the previous 12 months before data collection were excluded from the study to minimize recall bias. Furthermore, 194 health care providers from 12 health centers participated in the study to provide cluster level data.

Study variables and measurement

The outcome variable of interest for this study was the overall PQOC score. It was measured using a 17-item scale designed after a thorough review of the contents of previous instruments developed and validated in China,[29 30] Burkina Faso[31 32] and Ethiopia.[33] Respondents were asked

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to rate the extent to which they agreed on a set of items relating to their experiences with the health care they received in the outpatient departments of the nearby health centers. Each item was designed on a 5-point response format with 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree. To allow for comparisons of summary scores of overall PQOC, quality dimensions, and measurement items on a common scale, the 5-point response was converted to scores of 0, 25, 50, 75 and 100 respectively.[34] When reporting the results, mean scores were arithmetically transformed to a scale of 0 to 100.

The predictor variables included age, gender, education and marital status of the household head; wealth status; household size; current health insurance status; presence of chronic illness in the household; perceived health status, and time since the most recent visit to a health center. Health care providers' work experience, affective commitment, job satisfaction and patient volume were cluster-level variables.

Wealth index was generated using the principal component analysis method. The scores for 15 types of assets and utilities were translated into latent factors, and a wealth index was calculated based on the first factor that explained most of the variation. According to the wealth index, the study households were categorized into wealth tertile – lower, medium and higher wealth tertile. Perceived health status was measured based on a household head's subjective assessment of the health status of the household and was rated as "excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor". However, for analysis purposes, it was recategorized into "fair, good, and very-good", by merging the two extreme response categories with few frequencies to the next categories.

Affective commitment and job satisfaction are composite variables that were assessed using a 5-point Likert scale. Affective commitment was measured with a seven-item questionnaire based on a modified version of the Meyer et al. scale, which had previously been used in a hospital

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

setting.[35] Staff job satisfaction was measured using a 10-item scale which was adapted from a previous study among health care workers in Ethiopia.[36] Average affective commitment and job satisfaction scores were computed for each health center.

Patient volume was measured using the daily average number of patients managed by a health care provider in the outpatient department. It was calculated by dividing the total number of patients who visited the health center in the last six months before the study by the number of working days and then by the number of consultation rooms in each health center. An interaction term was created between patient volume and job satisfaction, in which job satisfaction was assumed to moderate the effect between patient volume and PQOC. The interaction effect was tested by plotting the marginal effects of interaction terms. The two variables were centered to the grand mean to facilitate the interpretation of coefficients.

Sample size and sampling procedure

The sample size was calculated using MedCalc sample size calculator software version 20. Sample size was calculated using a mean difference between two independent groups. The means and standard deviations (SD) of the outcome for the two comparison groups of insured and uninsured households were taken from a previous similar study conducted in Burkina Faso.[32] Mean scores of 5.2 and 5.4 with SD of 0.8 and 0.7 were reported on patient experience among insured and uninsured respondents, respectively, on a six-point response format Likert scale. Using a mean difference of 0.20, 80% power, 95% confidence level and equally sized groups, a total sample size of 446 was calculated. Considering a design effect of 1.5 attributable to the use of multi-stage sampling and a potential non-response rate of 10%, the effective sample size was estimated to be 736 households. Alternative sample sizes were calculated for each objective of a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PhD study on the sustainability of CBHI, with 1257 being the largest estimated sample size. Among those, 1081 eligible households participated in this study.

The study participants were recruited using a three-level multistage sampling method. First, 12 clusters of *kebeles* organized under a health center catchment area were selected. Then, 14 rural *kebeles* were drawn randomly using a lottery method proportional to the number of *kebeles* under each cluster. Accordingly, five *kebeles* from Tehulederie and nine from Kalu were included. A list of households who have ever been enrolled in the CBHI was obtained from the membership registration books of each *kebele* and these lists were used as the sampling frame. Then, the required sample was drawn randomly using a random number generator software from each *kebele* proportional to the total number of households ever enrolled in the scheme.

Data collection

An interviewer-administered questionnaire was used to collect data Household-level data were collected from 04 February to 21 March 2021 using a structured interviewer-administered questionnaire via an electronic data collection platform using the Open Data Kit (ODK) application. Individual-level data were collected at the household level in the community. The heads of the households were interviewed at their home or workplace by using the local language, Amharic. The data collectors submitted the completed forms to the ODK aggregator (Kobo) server daily, which helped us to review the daily submissions and facilitate the supervision process. Before the data collection, the questionnaire was pre-tested on a sample of 84 randomly selected participants in one kebele. As part of the pre-test, a cognitive interview was conducted on selected items using the verbal probe technique among eight respondents to determine whether or not items and response categories were understood, and interpreted by the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

potential respondents as intended. Accordingly, the wording of some items and response options were modified, and some items were removed.

Cluster-level data were collected from 12 health centers that provide health care for the population in the sampled *kebeles*. Patient volume data were obtained by reviewing the health centers' monthly service delivery reports while data related to work experience, affective commitment and job satisfaction were collected through a self-administered questionnaire among health care providers who worked more than one year in the current facility. Health center data were linked to household-level data based on the usual source of health care for each study participant.

