

## Socio-Economic Conditions and Their Effect on Patient Perceptions of Telemedicine Devices Quality

**Molagavalli Rajesh**

Ph.D. Research scholar, Department of Sociology, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India

---

Cite this paper as: Molagavalli Rajesh, (2024). Socio-Economic Conditions and Their Effect on Patient Perceptions of Telemedicine Devices Quality. *Frontiers in Health Informatics*, 13 (3) 1194-1201

---

### Abstract:

The government's efforts to popularize telemedicine will not be successful unless users are satisfied with the quality of digital devices. Therefore, the present study aims to identify the socio-demographic factors influencing the patient community's perception of the quality of digital devices used in telemedicine. The findings of this field survey, conducted in the Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh, have been statistically analyzed, revealing that the following socio-demographic factors serve as major barriers to the patient community's perception of the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations: locality, gender, age, education, and income. It is recommended that the government initiate digital training programs for citizens in general, and the patient community in particular, to improve perceptions of the quality of digital devices.

**Keywords:** Telemedicine, Digital Devices Quality, Socio-demographic Factors, Patient Perception, Digital Training

### Introduction:

The goal of telemedicine engagement in society is to investigate the social dynamics, relationships, and ramifications that emerge when telemedicine is incorporated into healthcare institutions and the general public. This involves studying the effects of telemedicine on patients, healthcare professionals, organizations, and larger societal systems. Some key social points to consider include existing digital gaps, where certain individuals lack access to technology or the know-how to use it. These gaps may be exacerbated by the availability and usage of telemedicine services. Sociological studies examine the impact of these discrepancies on healthcare outcomes and access. Telemedicine services must demonstrate cultural sensitivity and adaptability to various social contexts. Sociologists investigate how social issues, language barriers, and cultural norms affect the use and adoption of telemedicine in different communities.

Telemedicine, a medical innovation, unexpectedly gained popularity after the COVID-19 pandemic. There is no denying its value to society—it benefits both patients and healthcare practitioners. Telemedicine increases access to healthcare services, particularly for those in underdeveloped or remote areas with few medical facilities. This ensures that people don't have to travel long distances for medical advice and treatment. Patients can avoid taking time off work, driving to and from medical appointments, and waiting in crowded waiting rooms by using telemedicine. This reduces the overall burden of seeking medical care and saves time. Telemedicine encourages patients to be more involved in their treatment. With easier appointment scheduling and better access to medical information, patients are empowered to make informed decisions about their health. Telemedicine is especially helpful for managing chronic conditions like diabetes, hypertension, and asthma. Frequent in-person visits are unnecessary for routine check-ups and medication adjustments. By reducing overhead associated with running physical clinics and hospitals, telemedicine can help lower healthcare costs. It may also reduce unnecessary hospital stays and emergency room visits through early intervention.

For senior citizens and others with disabilities who may have difficulty traveling to doctor's appointments, telemedicine offers a lifeline, enabling them to receive healthcare in the comfort of their own homes. Telemedicine can assist people in emergencies by providing initial evaluations and medical guidance, helping them decide whether they need urgent in-

person care. It plays a significant role in destigmatizing mental health treatment by offering therapy and counseling services without the need for patients to visit a physical facility. Telemedicine has the potential to close gaps in global healthcare access by enabling medical consultations in underserved and remote areas. It also reduces the transmission of infectious diseases by allowing medical professionals to assess and advise patients remotely during disease outbreaks or public health emergencies. Even if patients cannot attend a clinic, they can still communicate regularly with their healthcare providers, promoting continuous health monitoring and timely medical intervention. Healthcare workers can share information and stay updated on the latest medical developments by using telemedicine platforms for education and training. The valuable healthcare data generated through telemedicine can contribute to research and public health efforts, improving medical knowledge and health outcomes.

### Literature Review

Telemedicine has emerged as a transformative mode of healthcare delivery, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, providing benefits such as improved accessibility, convenience, and cost-effectiveness. However, socio-economic factors significantly influence patient perceptions and adoption of telemedicine devices, leading to disparities in healthcare access. Research by Siddiqui et al. (2023) highlighted barriers like limited access to technology and unfamiliarity with telemedicine platforms, emphasizing the importance of digital literacy and equitable access. Similarly, Aneja (2022) found high patient satisfaction with telemedicine despite challenges, stressing the need for continuous evaluation of telemedicine services to address emerging issues and enhance service quality. These findings indicate that socio-economic factors, including income and education levels, play a critical role in shaping patient perceptions of telemedicine device quality.

