

Patients' perception of healthcare givers services

ABSTRACT

Aim: This study aimed to describe the communication between Ghanaian patients and nurses, midwives, and doctors regarding the core elements of the "Four Habits Model" (4HM).

Methods: The researcher trained four research assistants who assisted with administering the questionnaires. All patients had one or several consultations with a nurse, midwife, and/or doctor during their hospital stay. A self-report inventory was administered to patients at discharge from the hospitals using Four Habits Patients Questionnaire (4HPQ) and eight questions on information regarding treatment (8QIRT). Data was collected from January and March 2016.

Results: Five eigenvalues greater than 1.0. They were 8.31 (component 1), 3.70 (component 2), 1.77 (component 3), 1.23 (component 4), and 1.16 component 5. Therefore, the components were labelled. The means and standard deviations showed that the additional 8QIRT were the least ranked. On the 4HM, Habit IV (invest in the end) was ranked least.

Conclusions: Based on this study, patients will want issues of patients not allowed to express themselves to be addressed by their healthcare providers.

Keywords: doctors; explorative study; Four Habits Model; Four Habits Patients' Questionnaire; patients' perceptions; nurses and midwives.

1. INTRODUCTION

The involvement of patients' perspectives in providing healthcare has been recognized [1] and is being used in the assessment of healthcare quality [2]. It has been demonstrated that patients feel satisfied when there is good communication with their healthcare providers [3]. Researchers have also found that good communication reduces patients' symptoms of depression and anxiety [4–7]. These are the bases upon which all healthcare providers, and therefore nurses and midwives, need good communication skills. It has been reported that patient satisfaction with care has rarely been examined in developing countries [8]. Therefore, the objectives of this study were (1) To describe the communication between Ghanaian patients and nurses, midwives, and doctors regarding the core elements of the "Four Habits Model" (4HM) [9] measured by Four Habits Patients Questionnaire (4HPQ) [10]; and (2) To find an effective method to implement descriptions of the communication between patients' and nurses, midwives, and doctors regarding the core elements of the 4HM [9] to bring improvement.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Design and sample

This exploratory study had a cross-sectional, multicenter design. Four Hospitals participated in this study. A convenience sample of patients (N = 400) from four hospitals (Tamale Teaching Hospital, Tamale West Hospital, Yendi Hospital, and Salaga Hospital) was included.

2.2 Ethical approval

This study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki [11, 12]. The procedures used in this study adhere to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki [11, 12]. The University for Development Studies, Tamale Institutional Review Board approved this study (Date: January 2016/No: UDS-IRB No.20200101-0535).

2.3 Criteria for inclusion and exclusion

The inclusion and exclusion criteria in this exploratory study are presented in (Table 1).

Table 1: Criteria for inclusion and exclusion in this explorative study

Inclusion criteria

- Patients 18 years and above.
- Patients who were from Tamale Teaching Hospital, Tamale West Hospital, Yendi Hospital, and Salaga Hospital.
- Patients who had one or several consultations with a nurse, a midwife, or a doctor during their stay in any of the above-mentioned hospitals.
- Patients who had been discharged and were ready to go home.

Exclusion criteria

- Patients below 18 years.
- Patients who were not from Tamale Teaching Hospital, Tamale West Hospital, Yendi Hospital, and Salaga Hospital.
- Patients who had no consultation with a nurse, a midwife, or a doctor during their stay in any of the above-mentioned hospitals.
- Patients who were still on admission at the hospitals.

2.4 Procedure

The researcher trained four research assistants who assisted with administering the questionnaires. The participants consented to participate in the study. All patients had one or several consultations with a nurse, midwife, and/or doctor during their hospital stay. A self-report inventory was administered to patients at discharge from the hospitals using the 4HPQ [10] and eight questions on information regarding treatment (8QIRT).

Informed consent for participation in the study was obtained verbally from all participants, which was waived because some patients were illiterate while others were bedridden. Written approval was obtained from the University for Development Studies Tamale Institutional Review Board (Date: January 2016/No: UDS-IRB No.20200101-0535). The responses were recorded and kept under lock to preserve patient confidentiality. The aims and objectives of the study were explained to the participants before informed consent was obtained. After obtaining informed consent, the participants responded to the questionnaires. Data were collected between January and March 2016. Further details of this procedure are available in Alhassan [13]. There is an overlap of data and information from this research with that of Alhassan [13] because this was part of the author's PhD Dissertation submitted to Heinrich-Heine University, Dusseldorf [13].