Data analysis

The data were analyzed using Stata version 17.0. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to assess the validity of the quality measurement scale. Bartlett's test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin's (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were performed to assess the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis. The principal component factor method of extraction and Promax rotation with Kaiser Normalization was used. The Eigenvalue greater than one decision rule was used to determine the appropriate number of factors to be extracted. Items with loadings below 0.40 were removed from the analysis.[37] Correlation coefficients were used to test construct validity. Item-total score correlation, dimension-total score correlation and dimension intercorrelation were computed. The total score was the mean score of the ratings for all of the scale's items and the dimension score was the factor scores. A questionnaire has good construct validity when the item-total score correlations are higher than 0.40, dimension intercorrelations are less than 0.80 and dimension-total score correlations are higher than dimension intercorrelations.[30] Cronbach's alpha coefficients were generated for each dimension

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to assess the internal consistency. Reliability of the scale was considered acceptable if Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.60 or higher.[37]

To compare mean scores of overall PQOC and its dimensions among subgroups, an independent t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey's post-hoc test were used. The relationship between the PQOC and its predictors was assessed using Multilevel linear regression model. The PQOC was assumed to be influenced by the characteristics of households as well as health center level factors. The characteristics of the household and household heads were taken as individual-level variables, whereas the characteristics of health care providers were considered as health center-level variables. Considering the hierarchical structure of the data, where patients are nested within health centers, a two-level multiple linear regression model was applied. Four models were fitted to determine the model that best fits the data: Model I or the null model (a model without predictors), Model II (only individual-level variables; Model III (only health center-level variables); and Model IV (both individual and health center-level variables).

The measures of association (fixed-effects) estimate the association between overall PQOC and various explanatory variables. The existence of a statistically significant association was determined at p-values of <0.05. The degree of the association was assessed using regression coefficients and their statistical significance was determined at a 95% confidence interval.

Intra-cluster correlation (ICC) and Proportional Change in Variance (PCV) were used to report the measures of variation (random effects). The need for multilevel analysis which considers health center-level factors was tested using the ICC. The ICC shows the variation in PQOC accounted for health center level characteristics. Statistically significant variability between health centers justifies the need to consider health center level factors.[38] The ICC was calculated as:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

$$ICC = \sigma_b^2 \ / \ (\sigma_b^2 + \sigma_w^2)$$

Where σ_b^2 and σ_w^2 are the between and within health center variances.[39]

The PCV expresses the change in the health center level variance between the empty model and models with more terms and was calculated by $PCV = V_A - V_B/V_A$, where V_A = variance of the null model, and V_B = variance of the model with more terms. It measures the total variation explained by individual and health center level factors. Models were compared using the Deviance Information Criteria (DIC) and Akaike Information Criteria (AIC). The model with the lowest DIC and AIC values was deemed to be the best fit model.

The preliminary analysis confirmed no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and multicollinearity. The presence of multicollinearity was determined using Variance Inflation Factor with a cutoff point of 5. We used the Durbin–Wu–Hausman test to look for endogeneity between current insurance status and PQOC.

RESULTS

Background characteristics of the study population

The household survey included 1081 respondents who had visited a health center at least once in the previous 12 months prior to the study. The average age of the study participants was 49.25 years (SD=12.07), with slightly more than half (51.34%) being between the ages of 45 and 64, and 12.67% being 65 and older. Of the total household heads, 938 (86.77%) were men, and 1003 (92.78%) were currently married. One-fifth of the study participants (20.91%) attended formal education, and 62.72% had a household size of five or above.

Nearly ninety percent of the households (87.14%) were active members of the CBHI scheme at the time of the study. A quarter of households (25.72%) had one or more individuals with a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

known chronic illness informed by a healthcare provider. One-third of respondents (33.58) rated their household health status as very good, while 207 (19.15%) and 511 (47.27) of them rated it as fair and good respectively. Nearly half of the households (46.16%) had visited a health center within three months prior to the study, while 31.73% and 22.11% had their most recent visit to a health center before 6-12 and 3-6 months, respectively (Table 1).

The median work experience of health care providers involved in this study ranges from three to ten years. The mean scores of affective commitment and job satisfaction were 29.00 and 30.95 (SD=2.08 and 3.17) respectively. The average patient volume was 32.17 per day per care provider with a range of 19 to 43 (SD=7.83).

Factor analysis

Sampling was adequate as measured by the KMO (0.83) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p<0.001$). Two items were removed from further analysis due to loadings below 0.40, and one item was removed due to low communality. The factor analysis extracted five dimensions that explained 59.25% of the total variation (online supplemental file 1). The item-total score correlations ranged from 0.268 to 0.622, four items had correlations less than 0.40. The dimension intercorrelations varied from 0.031 to 0.434, all of which were less than the 0.80 criterion, indicating that each dimension was distinct enough to be considered an independent measure. Dimension-total score correlation range between 0.463 to 0.743, all significant at a p-value of .001, and were higher than dimension intercorrelation. The scale was tested for reliability and had an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.804. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the five dimensions exceeded 0.60, except for access to care subscale, which had an alpha coefficient of 0.531.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Basic characteristics of respondents in health centers affiliated with a CBHI in two districts of Northeastern Ethiopia, 2021.

Variable	Categories	N=1081	%
Age in years	25 – 44	389	35.99
	45 – 64	555	51.34
	65+	137	12.67
Gender	Men	938	86.77
	Women	143	13.23
Marital status	Divorced or widow	78	7.22
	Married	1003	92.78
Attend formal education	No	855	79.09
	Yes	226	20.91
Household size	< Five	403	37.28
	≥ Five	678	62.72
Wealth tertile	Lowest	361	33.40
	Medium	360	33.30
	Highest	360	33.30
Current insurance status	Ex-member	139	12.86
	Active-member	942	87.14
Perceived health status	Fair	207	19.15
	Good	511	47.27
	Very good	363	33.58
Chronic illness	No	803	74.28
	Yes	278	25.72
Most recent visit to a health center	< 3 months	499	46.16
	3-6 months	239	22.11
	6-12 months	343	31.73

Perceived quality of care

The minimum maximum and mean PQOC scores were 22.06 and 97.06 respectively. The mean score was 62.85 (95% CI: 62.22, 63.47) with an SD of 10.49. The aggregated mean score at the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

health center level ranges from 56.18 to 67.58. Patient-provider communication had the highest mean score (M=72.29, SD=12.66) of the five quality dimensions, while information provision had the lowest score (M=55.83, SD=17.34). The mean score of each measurement item is summarized by online supplemental file 2.