The role of social connectivity in telemedicine further underscores the importance of addressing socio-economic disparities. Watson, Lupton, and Michael (2021) demonstrated how digital platforms maintain patient-provider communication and social support during crises, while Kodali et al. (2020) identified user-centric design and responsive technological solutions as key factors influencing patient perceptions of telemedicine tools. Arcury et al. (2020) found that computer anxiety negatively affected eHealth literacy among low-income older adults, suggesting the need for targeted educational interventions. These findings collectively highlight the intersection of socio-economic status and digital literacy, underscoring the necessity of addressing these gaps to ensure equitable telemedicine adoption.

Digital divide and health equity remain critical concerns in telemedicine adoption. Azzopardi-Muscat & Sørensen (2019) emphasized that while digital technologies have the potential to bridge healthcare gaps, they can also exacerbate disparities if not implemented equitably. Granger (2016) and Lustria, Smith, and Hinnant (2011) underscored the influence of socio-demographic factors like income, education, and familiarity with technology on telemedicine adoption. Additionally, Skinner, Biscope, and Poland (2003) found that privacy and internet access significantly shape patient trust in digital platforms. Addressing these issues requires targeted strategies such as subsidizing technology, promoting digital literacy, and improving digital infrastructure to enhance perceptions of telemedicine device quality.

Despite existing research addressing various aspects of telemedicine adoption, a significant research gap remains regarding the influence of socio-economic conditions on patient perceptions of digital device quality in telemedicine. While studies like Siddiqui et al. (2023) and Aneja (2022) explore barriers to telemedicine and patient satisfaction, they do not deeply examine how socio-demographic factors—such as income, education, and locality—directly impact perceptions of telemedicine devices. Furthermore, while research by Arcury et al. (2020) and Azzopardi-Muscat & Sørensen (2019) highlights issues related to digital literacy and health equity, they do not specifically address how these factors influence patients' evaluations of the quality of telemedicine tools. Additionally, studies like Granger (2016) and Lustria, Smith, and Hinnant (2011) focus on technology preferences but fail to integrate socio-economic disparities in shaping these preferences. There is a need for more research to explore how socio-economic conditions affect patient perceptions and to develop strategies for improving telemedicine accessibility and effectiveness across diverse populations.

### Objectives:

- To study the influence of various socio-demographic factors of the patient community on patients' perceptions of the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations.
- To suggest ways to overcome the impediments posed by socio-demographic factors in developing a positive perception of the quality of telemedicine's digital devices in the minds of patients.

### Hypothesis:

- There is no significant association between the Socio-demographic profile of the respondents and their perception on the Quality of digital devices

### Research Methodology:

#### Area of the Study

Chittoor district in Andhra Pradesh was purposively selected for the present study. According to the 2011 census, Chittoor district had a population of 4,174,064, with 2,090,204 males and 2,083,860 females. In Andhra Pradesh, e-Sanjeevani Telemedicine services were introduced after the COVID-19 pandemic. The Andhra Pradesh government established three Telemedicine hubs in November 2020 to meet the healthcare needs of the people. One of these hubs is located in Tirupati, which provides healthcare services to Chittoor district through telemedicine. The nature of the research is descriptive.

#### Sample Size And Distribution

Users of the e-Sanjeevani Telemedicine platform accessed through the sub-centers and UPHCs in Chittoor district were referred to as the universe of the study. Between January 1 and December 31, 2021, there were 8,180 telemedicine consultations through the e-Sanjeevani platform in the Chittoor area. The sample size is 5% of all consultations, which equals 409 ( $0.05 * 8,180$ ). A purposive sampling strategy was adopted for data collection. In Chittoor district, there are 522 sub-centers with telemedicine facilities and 35 UPHCs. This gives a total of 557 centers with telemedicine capabilities ( $522 + 35$ ). The sample was drawn from 7% of the total number of centers with e-Sanjeevani Telemedicine access, which equals 39 centers ( $0.07 * 557$ ). The number of centers selected for sampling in each revenue division of Chittoor district was determined based on the percentage of total centers with telemedicine capabilities in each division. The sample from each center was carefully chosen based on availability and willingness to participate in the interview process. Efforts were made to ensure that the sample represents various social backgrounds.