2.5 Outcome measure

The eight questions on information regarding treatments (8QIRT), developed from a Focused Group (FG) discussions, were added to the Four Habits Patients Questionnaire (4HPQ) [10] to be able to answer the explorative research. The 4HPQ has 15-items on a five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (not very effective behavior) to 5 (highly effective behavior).

Psychometric properties: A number of studies have used the 4HPQ [9, 10, 14, 15]. It has been validated against the Roter Interaction Analysis System [15], an instrument regularly used in doctor-patient communication research. The 4HPQ takes approximately 10-15 minutes to administer, which is good for patients because they usually want to leave the hospital immediately after discharge.

Eight questions on information regarding treatment (8QIRT) are presented in Table 2.

Table 2; Eight questions on information regarding treatment (8QIRT)

Question	Details
16	Was the name/nature of proposed treatment or procedure explained to you?
17	Were the advantages of proposed treatment made known to you?
18	Were the disadvantages of proposed treatment explained to you?
19	Were alternative treatment procedures (regardless of costs or extent covered by insurance) explained to you?
20	Were the advantages of alternative treatment also explained?
21	Were the disadvantages of alternative treatment also explained?
22	Were the advantages of not receiving treatments explained to you?
23	Were the disadvantages of not receiving treatments explained to you?

2.6 Data analysis

Data was screened for outliers. Normality was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk's test ($P = .05$) [16, 17]. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion for sampling adequacy, Bartlett's test of sphericity to test for validity, Cronbach's alpha to test for reliability, and correlations were computed. Data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences).

3. RESULTS

3.1 Demographic information

Analyses of the data showed that 345 patients participated in the study. The patients were females ($n = 192$) and males ($n = 153$) aged 18 years and above from the Tamale Teaching Hospital, Tamale West Hospital, Yendi Hospital, and Salaga Hospital (Table 3).

Table 3: Demographic data

		Patients (N = 345)	
Characteristics		<i>n</i>	%
Age	18 years and above		
Gender	Females	192	56
	Males	153	44
Hospital	Tamale Teaching Hospital	99	29
	Tamale West Hospital	100	29
	Yendi Hospital	62	18
	Salaga Hospital	84	24

Legend: N = total sample size.
n = group sample size

3.2 Assumptions testing

A Shapiro-Wilk's test ($P = .05$) [16, 17] showed all the 23 items scores were approximately normally distributed. In this study, the statistics associated with the Shapiro-Wilk test were all significant ($P = .05$) (Table 4).

Extreme values were removed from the data. Data from 13 (4%) participants were also excluded from the study due to incomplete data. The sample left after handling missing data using list-wise deletion was 345 for the 23 variables. With 345 cases and 23 variables, the ratio of cases to variables was 15:1 [18–20], which met the requirement of the case-to-variable ratio (Table 4).

Table 4: Normality Test

Variables	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Stat.	df	P
1	.80	345	*.000
2	.78	345	*.000
3	.77	345	*.000
4	.77	345	*.000
5	.78	345	*.000
6	.81	345	*.000
7	.85	345	*.000
8	.91	345	*.000
9	.92	345	*.000
10	.89	345	*.000
11	.80	345	*.000
12	.82	345	*.000
13	.85	345	*.000
14	.87	345	*.000
15	.86	345	*.000
16	.87	345	*.000
17	.87	345	*.000
18	.87	345	*.000
19	.86	345	*.000
20	.86	345	*.000
21	.85	345	*.000
22	.78	345	*.000
23	.79	345	*.000

*significance level $P = .05$

Legend: Stat. = statistical df = degrees of freedom. P = Probability

3.3 Reliability, validity, and sampling adequacy

In this study, the scores were reliable ($\alpha = .92$, $N = 23$) (Table 5).

Table 5: Table of reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N
(α)	
.92	23

Legend: N = total sample size

Bartlett's test of sphericity for validity was [χ^2 (253) = 5488.84, $P = .05$] and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion for sampling adequacy was .88. This probability was also significant ($P = .001$) (Table 6).

Table 6: Sampling adequacy for the set of variables

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.88
Bartlett's test of sphericity	App. Chi-Square
	5488.8
	4
	df
	253
	Sig.
	*.000

*significance level $P = .05$

Legend: df = degrees of freedom.

Sig. = significance level

App. = approximate

3.4 Communalities

The results showed that the minimum value of all communalities was .55, the maximum was .82, and the mean value of communalities was .70. The results showed that all communalities were above .50 (Table 7).