A two-sample t-test and one-way ANOVA test were performed to compare differences in overall PQOC and its dimensions scores between subgroups. As shown under table 2, for example, there was a significant difference in the total score of PQOC for wealth tertile at the $p<0.05$ level (F=8.83, p=0.001). A significant difference was also observed between wealth tertile in terms of mean score of patient-provider communication (F=8.21, $p<0.001$), information provision (F=50.06, $p<0.001$), and trust in care providers dimensions (F=4.13, p=0.016). Tukey's post-hoc test indicated that the mean score of the overall PQOC for the low wealth tertile (M=64.71, SD=11.43) was significantly different from both the medium (M=61.70, SD=10.21) and high (M=62.12, SD=9.52) wealth tertile. However, no significant difference was seen between medium and high wealth tertile.

The overall mean PQOC score was significantly different among health centers (F=11.85, $p<.001$). The mean scores for all the five dimensions were also significantly different among health centers $p<0.001$ level: technical care (F=8.66), patient-provider communication (F=6.65), information provision (F=47.42), access to care (F=36.87) and trust in care providers (F=6.98). The mean scores of the five quality dimensions across groups from each health center are depicted by a radar chart (Figure 1). The chart shows a comparison of the mean scores on a scale of 10 to 80. For example, respondents from 11 health centers had a higher perception score on patient-provider communication than other dimensions with lesser variation, while the information provision dimension was mostly ranked low with significant variability.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: t-test and ANOVA comparing mean scores of PQOC across respondent characteristics in health centers affiliated with CBHI in two districts of Northeastern Ethiopia, 2021.

Variable	Categories	N	Technical care			Communication			Information provision		
			M	SD	t/F	M	SD	t/F	M	SD	t/F
Age in years	25 – 44	389	60.41	19.51	0.24	72.00	12.36	1.10	53.44[b]	17.16	15.69[#]
	45 – 64	555	60.18	18.99		72.13	12.51		55.75[b]	17.53	
	65+	137	61.44	18.05		73.78	13.99		62.96	15.11	
Gender	Men	938	60.39	18.91	-0.12	72.09	12.71	-1.39	55.50	17.25	-1.60
	Women	143	60.61	20.01		73.66	12.26		58.00	17.84	
Marital status	Divorced/widowed	78	63.46	18.43	1.46	73.50	15.12	0.88	63.46	16.98	4.06[#]
	Married	1003	60.19	19.09		72.20	12.45		55.24	17.24	
Attend formal education	No	855	60.47	19.26	0.15	72.22	12.85	-0.36	55.54	17.47	-1.08
	Yes	226	60.25	18.27		72.57	11.92		56.94	16.82	
Household size	< Five	403	61.37	19.02	1.27	73.14	12.59	1.69	56.42	17.89	0.86
	≥ Five	678	59.86	19.06		71.79	12.68		55.48	17.01	
Wealth tertile	Lowest	361	62.05	18.02	2.49	74.47	12.42	8.21[#]	62.76[a]	16.04	50.06[#]
	Medium	360	58.89	19.10		71.00[b]	13.21		53.85[a]	18.00	
	Highest	360	60.32	19.91		71.41[b]	12.06		50.87[a]	15.68	
Current insurance status	Ex-member	139	55.94	19.67	-2.99[§]	67.77	16.13	-4.46[§]	53.91	18.08	-1.40
	Active-member	942	61.08	18.88		72.95	11.93		56.12	17.22	
Self-rated health	Fair	207	64.69[b]	17.16	11.24[#]	75.44	11.93	9.66[#]	62.53	16.09	20.50[#]
	Good	511	61.06[b]	18.41		70.91[b]	12.58		54.83[b]	17.44	
	Very good	363	57.09	20.39		72.45[b]	12.87		53.43[b]	16.99	
Chronic illness	No	803	59.24	19.47	-3.50[#]	71.63	12.94	-2.96[§]	53.87	17.18	-6.45[#]
	Yes	278	63.85	17.38		74.22	11.61		61.51	16.58	
Most recent visit to a health center	< 3 months	499	60.10	18.87	1.29	73.08	12.81	2.09	60.08	17.43	31.01[#]
	3-6 months	239	62.13	18.49		72.11	12.46		53.71[b]	16.12	
	6-12 months	343	59.69	19.68		71.28	12.53		51.13[b]	16.57	
Total		1081	60.42	19.05		72.29	12.66		55.83	17.34	
Variable	Categories	N	Access to care			Trust in providers			Overall PQOC		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

