

## Digital Marketing Strategies For Private And Public Hospitals: A Comparative Analysis

Mr. Swapnil Narake<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Sanjay Dharmadhikari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Research Scholar, Institute of Business Management & Rural Development. Vadgaon Gupta (Vilad Ghat), P.O. MIDC, Ahmednagar. Pin No-414111. Ahmednagar, (MS) India. swapnilnarake@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Research Guide, Director, Institute of Business Management & Rural Development. Vadgaon Gupta (Vilad Ghat), P.O. MIDC, Ahmednagar. Pin No-414111. Ahmednagar, (MS) India. Dharmadhikari02@gmail.com

### Abstract

For hospitals to connect and communicate with their patients in the quickly changing healthcare industry, digital marketing has become a crucial tool. In this research report, the digital marketing strategies used by public and private hospitals are compared. This research examines the efficacy of these strategies utilizing a facts analysis-primarily based have a look at with a sample size of 250 respondents, targeting factors which includes social media presence, search engine marketing, email advertising and marketing, and patient interaction. The results highlight important areas where public healthcare organizations fall short and provide insight into how private hospitals use digital platforms more successfully than public hospitals. The study also emphasizes how telemedicine services and online patient reviews are becoming more and more significant in influencing patient decision. Both industries may enhance their outreach and service delivery to the digitally informed people by comprehending these strategies.

**Keywords:** Digital Marketing, Private Hospitals, Public Hospitals, Patient Engagement, Social Media, Search Engine Optimization (SEO), Email Marketing, Telehealth, Healthcare Marketing,

### 1. Introduction

The healthcare industry is not an exception to how digital marketing has changed businesses throughout the globe. To interact with patients, market it offerings, and improve their reputations, each public and private hospitals are increasingly using digital platforms. In order to stay competitive, hospitals ought to alter their advertising strategies as healthcare clients rely increasingly on the internet for information and decision-making. The emergence of digital tools like electronic mail marketing, social media, and seo (search engine marketing) has given healthcare corporations the hazard to increase affected person happiness and outreach. Between public and private hospitals, the efficacy of those strategies differs substantially.

Due to their focus on profit and competitiveness, private hospitals are often quicker to implement digital marketing strategies. According to research, private healthcare providers spend a lot of money improving their online visibility via social media engagement, patient-focused content, and tailored marketing initiatives (Radu et. al., 2018). By offering convenient services like online appointments, telemedicine consultations, and real-time patient feedback systems, these institutions use digital tools to draw in and keep patients (Syed et al., 2021). As a end result, personal hospitals regularly do higher than public hospitals in terms of patient involvement, on-line exposure, and overall efficacy of digital advertising.

Public hospitals, on the other hand, deal with issues which includes restrained price range, purple tape, and a slower price of change. A lack of assets and specialised understanding in digital advertising once in a while impedes the efforts of public hospitals that have all started imposing virtual marketing strategies (Huppertz et al., 2017). Many public healthcare organizations thus underuse digital media or depend on conventional communication strategies. While public hospitals promote accessibility and cost, their digital presence is less sophisticated than that of their private counterparts, according to a comparative study of public marketing strategies in the healthcare industry (Erdem & Harrison-Walker, 2006).

In addition to patient acquisition, digital marketing is crucial for hospitals. Strong digital presences had been proven to enhance affected person enjoy universal, growth patient self assurance, and expedite sanatorium operations (Alexandra and Nadjib, 2023). In order to fulfill the demands of increasingly more tech-savvy healthcare customers, hospitals must provide precedence to digital channels. The growing tendency of clients searching out fitness facts on-line emphasizes how vital digital advertising is to steer healthcare choices. More than 70% of American people, in step with Pew Research, have looked for fitness-associated data online, and lots of them base their healthcare choices at the effects (Fox & Duggan, 2013). In nations like India, where digital use in healthcare is growing quickly, this tendency is similarly common (Zade et. al., 2020).