Table 7: Commonalties

Variables	Extraction
1	.63
2	.77
3	** .82
4	.77
5	.69
6	.72
7	*.55
8	.68
9	.64
10	.57
11	.74
12	.77
13	.70
14	.56
15	.60
16	.69
17	.81
18	.81
19	.62
20	.79
21	.79
22	.79
23	.66

The mean value is .70

** Minimum*

*** Maximum*

3.5 Correlations

In this study, all 23 items were correlated at .30, resulting in 127 correlations, as shown in bold (Table 8), all anti-image correlations in which were over .50, as shown in bold (Table 9).

3.6 Rotated component loadings

The results showed that component 1 had seven items, component 2 had five items, component 3 had five items, component 4 had three items, and component 5 had three items. In the results, component loadings < .50 are not shown (Table 10).

Table 10: Rotated component matrix

Variables	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
1					.74
2					.70
3	.67				.56
4	.66				
5			.63		
6			.72		
7	.54				
8			.70		
9			.72		
10			.68		
11	.84				
12	.86				
13	.80				
14					
15	.68				
16				.75	
17				.77	
18				.74	
19		.67			
20		.76			
21		.78			
22		.88			
23		.76			

Items with less than .50 have not been shown

3.7 Number of components (cumulative variance)

The results of extraction for explanation of variance showed component 1 (20.29%), component 2 (15.75%), component 3 (14.26%), component 4 (11.94%), and component 5 (8.04%). The total variance is 70.28% (Table 11).

Table 11: Number of components extracted (latent root criterion)

Total variance explained									
Var.	Eigenvalues			Extraction SS loadings			Rotation SS loadings		
	Total	Var.	Cum. %	Total	Var.	Cum. %	% of		
							Total	Var.	Cum. %
1.	8.31	36.15	36.15	8.31	36.15	36.15	4.67	20.29	20.29
2.	3.70	16.10	52.24	3.70	16.10	52.24	3.62	15.75	36.05
3.	1.77	7.67	59.92	1.77	7.67	59.92	3.28	14.26	50.30
4.	1.23	5.33	65.24	1.23	5.33	65.24	2.75	11.94	62.24
5.	1.16	5.04	70.28	1.16	5.04	70.28	1.85	8.04	70.28
6.	.81	3.53	73.81						
7.	.72	3.12	76.92						
8.	.69	3.02	79.94						
9.	.61	2.63	82.57						
10.	.55	2.39	84.96						
11.	.48	2.09	87.05						
12.	.40	1.75	88.80						
13.	.38	1.66	90.46						
14.	.36	1.56	92.02						
15.	.32	1.41	93.43						
16.	.30	1.30	94.73						
17.	.27	1.18	95.91						
18.	.23	.98	96.89						
19.	.21	.92	97.81						
20.	.16	.69	98.50						
21.	.14	.61	99.11						
22.	.12	.51	99.62						
23.	.09	.38	100.00						

Legend:

SS = Sum of Squares

Cum. = cumulative

Var. = variance

3.8 Number of components (eigenvalues)

The results showed that five eigenvalues are greater than 1.0. They were 8.31 (component 1), 3.70 (component 2), 1.77 (component 3), 1.23 (component 4), and 1.16 component 5 (Table 11).

3.9 Component labelling

Component labelling was as follows: component 1; ***“patients are not allowed to express themselves”***, component 2; ***“advantages and disadvantages of treatment are not explained to patients”***, Component 3; ***“doctors, nurses, and midwives do not display empathy towards patients”***, component 4; ***“doctors, nurses, and midwives do not provide information on patients treatment”*** (Table 12; Fig. 1 - Fig. 4).

Table 12: Component labels

Variables	Component				Component Label
	1	2	3	4	
3	.67				
4	.66				
7	.54				
11	.84				Patients are not allowed to express themselves
12	.86				
13	.80				
15	.68				

6	.72	Doctors, nurses and midwives do not display empathy towards patients.
8	.70	
9	.72	
10	.68	
16	.75	Doctors, nurses and midwives do not provide information on patients' treatment
17	.77	
18	.74	
19	.69	Advantages and disadvantages of treatment are not explained to patients
20	.76	
21	.78	
22	.88	
23	.76	

Rotation method was by Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Items with less than .50 have not been shown

Fig. 1: Component 1 labelled with 7 items




Fig. 2: Component 2 labelled with 5 items




Fig. 3: Component 3 labelled with 4 items





Fig. 4: Component 4 labelled with 3 items



3.10 Descriptive statistics of the 4HPQ and 8QIRT

In this study, the means and standard deviations showed that the additional eight questions on treatment information (8QIRT) were the least ranked. On the "Four Habits Model" [9], Habit IV (invest in the end) was least ranked, followed by Habit III (demonstrate empathy), then Habit II (elicit patients perspective), and then Habit I (invest in the beginning) (Table 13).