			M	SD	t/F	M	SD	t/F	M	SD	t/F
Age in years	25 – 44	389	62.48	14.55	1.12	66.99[b]	12.64	4.89[§]	62.46	9.72	1.08
	45 – 64	555	61.77	15.05		67.01[b]	13.69		62.83	10.66	
	65+	137	60.31	13.72		63.08	16.51		64.00	11.86	
Gender	Men	938	61.68	14.58	-0.92	66.47	13.50	-0.21	62.68	10.26	-1.31
	Women	143	62.89	15.53		66.72	15.46		63.91	11.89	
Marital status	Divorced/widowed	78	58.97	16.29	-1.79	65.38	17.52	-0.75	64.52	13.69	1.46
	Married	1003	62.06	14.56		66.59	13.44		62.72	10.20	
Attend formal education	No	855	62.03	14.55	0.83	66.73	13.91	1.07	62.86	10.61	0.07
	Yes	226	61.12	15.30		65.63	13.20		62.80	10.07	
Household size	< Five	403	62.97	14.06	1.94	66.48	14.92	-0.04	63.56	10.79	1.73
	≥ Five	678	61.17	15.05		66.52	13.05		62.42	10.30	
Wealth tertile	Lowest	361	60.99	14.36	2.62	65.17[a]	16.34	4.13[*]	64.71	11.43	8.83[#]
	Medium	360	61.25	14.77		66.27	13.06		61.70[b]	10.21	
	Highest	360	63.28	14.93		68.08[a]	11.30		62.12[b]	9.52	
Current insurance status	Ex-member	139	58.81	16.96	-2.61[§]	63.49	16.34	-2.77[§]	59.57	12.06	-3.96[#]
	Active-member	942	62.29	14.30		66.95	13.30		63.33	10.16	
Self-rated health	Fair	207	60.78	14.39	1.76	65.74	14.79	3.71[*]	65.35	11.05	8.04[#]
	Good	511	61.47	13.92		67.69[a]	12.29		62.60[b]	9.79	
	Very good	363	62.96	15.89		65.27[a]	14.99		61.77[b]	10.91	
Chronic illness	No	803	61.41	14.88	-1.64	66.33	13.67	-0.69	61.92	10.36	-4.96[#]
	Yes	278	63.08	14.16		66.70	14.06		65.51	10.42	
Most recent visit to a health center	< 3 months	499	61.10[b]	14.36	5.41[§]	64.71	15.25	8.63[#]	63.44[b]	11.24	4.78[§]
	3-6 months	239	64.59	14.10		68.83[b]	11.63		63.67[b]	9.49	
	6-12 months	343	61.01[b]	15.42		67.49[b]	12.51		61.41	9.90	
Total		1081	61.84	14.71		66.50	13.77		62.85	10.49	

[*]$p<0.05$; [§]$p<0.01$; [#]$p<0.001$; t/F – t-test/F-test statistics; Based on Tukey's post-hoc test, means sharing letter 'a' are significantly different; while means sharing letter 'b' are not significantly different in the group at the 5% level.

Figure 1: Dimensions of PQOC across health centers affiliated with CBHI in two districts of Northeastern Ethiopia, 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Predictors of perceived quality of care: Multilevel analysis

The fixed effects (measures of association) and the Random effects (measures of variation) for the multilevel linear regression model are depicted in Table 3. The results of the null model showed that 7.80% of the total variance in PQOC was attributed to health center level variables (ICC=0.078). The variability between health centers was statistically significant (τ=8.38, p<0.001). Furthermore, the null model shows a significant improvement in fit relative to a standard linear model, demonstrating the importance of developing a multilevel model. The health center level variation in Model II remained significant (τ=8.77, p<0.001), with 8.44% of the total variability being attributed to differences across health centers. The PCV is negative in this model, indicating that household-level characteristics did not play a role in explaining the between health center variation. In Model III, the PCV demonstrated that cluster-level variables explained nearly all of the variation between health centers, indicating the importance of including health center-level characteristics to build a more robust explanatory model. The model with the lowest DIC and AIC (Model IV) was selected to describe, and interpret the results of the regression analysis.

After adjusting for other individual and health center level factors, the PQOC for households with higher wealth tertile increased by 2.24 points compared to those with lower wealth tertile (b=2.24; 95% CI: 0.48, 4.00). Households that were active members of CBHI at the time of the study had a 3.37-point higher overall PQOC score than ex-members (b=3.37; 95% CI: 1.58, 5.16).

The PQOC score of households who rated their health status as very good was 2.25 points lower compared to those who rated it as fair (b=-2.25; 95% CI: -4.12, -0.38). The PQOC score of households who had one or more family members with chronic illness was 1.78 points higher

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

compared to those with no chronic illness (b=1.78; 95% CI: 0.29, 3.27). Time since the most recent visit to a health center was also significantly associated with PQOC. The PQOC score for households who had their most recent visit to a health center before 3-6 months was 2.36 points higher compared to those whose recent visit was within 3-months prior to the study (b=2.36; 95% CI: 0.78, 3.94).

Regarding health canter level variables, the work experience of health care providers and patient volume had statistically significant associations with PQOC. A 1.34-point improvement in the average PQOC of health centers was noted for every year increase in the median work experience of health care providers (b=1.34; 95% CI: 0.93, 1.75). At an average staff job satisfaction, a 0.52-point drop in the average PQOC of health centers was observed for a unit increase in patient volume (b=-0.52; 95% CI: -0.63, -0.41).

DISCUSSIONS

In this study, the patient-provider communication received the highest score among the five quality dimensions. In 2015, the Ethiopian government incorporated the development of caring, respectful and compassionate health care providers as one of the main transformations agendas in its five-year strategic plan.[27] Our finding may be partly attributed to the government's ongoing training initiative aimed at producing caring, respectful and compassionate health care providers. The perception score for the information provision dimension, on the other hand, was the lowest. This could be attributed to an increase in patient volume as a result of the implementation of CBHI.[26] Items loaded under this dimension appear to be less practical in the presence of a larger patient load. If health care providers are required to treat a greater number of patients, consultation times will be reduced. They are unlikely to provide the necessary information to their clients if they are under time constraints.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3: Multilevel Linear regression analysis on factors associated with PQOC in health centers affiliated with CBHI in two districts of Northeastern Ethiopia, 2021.