There isn't much research on how public and private hospitals in developing nations use digital marketing strategies, despite the field's expanding significance. By comparing the virtual advertising techniques utilized by public and personal hospitals, the present research work at seeks to shut the gap. The research also explores how those equipment have an effect on affected person conduct, health facility reputation, and care delivery. It specializes in several virtual advertising and marketing techniques, which include social media, SEO, electronic mail advertising, and patient interplay platforms.

This study will advance knowledge of how healthcare organizations may use digital tools to enhance patient outcomes and hospital performance by examining current digital marketing trends in both public and private hospitals. The results will also provide politicians and healthcare administrators practical advice, highlighting the need of a more creative and strategic approach to digital marketing in public health systems.

## 2. Review of Literature

Numerous studies emphasizes how social media has revolutionized healthcare marketing. According to Alalwan et al. (2017), hospitals now depend heavily on social media sites like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter to talk with patients, disseminate health data, and put it on the market their services. Patient engagement and satisfaction have grown as a consequence of private hospitals' proactive use of these platforms to promote direct connection with patients. Additionally, private hospitals often use social media targeted advertising to draw in patients from certain demographics, such those in need of specialist care (Moorhead et al., 2013).

Another crucial component of digital marketing in the healthcare industry is search engine optimization, or SEO. In order to make sure that their web sites display up higher in seek engine results while sufferers look for fitness-related statistics or services, hospitals use search engine optimization strategies. According to investigate through Chaffey and Ellis-Chadwick (2019), personal hospitals spend extra cash on SEO than public hospitals do. This helps them become more visible online and draw in more patients. Given the abundance of healthcare alternatives available to patients in competitive metropolitan marketplaces, this is especially important.

While public hospitals have had greater achievement using state-of-the-art digital advertising techniques, personal hospitals are from time to time hindered by way of a lack of sources and a slower fee of era adoption. A examine by means of Berthon et al. (2012) determined that loss of advertising abilities, bureaucratic decision-making processes, and monetary constraints make it tough for public hospitals to undertake virtual advertising strategies. Compared to private hospitals, their online presence is thus often less thorough and interesting. However, in their marketing, public hospitals often highlight price, accessibility, and transparency, which appeals to patients who value affordable treatment above state-of-the-art facilities (Cockerham et al., 2017).

Additionally, email marketing is essential for promoting healthcare. Personalized email campaigns are often used by private hospitals to inform patients about appointments, new services, and health advice. Email marketing, especially when paired with loyalty programs or health reminders, is highly successful in keeping patients and promoting return visits, claim Karjalainen et al. (2015). However, email marketing is typically underutilized in public hospitals, sometimes as a result of inadequate data infrastructure and a lower priority for customer relationship management (CRM) systems (Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick, 2019).

Businesses need to have a pool of people with digital skills in order to promote digital agripreneurship, according to Chaudhari and Anute (2022). By proving its value to farmers and how it differentiates from other m-Agri apps, the Uphoven app will draw in additional farmers who do not presently use it. Advertising is a deliberate kind of communication that employs both spoken and nonverbal cues. For the benefit of farmers, the government and many businesses are funding agriculture marketing campaigns. In order to double farmer productivity and triple farmer income in the next years, digital agriculture marketing will be essential.

The reputation and patient acquisition of a hospital are now heavily influenced by patient interaction and online reviews. According to research by Ahmad et al. (2017), patient preferences for healthcare providers are increasingly influenced by online reviews and ratings. By replying to patient reviews and encouraging pleased patients to post good comments, private hospitals often actively manage their online reputation. Public hospitals, on the other hand, take longer to implement these techniques because to their restricted funding, which may harm their reputation among the public. Nonetheless, several public hospitals are working to enhance their online presence as they start to understand the need of managing their digital reputation (Mackey & Liang, 2013).

Finally, a rising corpus of research highlights how crucial patient data analytics are to the development of digital marketing strategies. Private hospitals may develop more individualized and successful marketing efforts by using big data and AI-driven analytics (Zhang et al., 2019). However, because of institutional and financial constraints, public hospitals often embrace data analytics more slowly. But if digital health technology becomes more widely available, public hospitals may be able to bridge this gap and use data-driven marketing strategies more effectively in the future.