**Table 1: Sample distribution in Chittoor District**

| Revenue Division | Centres having Telemedicine facility | Percentage | Number of centres taken for sampling |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| Madanpalli       | 228                                  | 40.93      | $0.4093 * 39 = 16$                   |
| Tirupati         | 173                                  | 31.06      | $0.3106 * 39 = 12$                   |
| Chittoor         | 156                                  | 28.00      | $0.28 * 39 = 11$                     |
| Total            | 557                                  | 100        | 39                                   |

### Data Analysis:

**Table 2: Socio-demographic details of the Respondents**

| Socio-demographic variables | Response | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|

|                       |                        |     |        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----|--------|
| <b>Locality</b>       | Rural                  | 281 | 68.70  |
|                       | Urban                  | 128 | 31.30  |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Gender</b>         | Male                   | 217 | 53.06  |
|                       | Female                 | 192 | 46.94  |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Age</b>            | 0-20 Years             | 36  | 8.80   |
|                       | 21-35 Years            | 116 | 28.36  |
|                       | 36-55 Years            | 152 | 37.16  |
|                       | 56 and above           | 105 | 25.67  |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Religion</b>       | Hindu                  | 331 | 80.93  |
|                       | Muslim                 | 41  | 10.02  |
|                       | Christian              | 37  | 9.05   |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Caste</b>          | OC                     | 91  | 22.25  |
|                       | BC                     | 198 | 48.41  |
|                       | SC                     | 84  | 20.54  |
|                       | ST                     | 36  | 8.80   |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Occupation</b>     | Formal                 | 33  | 8.07   |
|                       | Informal               | 376 | 91.93  |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Education</b>      | Illiterate             | 138 | 33.74  |
|                       | 1-5th class            | 51  | 12.47  |
|                       | 6-7th class            | 56  | 13.69  |
|                       | 8-10th class           | 55  | 13.45  |
|                       | intermediate           | 65  | 15.89  |
|                       | Degree and above       | 44  | 10.76  |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>Monthly Income</b> | Below 5000             | 38  | 9.29   |
|                       | 5001 - 10000 Rupees    | 175 | 42.79  |
|                       | 10001 - 15000 Rupees   | 120 | 29.34  |
|                       | 15001 - 20000 Rupees   | 42  | 10.27  |
|                       | 20001 Rupees and Above | 34  | 8.31   |
|                       | Total                  | 409 | 100.00 |

**Table 3: Responses of the Patients on Quality of Digital devices**

| <b>Quality of digital devices</b> | <b>Response</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>The video quality is good</b>  | Strongly Agree  | 1                | 0.24           |

|                                                     |                            |     |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|--------|
|                                                     | Agree                      | 43  | 10.51  |
|                                                     | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 229 | 55.99  |
|                                                     | Disagree                   | 134 | 32.76  |
|                                                     | Strongly Disagree          | 2   | 0.49   |
|                                                     | Total                      | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>The sound quality is good</b>                    | Strongly Agree             | 4   | 0.98   |
|                                                     | Agree                      | 228 | 55.75  |
|                                                     | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 175 | 42.79  |
|                                                     | Disagree                   | 2   | 0.49   |
|                                                     | Total                      | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>The prescription quality in the text is good</b> | Strongly Agree             | 31  | 7.58   |
|                                                     | Agree                      | 251 | 61.37  |
|                                                     | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 124 | 30.32  |
|                                                     | Disagree                   | 3   | 0.73   |
|                                                     | Total                      | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>The speed of digital devices is good</b>         | Strongly Agree             | 7   | 1.71   |
|                                                     | Agree                      | 157 | 38.39  |
|                                                     | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 241 | 58.92  |
|                                                     | Disagree                   | 4   | 0.98   |
|                                                     | Total                      | 409 | 100.00 |
| <b>The speed of the internet adequate</b>           | Strongly Agree             | 1   | 0.24   |
|                                                     | Agree                      | 56  | 13.69  |
|                                                     | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 280 | 68.46  |
|                                                     | Disagree                   | 67  | 16.38  |
|                                                     | Strongly Disagree          | 5   | 1.22   |
|                                                     | Total                      | 409 | 100.00 |

**Table 4: Testing the significance of the Null Hypothesis**

| Variables | Response | N | Mean Rank | KWH/MU values |
|-----------|----------|---|-----------|---------------|
|-----------|----------|---|-----------|---------------|