Variables		Model I	Model II	Model III	Model IV
	Category		b (95% CI)	b (95% CI)	b (95% CI)
Fixed effects					
Age			-0.02 (-0.07, 0.04)		-0.03 (-0.09, 0.02)
Gender	Men		ref.		ref.
	Women		0.79 (-1.31, 2.91)		1.01 (-1.09, 3.10)
Marital status	Divorced/Widowed		ref.		ref.
	Married		-0.18 (-3.02, 2.66)		0.22 (-2.59, 3.03)
Attend modern education	No		ref.		ref.
	Yes		-0.08 (-1.65, 1.49)		-0.31 (-1.85, 1.24)
Wealth tertile	Low		ref.		ref.
	Medium		-0.75 (-2.38, 0.89)		-0.20 (-1.74, 1.35)
	High		0.86 (-1.13, 2.84)		2.24 (0.48, 4.00)*
Household size	Small (< 5)		ref.		ref.
	Large (≥ 5)		-0.35 (-1.59, 0.89)		-0.39 (-1.62, 0.84)
Current insurance status	Ex-member		ref.		ref.
	Active member		3.31 (1.51, 5.12)#		3.37 (1.58, 5.16)#
Perceived health status	Fair		ref.		
	Good		-0.94 (-2.69, 0.82)		-0.92 (-2.66, 0.83)
	Very good		-2.22 (-4.10, -0.38)*		-2.25 (-4.12, -0.38)*
Chronic illness	No		ref.		ref.
	Yes		1.95 (0.44, 3.45)*		1.78 (0.29, 3.27)*
Most recent visit to a health center	< 3 months		ref.		ref.
	3-6 months		2.04 (0.46, 3.65)*		2.36 (0.78, 3.94)§
	6-12 months		0.94 (-0.57, 2.46)		1.27 (-0.21, 2.75)
Work experience				0.94 (0.60, 1.28)#	1.34 (0.93, 1.75)#
Affective commitment				0.61 (0.15, 1.06)§	0.34 (-0.12, 0.81)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Patient volume			-0.42 (-0.51, -0.33)#	-0.52 (-0.63, -0.41)#
Job satisfaction			0.06 (-0.15, 0.27)	0.09 (-0.12, 0.30)
Patient volume x Job satisfaction			0.08 (0.04, 0.12)#	0.06 (0.02, 0.10)§
Random effect				
τ (SE)	8.38 (3.81)#	8.77 (4.16)#	≈ 0	≈ 0
ICC (%)	7.80	8.44	≈ 0.00	≈ 0.00
PCV (%)	Reference	-4.65	≈ 100	≈ 100
Model fitness				
DIC	8061.75	8018.83	8037.26	7984.46
AIC	8067.75	8050.83	8051.26	8026.46

*p<0.05; §p<0.01; # p<0.001; ref. - reference group; τ - Cluster level variance, ICC - Intraclass Correlation; PCV - Proportional Change in Variance; DIC - Deviance Information Criterion; AIC - Akaike Information Criterion; SE – standard error; b - regression coefficient; CI – Confidence Interval.

In terms of item level observations, waiting time and medicine availability received the lowest perception scores (53.70 and 54.37 respectively), which could be also related to increased patient load. This is consistent with previous studies in Ethiopia, which showed that CBHI insured clients frequently complain about a lack of medicine and long wait times at CBHI affiliated health facilities.[40 41]

Results of the regression analysis revealed that households with higher wealth tertile had a higher PQOC score than those with lower wealth tertile. This is in contrast to other studies,[15 42] whereby the richest group had a lower perception score. This discrepancy could be attributed to the use of different metrics to assess the quality of care. People with higher economic status may be more aware of health issues and may be able to bargain with health care providers to obtain the best possible care. Furthermore, if prescribed medicines are not available in CBHI affiliated health facilities (which is one of the lowest-rated items in this study), they can afford to buy from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

private pharmacies. On the contrary, it may be irritating for people with lower economic status to buy medicines with limited money at hand or to forgo treatment due to lack of money. In this regard, they may develop a negative perception of the quality of care.

Households who were active members of the community health insurance at the time of the study had a higher rating of PQOC compared to ex-members. Contrary to our finding, a study in Ghana showed that previously insured clients had a higher perception of quality of care compared to actively insured clients (statistical significance not reported). The authors argued that this was due to the more time-consuming nature of the service delivery processes for insured clients.[43]

At least three possible explanations exist for the relationship between CBHI status and quality of care. First, because they do not have to pay for health care, active members have better access to and enjoy its benefits, resulting in a favorable perception of its quality. Second, the relationship could be due to an endogeneity issue. It is plausible that higher quality reported by active members is due to their desire to stay in the scheme, which could be influenced by unobserved variables. We tested for endogeneity between current insurance status and PQOC using the Durbin–Wu–Hausman test, and the results showed no evidence of endogeneity. However, there is still the possibility of endogeneity due to omitted variables. Third, ex-members of CBHI may have had negative experiences with health services, which led to the decision to discontinue their membership. As a result, they would be critical in rating the quality of care provided. In support of the latter argument, it was evidenced that poor quality of care was a major reason why insurance members leave the scheme.[24 44] A statistically significant association was also reported between dropout and low quality of care.[44-46]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This study verified that the PQOC score of households who rated their health status as very good was significantly lower compared to those who rated it as fair. The households' chronic illness experiences also influence the PQOC rating. The PQOC score of households that had one or more family members with chronic illness was higher compared to those with no chronic illness. This may be true for people who perceive their health as poor or who live with chronic conditions to appreciate the gains or benefits of the health care they receive. In this respect, they may be more likely than their counterparts to rate the quality of care higher.

The results also indicated that households who had their most recent visit to a health center before 3-6 months had higher PQOC scores compared to those whose recent visit was within 3-months prior to the study. Patients may be experiencing varying levels of emotional highs and lows depending on the length of the most recent facility visit. Although patients' perceptions of quality may develop over time,[5] patients who have recently visited a health facility may be more critical of the quality of care due to strong emotions attached with negative events or health services that fall short of their expectations.