Table 13: Descriptive statistics for the 4HPQ and 8QIRT

Habit	Var.	M	SD	Habit M
I	1	4.90	1.65	5.10
	2	5.18	1.40	
	3	5.23	1.36	
II	4	5.19	1.38	4.74
	5	4.74	1.68	
	6	4.29	1.97	
III	7	5.21	1.47	4.69
	8	4.60	1.63	
	9	4.25	1.58	
IV	10	4.37	1.79	4.48
	11	4.87	1.64	
	12	5.08	1.54	
	13	4.72	1.75	
	14	3.88	1.97	
	15	3.93	2.03	
8QIRT	16	3.52	1.99	2.84
	17	3.12	1.88	
	18	2.98	1.81	
	19	2.94	1.83	
	20	2.70	1.69	
	21	2.69	1.66	
	22	2.29	1.60	
	23	2.47	1.74	

Legend:

Var. = Variable

M = Mean

SD = Standard deviation

4HPQ = Four Habits Patients Questionnaire [10]

8QIRT = Eight questions on information regarding treatment

4. DISCUSSION

The explorative study was conducted to answer the research question (How do Ghanaian patients describe communication between themselves and nurses, midwives and doctors regarding the core elements of “Four Habits Model” [9]) measured by Four Habits Patients Questionnaire (4HPQ) [10]?). To answer this question, data were collected using the Four Habits Patients Questionnaire (4HPQ) [10] and eight questions on treatment information (8QIRT) and analyzed using principal component analysis (PCA). Therefore, the data were examined for appropriateness using PCA to analyze and determine which components could account for the core elements of the “Four Habits Model” [9].

When analyzing data using PCA, there are several important requirements. Some important requirements are sampling adequacy, level of significance, rotated component matrix, correlations, communalities, latent root criterion, and eigenvalues. Below are discussions of these requirements.

The determination of sampling adequacy was by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion was used to determine sampling adequacy. In this study, the sampling adequacy was .88 (Table 7). Kaiser [21] reported that KMO values were closer to 1.0, and Gamst and Guarino [22] indicated that a value of .70 is considered as adequate.

In addition, it has been reported that the level of significance of PCA should be greater than the probability of Bartlett's test of sphericity [23]. The probability associated with the Bartlett test in this study was $P < 0.001$ (Table 6), which satisfied this requirement.

In this study, all 23 items were correlated at least .30 with another item (Table 8). This satisfies the researchers' advice that if the number of correlations above .30 in the matrix is small, it is better not to continue with the analyses [24, 25].

Furthermore, when using PCA, the requirements of having correlations $> .30$ and anti-image correlation $> .50$ between the variables were satisfied [24]. In this study, there were 127 correlations $> .30$ (Table 8) and anti-image correlation $> .50$ (Table 9) in the matrix.

In this study, all communalities were above .50, with a minimum of .55, a maximum of .82, and a mean of .70 (Table 7). These commonality values satisfy a report that the solution using PCA explains more than half of each original variable's variance; therefore, communalities for each variable shall be $> .50$ [22].

After satisfying the important requirements, an important step was to determine the number of components because PCA is a reduction technique. Therefore, the latent root criterion and eigenvalues are used to determine the number of components.

First, the latent root criterion for the number of extracted components showed five components (Table 10). However, a 4-component solution is preferred because of the inadequate number of primary loadings [26].

Second, the initial eigenvalue component explanations were Components 1 (20.29%), 2 (15.75%), 3 (14.26%), 4 (11.94%), and 5 (8.04%). The examination of eigenvalues was performed by varimax rotations of the component loadings. A 4-component solution was preferred because the cumulative proportion of variance criteria (62.24%) (Table 12) could be satisfied. It has been recommended that the criterion for explaining $> 60\%$ of the total variance should be satisfied [21].