|                           |                  |     |        |                                      |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|--------------------------------------|
| Locality                  | Rural            | 281 | 190.53 | U=13917.500<br>P=.001***             |
|                           | Urban            | 128 | 236.77 |                                      |
| Gender                    | Male             | 217 | 232.46 | U=14874.000<br>P=.001***             |
|                           | Female           | 192 | 173.97 |                                      |
| Age                       | 0-20 Years       | 36  | 247.25 | $\chi^2=10.923$<br>Df=3<br>P=.012*   |
|                           | 21-35 Years      | 116 | 221.84 |                                      |
|                           | 36-55 Years      | 152 | 195.11 |                                      |
|                           | 56 and above     | 105 | 186.23 |                                      |
| Religion                  | Hindu            | 331 | 206.16 | $\chi^2=1.876$<br>Df=2<br>P=.391@    |
|                           | Muslim           | 41  | 183.67 |                                      |
|                           | Christian        | 37  | 218.24 |                                      |
| Caste                     | OC               | 91  | 231.16 | $\chi^2=6.702$<br>Df=3<br>P=.082@    |
|                           | BC               | 198 | 195.22 |                                      |
|                           | SC               | 84  | 206.83 |                                      |
|                           | ST               | 36  | 188.39 |                                      |
| Educational Qualification | Illiterate       | 138 | 166.76 | $\chi^2=25.248$<br>Df=5<br>P=.001*** |
|                           | 1-5th class      | 51  | 202.20 |                                      |
|                           | 6-7th class      | 56  | 229.70 |                                      |
|                           | 8-10th class     | 55  | 227.84 |                                      |
|                           | Intermediate     | 65  | 223.25 |                                      |
|                           | Degree and above | 44  | 241.24 |                                      |
| Occupation Status         | Formal           | 33  | 251.50 | U=4669.500<br>P=.017*                |
|                           | Informal         | 376 | 200.92 |                                      |
| Monthly Income            | Below ₹5000      | 38  | 175.16 | $\chi^2=21.572$<br>Df=4<br>P=.001*** |
|                           | ₹5001 - 10000    | 175 | 184.00 |                                      |
|                           | ₹10001 - 15000   | 120 | 217.37 |                                      |
|                           | ₹15001 - 20000   | 42  | 234.33 |                                      |
|                           | ₹20001 and above | 34  | 266.54 |                                      |
|                           | Total            | 409 |        |                                      |

**Significance Level:** p<0.001\*\*\*, p<0.01\*\*, p<0.05\*, @-Not Significant

**Source of Data:** Primary

### Interpretation:

The KWH/MU test was carried out to assess the association between the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations and the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. The following table provides the association analysis data concerning the corresponding research findings.

The socio-demographic variables (Locality, Gender, Age, Religion, Caste, Educational Qualification, Occupational Status, and Monthly Income) were analyzed to determine the strength of their association with the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations.

The results of Table No. 4 from the KWH test, or Mann-Whitney U test, indicate that the respondents' perceptions of the quality of digital devices are significantly associated with the following six socio-demographic variables: (i) Locality (U=13,917.500, p<0.001), (ii) Gender (U=14,874.000, p<0.001), (iii) Age ( $\chi^2=10.923$ , p<0.05), (iv) Educational

Qualification ( $\chi^2=25.248$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), (v) Occupation Status ( $U=4,669.500$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), and (vi) Monthly Income ( $\chi^2=21.572$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

**Locality:** Urban respondents registered a higher mean score ( $M=236.77$ ) on their perception of the quality of digital devices, compared to rural respondents ( $M=190.53$ ). This suggests that urban respondents have a better perception of the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations than their rural counterparts.

**Gender:** Male respondents had a higher mean score ( $M=232.46$ ) regarding the perception of digital device quality than female respondents ( $M=173.97$ ). This indicates that male respondents generally perceive the quality of telemedicine devices as being better than female respondents.

**Age:** Respondents in the 0-20 age group registered the highest mean score ( $M=247.25$ ) regarding the quality of digital devices. The mean scores of the other age groups were as follows: (a) 21-35 Years ( $M=221.84$ ), (b) 36-55 Years ( $M=195.11$ ), and (c) 56 and above ( $M=186.23$ ). This indicates that younger respondents perceive the quality of telemedicine devices more favorably than older respondents, and perception of digital device quality tends to decline with age.

**Educational Qualification:** Respondents with a Degree or higher qualification registered the highest mean score ( $M=241.24$ ) regarding digital device quality. Other educational groups had the following mean scores: (a) Intermediate ( $M=223.25$ ), (b) 8-10th class ( $M=227.84$ ), (c) 6-7th class ( $M=229.70$ ), (d) 1-5th class ( $M=202.20$ ), and (e) Illiterate ( $M=166.76$ ). Thus, those with higher educational qualifications perceived the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations to be the highest.

**Occupation Status:** Respondents in the formal sector reported a higher mean score ( $M=251.50$ ) on the quality of digital devices compared to respondents in the informal sector ( $M=190.92$ ). This suggests that formal sector workers perceived the quality of telemedicine devices as being higher than informal sector workers.