Our findings revealed that the work experience of health care providers was positively associated with PQOC. Work experience is linked to increased process flow, service integration and task specialization. Specialization can lead to a faster work pace, more output in less time, and higher quality.[47] This could be more pronounced in Ethiopia, where the number of outpatient visits to CBHI affiliated health centers had increased dramatically.[26] Providers with more experience take less time to make diagnosis and treatment decisions while still providing recommended practical aspects of care such as good communication, physical examination, and provision of relevant health information.[47] As a result, they can reduce waiting times and their management outcomes may be more effective than inexperienced providers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conditional on the average staff job satisfaction, patient volume has a negative association with PQOC. A study in Ethiopia identified a non-linear significant association (an inverted U-shape) between patient volume and quality. Quality decreased with increasing patient volume in health facilities that treated 90.6 or more patients per day, while quality increased with increasing patient volume in health facilities that treated less than 90.6 patients per day in the outpatient departments.[48] Our finding is consistent with a study at public hospitals in China,[29] where overcrowding was negatively associated clients' perception of quality of care. There are two possible explanations for the observed relationship between patient volume and PQOC. First, the increased patient volume would put a great deal of pressure on health care providers to treat a large number of patients in a short time. This may result in a shorter consultation time and the omission of important practical aspects of care. Second, an increase in patient volume would mean longer waiting times at various service delivery points. Both of these factors could have contributed to a negative patient experience and influenced their perception on the overall quality of care.

Some studies reported a positive relationship between patient volume and quality of basic maternal care, and postoperative infections.[49 50] The alternative direction of this relationship, in which quality drives patient volume, is based on the assumption that the provision of high-quality care will attract more patients. This may be true in areas where patients have access to a variety of competitive health care facilities and health care providers are incentivized for providing higher-quality care. This is not the case in low-income countries, like Ethiopia, where health care facilities are hard to reach for most of the rural population. Members of CBHI are further limited to use health services only in public health facilities that are affiliated with the scheme.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This study found no relationship between staff job satisfaction and the quality of care. This contrasts with the findings of Kvist et al,[51] which reported a positive relationship between job satisfaction amongst nursing staff and patients' perceptions of quality of care. Despite this, it moderates the relationship between patient volume and quality of care. An interaction term between patient volume and job satisfaction was found to be positively associated with PQOC, implying that increasing staff job satisfaction would buffer or lessen the effect between patient volume and PQOC. At average job satisfaction, a one-unit increase in patient volume is associated with a 52% decrease in the average PQOC of health centers. If job satisfaction is set one SD above the mean, a one-unit increase in patient volume would result in a 33% decrease in PQOC. This prediction is substantiated by the fact that the margins graph for patient volume showed the flattest slope for high job satisfaction.

The findings of this study will be an essential input for quality improvement initiatives as well as addressing challenges in the country's effort to establish higher-level insurance pools. This is the first study of its kind to consider variables at the health center level that are associated with perceived quality of care in Ethiopia. It gives an important lesson for health care managers and other relevant stakeholders to consider health center level characteristics in healthcare quality improvement efforts. It also pointed out quality dimensions that require special consideration in managerial decisions. Despite the significant findings of the current study, some caution should be taken in interpreting the findings. One noteworthy limitation of this study is the cross-sectional nature of the data, which makes inferring causation between current insurance status and PQOC difficult due to possibility of endogeneity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

CONCLUSIONS

Despite encouraging findings on patient-provider communication, much work remains to be done to improve information provision and access to care quality dimensions. According to the findings, people's perceptions of quality of care varied depending on a variety of individual and health center level factors. The household's wealth status, current insurance membership, perceived health status, presence of chronic illness in the household and time since the most recent visit to a health center were individual-level predictors of PQOC. At the health center level, patient volume and work experience of health care providers were found to be associated with PQOC. Staff job satisfaction was an important factor that moderated the effect between patient volume and PQOC. A lower patient volume allows the health care provider to devote more time and attention to each patient, address their patients' individual needs, and have more time to improve communication with and provide behavior change counseling which has an impact on quality of care.[52] Therefore, to ensure that patients have access to a better quality of care, it is critical to determine an appropriate patient volume per care provider. It is also vital to devise mechanisms to improve staff job satisfaction, as this lessens the effect of increased patient volume on quality of care. More importantly, health centers should go to great lengths to ensure that every patient has access to the necessary medications. This will boost clients' trust in health care providers, which will be critical for health insurance schemes to retain and attract members.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to acknowledge the health offices of Tehulederie and Kalu districts, health extension workers, *kebele* leaders, data collectors, supervisors, and study participants.

Contributors

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

MH conceptualized the study, designed the study, collected the data, analyzed and interpreted the data, and drafted the manuscript. MA and NBB contributed to survey design data collection and statistical analysis and reviewed the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Ethics approval Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of College of Medicine and Health Science, Bahir Dar University with protocol number 001/2021. A support letter was communicated to the district health offices to gain entry permission into the community where the research was conducted. Before the interview, oral informed consent was secured from each of the study participants. Confidentiality was assured through collecting anonymous information and by informing the participants that personal identifiers will not be revealed to a third party.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data are available in a public, open access repository. The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available in the Dryad repository, at https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.ncjsxksw5

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY- NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

remix, adapt, build upon this work non- commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non- commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/ .

ORCID iD

Mohammed Hussien https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5747-8967

Muluken Azage https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3222-0158

Negalign Berhanu Bayou https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0975-8358

REFERENCES

1. Nash DB, Joshi MS, Ransom ER, et al. The healthcare quality book : vision, strategy, and tools. 4th ed. Washington, DC: *Health Administration Press* 2019.