Furthermore, the number of primary loadings is important in determining the number of components [26]. The determination of principal components (sometimes referred to as the number of components or variables) is critical. According to some researchers a minimum of 3 variables per component is critical [27, 28]. It has also been recommended that at least four measured variables be used for each common component, and perhaps up to 6 [29]. It has been said that components with less than 3 items are generally weak and unstable [29].

There has been limited number of studies that considers patients perception of communication between themselves and nurses, midwives and doctors in Ghana. However, few studies have been conducted in African and other countries.

In this study, there were eight questions on treatment information (8QIRT). This has a correlation with a related study by Gulbrandsen et al. [9], that the "Four Habits" [9] was applicable to doctors with some modifications.

The results of this study showed that component 2 (advantages and disadvantages of treatment not explained to patients) is very important. This study confirmed a study in Nigeria that 53% of outpatients were not provided with sufficient information on their diseases [30].

Furthermore, this study showed that nurses, midwives, and doctors do not provide information on patients' treatment. This has been confirmed by a related study that reported that a further indicator of quality was the proportion of respondents who were told their diagnosis or informed about the management of their illness, and that it was low (43%) [31].

An interesting result of this study was the component with low item loadings. Component 5 had low loadings for both components. This is understandable because the first item "doctors' knowledge of important information about patients' medical history" will be very difficult for a patient to know the nurses, midwives, and doctors' knowledge level because doctors' knowledge cannot be assessed only by patients with a short period of interaction. Importantly, knowledge assessment is subjective. Therefore, it is not surprising that

this item had poor loading. In contrast, the item 2 “doctor meet patients that put them at ease?” which also had low loadings was rather surprising because one would expect patients to be very interested in doctors and nurses, putting them at ease. However, this may be explained by the paternalistic [32] nature of nurses, midwives, and doctors in Africa, especially Ghana, where children are trained to not question the elderly or people in authority. This kind of training is usually applied to many situations, including nurses, midwives, and doctors.

In this study, item 14 (Did the doctor encourage you to be as involved as you would like in decisions about your healthcare?) had no loadings. This is interesting because it is not related to other items. Either participants probably did not understand the question, or it could stand alone without any relationship with the other items.

In this study, the findings using the means and standard deviations showed that the additional eight questions on information regarding treatment (8QIRT) were the least ranked. On the “Four Habits Model” [9], Habit IV (invest in the end) was least ranked, followed by Habit III (demonstrate empathy), then Habit II (elicit patient’s perspective), and then Habit I (invest in the beginning). These findings are consistent with those of a related study using the “Four Habits” [9] at a Norwegian hospital with doctors [9].

5. CONCLUSION

The findings from this study show that the Four Habit Patient Questionnaire (4HPQ) [10] could be reliable and valid for assessing patients’ health communication needs, not only in developed countries but also in developing countries.

Based on this study, patients will want certain issues to be addressed by healthcare providers. Some of the issues are that patients are not allowed to express themselves, the advantages and disadvantages of treatment are not explained to patients, doctors and nurses do not display empathy towards patients, and nurses, midwives, and doctors do not provide information on patients’ treatment. Therefore, an explorative study using the “Four Habits” [9] is applicable to assessing patients’ health communication needs. The “Four Habits” [9] is indicative of how patients health communication needs can be assessed.

These findings guided the author in a Randomized Control Trial (RCT) using communication skills training (CST) for nursing and midwifery students.

CONSENT

All participants consented to participate in the study. Informed consent for participation in the study had been obtained verbally. The aims and objectives of the study were explained to the participants before obtaining their informed consent to participate. Participants consented to publication of this research findings.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

This study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The University for Development Studies, Tamale Institutional Review Board approved this study (Date: January 2016/No: UDS-IRB No.20200101-0535). The procedures used in this study adhere to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki [11, 12].

REFERENCES

1. Hekkink CF, Sixma HJ, Wigersma L, Yzermans CJ, Van Der Meer JTM, Bindels PJE, et al. QUOTE-HIV: an instrument for assessing quality of HIV care from the patients’ perspective. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2003;12:188–93.