**Monthly Income:** Respondents in the "High monthly income ( $\text{₹}20,001$  and above)" group registered the highest mean score ( $M=241.24$ ) for their perception of digital device quality. The mean scores for the other income groups were: (a)  $\text{₹}15,001-20,000$  ( $M=234.33$ ), (b)  $\text{₹}10,001-15,000$  ( $M=217.37$ ), (c)  $\text{₹}5,001-10,000$  ( $M=184.00$ ), and (d) Below  $\text{₹}5,000$  ( $M=175.16$ ). This indicates that higher monthly income is positively associated with better perceptions of the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations.

In contrast, the respondents' perceptions of the quality of digital devices were not significantly associated with **Religion** ( $\chi^2=4.102$ ,  $p=0.129$ ) and **Caste** ( $\chi^2=1.647$ ,  $p=0.649$ ). Therefore, religion and caste do not appear to significantly influence the respondents' perceptions of the quality of digital devices used in telemedicine consultations.

### Conclusion:

The study reveals significant associations between socio-demographic factors and patients' perceptions of the quality of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations. Key factors influencing these perceptions include locality, gender, age, educational qualification, occupation status, and monthly income. Urban respondents, males, younger individuals, those with higher educational qualifications, formal sector workers, and those with higher income levels tended to have more favorable perceptions of digital devices used for telemedicine consultations. In contrast, religion and caste were found to have no significant impact on these perceptions. These findings highlight the need for tailored approaches to address the diverse needs of different socio-demographic groups, ensuring that telemedicine services reach all segments of the population effectively.

### Suggestions:

- Governments should focus on urban-rural disparities by improving digital infrastructure in rural areas and promoting awareness about telemedicine services.
- Telemedicine platforms should ensure that the quality of services and devices is consistently high across both genders, addressing any potential barriers that might contribute to gender differences in perception.



- Tailored training programs should be designed for older age groups to enhance their confidence and familiarity with telemedicine technologies.
- Policies should address educational and income disparities by providing access to training and affordable devices, especially for lower-income and less-educated groups.
- Continuous monitoring and feedback mechanisms should be established to ensure the consistent quality of digital devices used in telemedicine services, particularly in underserved areas.

### Acknowledgement

The researcher is deeply grateful to the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) for providing funding for his doctoral program.

### References

1. Aneja, J., Goyal, T., Verma, M., Kaur, G., Mirza, M., & Gupta, S. (2022). Client satisfaction with telemedicine services during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey from a teaching institute of North India. *Journal of family medicine and primary care*, 11(9), 5187–5193.
2. Arcury, T. A., Sandberg, J. C., Melius, K. P., Quandt, S. A., Leng, X., Latulipe, C., Miller, D. P., Jr, Smith, D. A., & Bertoni, A. G. (2020). Older Adult Internet Use and eHealth Literacy. *Journal of applied gerontology : the official journal of the Southern Gerontological Society*, 39(2), 141–150.
3. Azzopardi-Muscat, N., & Sørensen, K. (2019). Towards an equitable digital public health era: promoting equity through a health literacy perspective. *European journal of public health*, 29(Supplement\_3), 13–17.
4. Granger, D., Vandelanotte, C., Duncan, M. J., Alley, S., Schoeppe, S., Short, C., & Rebar, A. (2016). Is preference for mHealth intervention delivery platform associated with delivery platform familiarity?. *BMC public health*, 16, 619.
5. Kodali, P. B., Hense, S., Kopparty, S., Kalapala, G. R., & Haloi, B. (2020). How Indians responded to the Arogya Setu app?. *Indian journal of public health*, 64(Supplement), S228–S230.
6. Lustria, M. L., Smith, S. A., & Hinnant, C. C. (2011). Exploring digital divides: an examination of eHealth technology use in health information seeking, communication and personal health information management in the USA. *Health informatics journal*, 17(3), 224–243.
7. Siddiqui, S., Farr, E., Dusto, N., Chen, L., Kocherginsky, M., Skelton, F., Verduzco-Gutierrez, M., & Lee, S. (2023). Telemedicine Use Among Psychiatrists During the Early Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic and Potential for Future Use. *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*, 29(2), 242–252.
8. Skinner, H., Biscope, S., & Poland, B. (2003). Quality of internet access: barrier behind internet use statistics. *Social science & medicine (1982)*, 57(5), 875–880.
9. Watson, A., Lupton, D., & Michael, M. (2021). Enacting intimacy and sociality at a distance in the COVID-19 crisis: the sociomaterialities of home-based communication technologies. *Media International Australia*, 178(1), 136–150.