2. WHO, OECD, and, et al. Delivering quality health services: a global imperative for universal health coverage. Geneva: World Health Organization, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and The World Bank, 2018.

3. Larson E, Sharma J, Bohren MA, et al. When the patient is the expert: measuring patient experience and satisfaction with care. *Bull World Health Organ* 2019;97(8):563-69. doi: 10.2471/BLT.18.225201 [published Online First: 2019/08/07]

4. National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. Crossing the global quality chasm: Improving health care worldwide. Washington (DC): The National Academies Press 2018.

5. Hanefeld J, Powell-Jacksona T, Balabanovaa D. Understanding and measuring quality of care: dealing with complexity. *Bull World Health Organ 2017* 2017;95:368–74. doi: 10.2471/BLT.16.179309

6. Goodrich J, Fitzsimons B. Capturing patient experience to improve healthcare services. *Nurs Stand* 2019;34(8):24-28. doi: 10.7748/ns.2018.e11177 [published Online First: 2018/11/02]

7. Golda N, Beeson S, Kohli N, et al. Analysis of the patient experience measure. *JAM ACAD DERMATOL* 2018;78(4) doi: 10.1016/j.jaad.2017.03.051

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

8. Fujisawa R, Klazinga NS. Measuring patient experiences (PREMS): Progress made by the OECD and its member countries between 2006 and 2016. OECD Health Working Papers 102. Paris, 2017.

9. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between patient experience and clinical safety and effectiveness. *BMJ Open* 2013;3(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001570

10. Anhang Price R, Elliott MN, Zaslavsky AM, et al. Examining the role of patient experience surveys in measuring health care quality. *Med Care Res Rev* 2014;71(5):522-54. doi: 10.1177/1077558714541480 [published Online First: 2014/07/17]

11. Soors W, Devadasan N, Durairaj V, et al. Community Health Insurance and Universal Coverage: Multiple paths, many rivers to cross. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2010.

12. Lagomarsino G, Garabrant A, Adyas A, et al. Moving towards universal health coverage: health insurance reforms in nine developing countries in Africa and Asia. *The Lancet* 2012;380(9845):933-43. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(12)61147-7 [published Online First: 2012/09/11]

13. Lagomarsino G, Kundra SS. Overcoming the Challenges of Scaling Voluntary Risk Pools in Low-Income Settings: Results for Development Institute, 2008.

14. Boateng D, Awunyor-Vitor D. Health insurance in Ghana: evaluation of policy holders' perceptions and factors influencing policy renewal in the Volta region. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 2013;12(50)

15. Alhassan RK, Duku SO, Janssens W, et al. Comparison of Perceived and Technical Healthcare Quality in Primary Health Facilities: Implications for a Sustainable National Health Insurance Scheme in Ghana. *PLoS One* 2015;10(10):e0140109. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0140109 [published Online First: 2015/10/16]

16. Aggrey M, Appiah SCY. The influence of clients' perceived quality on health care utilization. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies* 2014;9(2):918-24.

17. Akachi Y, Kruk ME. Quality of care: measuring a neglected driver of improved health. *Bull World Health Organ* 2017;95(6):465-72. doi: 10.2471/BLT.16.180190 [published Online First: 2017/06/13]

18. Dror DM, Hossain SAS, Majumdar A, et al. What Factors Affect Voluntary Uptake of Community-Based Health Insurance Schemes in Low- and Middle-Income Countries? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One* 2016;11(8):e0160479. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0160479 [published Online First: 2016/09/01]

19. Fadlallah R, El-Jardali F, Hemadi N, et al. Barriers and facilitators to implementation, uptake and sustainability of community-based health insurance schemes in low- and middle-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

income countries: a systematic review. *Int J Equity Health* 2018;17(1):13. doi: 10.1186/s12939-018-0721-4 [published Online First: 2018/01/31]

20. Primary Health Care on the Road to Universal Health Coverage: 2019 global monitoring report. Geneva: WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, OECD and World Bank., 2019.

21. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, et al. High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. *The Lancet* 2018;6(11):e1196-e252. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30386-3 [published Online First: 2018/09/10]

22. Alhassan RK, Nketiah-Amponsah E, Arhinful DK. A Review of the National Health Insurance Scheme in Ghana: What Are the Sustainability Threats and Prospects? *PLoS One* 2016;11(11):e0165151. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0165151 [published Online First: 2016/11/11]

23. Adebayo EF, Uthman OA, Wiysonge CS, et al. A systematic review of factors that affect uptake of community-based health insurance in low-income and middle-income countries. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015;15(543):543. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-1179-3 [published Online First: 2015/12/10]

24. Hussien M, Azage M. Barriers and Facilitators of Community-Based Health Insurance Policy Renewal in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2021;13:359-75. doi: 10.2147/CEOR.S306855 [published Online First: 2021/05/20]

25. Tefera BB, Kibret MA, Molla YB, et al. The interaction of healthcare service quality and community-based health insurance in Ethiopia. *PLoS One* 2021;16(8):e0256132. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0256132 [published Online First: 2021/08/20]

26. Shigute Z, Mebratie AD, Sparrow R, et al. The Effect of Ethiopia's Community-Based Health Insurance Scheme on Revenues and Quality of Care. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17(22) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17228558 [published Online First: 2020/11/22]

27. FMHO. Health Sector Transformation Plan 2016-2020. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Federal Ministry of Health, 2015.