2. Ajayi IO, Olumide EA, Oyediran O. Patient satisfaction with the services provided at a general outpatients' clinic, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Afr J Med Med Sci.* 2005;34:133–40.
3. Clever SL, Jin L, Levinson W, Meltzer DO. Does Doctor–Patient Communication Affect Patient Satisfaction with Hospital Care? Results of an Analysis with a Novel Instrumental Variable. *Health Serv Res.* 2008;43 5 Pt 1:1505–19.
4. Roter DL, Hall JA, Kern DE, Barker LR, Cole KA, Roca RP. Improving physicians' interviewing skills and reducing patients' emotional distress. A randomized clinical trial. *Arch Intern Med.* 1995;155:1877–84.
5. Parle M, Jones B, Maguire P. Maladaptive coping and affective disorders among cancer patients. *Psychol Med.* 1996;26:735–44.
6. Ramirez AJ, Graham J, Richards MA, Cull A, Gregory WM. Mental health of hospital consultants: the effects of stress and satisfaction at work. *Lancet.* 1996;347:724–8.
7. Bertakis KD, Azari R. Patient-Centered Care is Associated with Decreased Health Care Utilization. *J Am Board Fam Med.* 2011;24:229–39.
8. Ariba AJ, Thanni LOA, Adebayo EO. Patients' perception of quality of emergency care in a Nigerian teaching hospital: The influence of patient-provider interactions. *Niger Postgrad Med J.* 2007;14:296–301.
9. Gulbrandsen P, Krupat E, Benth JS, Garratt A, Safran DG, Finset A, et al. "Four Habits" goes abroad: report from a pilot study in Norway. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2008;72:388–93.
10. Fossli Jensen B, Dahl FA, Safran DG, Garratt AM, Krupat E, Finset A, et al. The ability of a behaviour-specific patient questionnaire to identify poorly performing doctors. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2011;20:885–93.
11. WMA - The World Medical Association-WMA Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects. <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>. Accessed 14 Sep 2024.
12. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2001;79:373–4.
13. Alhassan M. Communication skills training (CST) to enhance nursing and midwifery students' empathy, communicative competence, communication skills attitude, and self-efficacy. <https://docserv.uni-duesseldorf.de/servlets/DocumentServlet?id=38707>. Accessed 16 Jan 2019.
14. Fossli Jensen B, Gulbrandsen P, Benth JS, Dahl FA, Krupat E, Finset A. Interrater reliability for the Four Habits Coding Scheme as part of a randomized controlled trial. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2010;80:405–9.
15. Krupat E, Frankel R, Stein T, Irish J. The Four Habits Coding Scheme: validation of an instrument to assess clinicians' communication behavior. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2006;62:38–45.
16. Shapiro SS, Wilk MB. An Analysis of Variance Test for Normality (Complete Samples). *Biometrika.* 1965;52:591–611.
17. Razali NM, Wah YB. Power comparisons of shapiro-wilk, kolmogorov-smirnov, lilliefors and anderson-darling tests. *J Stat Model Anal.* 2011;2:21–33.
18. Bryant FB, Yarnold PR. Principal-components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In: Grimm LG, Yarnold PR, editors. *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics.* Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association; 1995. p. 99–136.
19. Garson GD. *Guide to Writing Empirical Papers, Theses, and Dissertations.* CRC Press; 2001.

20. Gorsuch RL. Factor Analysis. Psychology Press; 2013.
21. Kaiser HF. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*. 1958;23:187–200.
22. Meyers LS, Gamst G, Guarino AJ. Applied Multivariate Research: Design and Interpretation. SAGE Publications; 2012.
23. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. Statistical Methods. Wiley; 1991.
24. Norman GR, Streiner DL. Biostatistics: The Bare Essentials. PMPH-USA; 2008.
25. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. Using Multivariate Statistics. Pearson Education; 2012.
26. Hare B, Call J, Tomasello M. Communication of Food Location Between Human and Dog (*Canis Familiaris*). *Evol Commun*. 1998;2:137–59.
27. Rindskopf D. Using phantom and imaginary latent variables to parameterize constraints in linear structural models. *Psychometrika*. 1984;49:37–47.
28. Velicer WF, Fava JL. Affects of variable and subject sampling on factor pattern recovery. *Psychol Methods*. 1998;3:231–51.
29. Fabrigar LR, Wegener DT, MacCallum RC, Strahan EJ. Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychol Methods*. 1999;4:272–99.
30. Akande TM. Patients' Perception on Communication Between Patients and Doctors in a Teaching Hospital. *Sahel Med J*. 2002;5:178–81.
31. Turkson PK. Perceived Quality of Healthcare Delivery in a Rural District of Ghana. *Ghana Med J*. 2009;43:65–70.
32. Shiffrin SV. Paternalism, Unconscionability Doctrine, and Accommodation. *Philos Public Aff*. 2000;29:205–50.