28. Zonal Health Department. Community-based health insurance performance reoprt of South Wollo Zone, 2020.

29. Bao Y, Fan G, Zou D, et al. Patient experience with outpatient encounters at public hospitals in Shanghai: Examining different aspects of physician services and implications of overcrowding. *PLoS One* 2017;12(2) doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0171684

30. Hu Y, Zhang Z, Xie J, et al. The Outpatient Experience Questionnaire of comprehensive public hospital in China: development, validity and reliability. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2017;29(1):40-46. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzw133

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

31. Baltussen R, Ye Y. Quality of care of modern health services as perceived by users and non-users in Burkina Faso. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2006;18(1):30-34.

32. Robyn PJ, Bärnighausen T, Souares A, et al. Does enrollment status in community-based insurance lead to poorer quality of care? Evidence from Burkina Faso. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 2013;12(31)

33. Webster TR, Mantopoulos J, Jackson E, et al. A brief questionnaire for assessing patient healthcare experiences in low-income settings. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2011;23(3):258–68.

34. Benson T, Potts HW. A short generic patient experience questionnaire: howRwe development and validation. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2014;14:499. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0499-z [published Online First: 2014/10/22]

35. Altindis S. Job motivation and organizational commitment among the health professionals: A questionnaire survey *Afr J Bus Manage* 2011;5(21):8601-09.

36. Alpern R, Canavan ME, Thompson JT, et al. Development of a brief instrument for assessing healthcare employee satisfaction in a low-income setting. *PLoS One* 2013;8(11):e79053. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0079053 [published Online First: 2013/11/14]

37. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, et al. Multivariate Data Analysis. 8th ed: CENAGE 2019.

38. Merlo J, Chaix B, Yang M, et al. A brief conceptual tutorial of multilevel analysis in social epidemiology: linking the statistical concept of clustering to the idea of contextual phenomenon. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2005;59(6):443-9. doi: 10.1136/jech.2004.023473 [published Online First: 2005/05/25]

39. SNIJDERS TAB, BOSKER RJ. Multilevel Analysis: An Introduction To Basic And Advanced Multilevel Modeling. 2nd ed. London, UK: SAGE 2012.

40. Mebratie AD, Sparrow R, Yilma Z, et al. Enrollment in Ethiopia's Community-Based Health Insurance Scheme. *World Development* 2015;74:58-76. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.04.011

41. Benjamin J, Haile M, Abebe Z. Community-Based Health Insurance Program in Ethiopia: Assessing Institutional and Financial Sustainability. Rockville, MD: Health Finance & Governance Project, Abt Associates Inc., 2018.

42. Amo-Adjei J, Anku PJ, Amo HF, et al. Perception of quality of health delivery and health insurance subscription in Ghana. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:317. doi: 10.1186/s12913-016-1602-4 [published Online First: 2016/07/31]

43. Duku SKO, Nketiah-Amponsah E, Janssens W, et al. Perceptions of healthcare quality in Ghana: Does health insurance status matter? *PLoS One* 2018;13(1):e0190911. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0190911 [published Online First: 2018/01/18]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.18.21265144; this version posted October 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

44. Eseta WA, Lemma TD, Geta ET. Magnitude and Determinants of Dropout from Community-Based Health Insurance Among Households in Manna District, Jimma Zone, Southwest Ethiopia. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2020;12:747-60. doi: 10.2147/CEOR.S284702 [published Online First: 2020/12/29]

45. Herberholz C, Fakihammed WA. Determinants of Voluntary National Health Insurance Drop-Out in Eastern Sudan. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy* 2016;15(2):215-26. doi: 10.1007/s40258-016-0281-y [published Online First: 2016/10/04]

46. Mladovsky P. Why do people drop out of community-based health insurance? Findings from an exploratory household survey in Senegal. *Soc Sci Med* 2014;107:78-88. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.008 [published Online First: 2014/03/13]

47. Kraus TW, Buchler MW, Herfarth C. Relationships between volume, efficiency, and quality in surgery--a delicate balance from managerial perspectives. *World J Surg* 2005;29(10):1234-40. doi: 10.1007/s00268-005-7988-5 [published Online First: 2005/09/02]

48. Arsenault C, Yakob B, Tilahun T, et al. Patient volume and quality of primary care in Ethiopia: findings from the routine health information system and the 2014 Service Provision Assessment survey. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2021;21(1) doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06524-y

49. Kruk ME, Leslie HH, Verguet S, et al. Quality of basic maternal care functions in health facilities of five African countries: an analysis of national health system surveys. *The Lancet Global Health* 2016;4(11):e845-e55. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(16)30180-2

50. Kruse FM, van Nieuw Amerongen MC, Borghans I, et al. Is there a volume-quality relationship within the independent treatment centre sector? A longitudinal analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2019;19(1):853. doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-4467-5 [published Online First: 2019/11/23]

51. Kvist T, Voutilainen A, Mäntynen R, et al. The relationship between patients' perceptions of care quality and three factors: nursing staff job satisfaction, organizational characteristics and patient age *BMC Health Serv Res* 2014;14(466)

52. Raffoul M, Moore M, Kamerow D, et al. A Primary Care Panel Size of 2500 Is neither Accurate nor Reasonable. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2016;29(4):496-9. doi: 10.3122/jabfm.2016.04.150317 [published Online First: 2016/07/09]

53. [Dataset] Hussien M, Azage M, Bayou NB (2021), Perceived quality of care in health centers affiliated with community-based health insurance in two districts of Northeastern Ethiopia, Dryad repository, https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.ncjsxksw5


HC1
HC2
HC3
HC4
HC5
HC6
HC7
HC8
HC9
HC10
HC11
HC12
80.00
70.00
60.00
50.00
40.00
30.00
20.00
10.00
0.00
Technical care
Communication
Information provision
Access to care
Trust in providers
Overall PQOC