### 3. Research Methodology

Since the goal of the current study was to evaluate the digital marketing strategies used by public and private hospitals, a cross-sectional survey research approach was deemed acceptable. A sample size of 250 respondents, including digital marketing specialists, hospital administrators, and healthcare marketing managers from both public and private hospitals in India, was chosen in order to get thorough insights. This guaranteed a fair assessment of the two categories of healthcare organizations' digital marketing strategies.

The population was divided into two strata depending on hospital type (private and public) using stratified random sampling. In order to collect a wide range of answers from various regions around the nation, each stratum was then further subdivided by geographic area. To provide proper representation of public and private hospitals from different regions, a random sampling of respondents was conducted from each stratum. This method made sure that the study included different viewpoints on hospital kinds and regions' digital marketing strategies.

An online questionnaire served as the main method of data collection, allowing for prompt replies from a distributed sample. The survey included 20 closed-ended questions covering a number topics related to digital marketing techniques, which includes strategies for patient interaction, electronic mail advertising, online recognition control, social media use, and search engine optimization. Five demographic questions that focused on the respondent's position, years of healthcare marketing experience, hospital type (private or public), and geographic location were also included. These demographic characteristics helped put the data in perspective.

The primary objective of this study was to assess the efficacy and variations in digital marketing strategies used by public and private hospitals, as well as the acceptance of new digital tools and the difficulties encountered during implementation. With an emphasis on finding potential for public hospitals to enhance their digital presence, the secondary objective was to examine how these strategies affect patient engagement and satisfaction.

The hypotheses of the study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

H0: "There is no significant difference in the digital marketing strategies employed by private and public hospitals."

H1: "There is a significant difference in the digital marketing strategies employed by private and public hospitals."

Hypothesis 2:

H0: "There is no significant association between hospital type (private or public) and the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies in improving patient engagement."

H1: "There is a significant association between hospital type (private or public) and the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies in improving patient engagement."

### 4. Empirical Results

**Table 1: Gender**

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	121	48.4%	48.4%	48.4%
Female	127	50.8%	50.8%	99.2%
Other	2	0.8%	0.8%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

#### Interpretation:

The sample is composed of 50.8% females and 48.4% males, with 0.8% selecting 'Other'. The research captures the opinions of both genders, with a small percentage identifying as others, as seen by the generally equal gender distribution.

**Table 2: Age Group**

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18-25 years	58	23.2%	23.2%	23.2%
26-35 years	92	36.8%	36.8%	60.0%
36-45 years	46	18.4%	18.4%	78.4%
46-55 years	31	12.4%	12.4%	90.8%
56+ years	23	9.2%	9.2%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

The biggest age group of respondents (36.8%) is between the ages of 26 and 35, followed by 23.2% who are between the ages of 18 and 25 years. With 9.2% of respondents being 56 years of age or older, the sample is representative of a range of age groups, guaranteeing that opinions from a range of age groups are represented.

**Table 3: Education Level**

Education Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
High school	32	12.8%	12.8%	12.8%
Undergraduate	96	38.4%	38.4%	51.2%
Postgraduate	78	31.2%	31.2%	82.4%
Doctorate	22	8.8%	8.8%	91.2%
Other	22	8.8%	8.8%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Although respondents have a wide range of educational backgrounds, the majority (38.4%) have an undergraduate degree. A tiny percentage of the sample has doctorates, and around 31.2% have finished postgraduate courses, suggesting that they are reasonably educated.

**Table 4: Occupation**

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Healthcare professional	67	26.8%	26.8%	26.8%
Non-healthcare professional	92	36.8%	36.8%	63.6%
Student	48	19.2%	19.2%	82.8%
Retired	16	6.4%	6.4%	89.2%
Self-employed	27	10.8%	10.8%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Most respondents work in non-healthcare professions (36.8%), while a significant portion (26.8%) are healthcare professionals. Students represent 19.2% of the sample, and retired individuals account for 6.4%, indicating a diverse range of occupations.

**Table 5: Monthly Household Income**

Income Group	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Below ₹25,000	54	21.6%	21.6%	21.6%
₹25,000-₹50,000	78	31.2%	31.2%	52.8%
₹50,000-₹1,00,000	62	24.8%	24.8%	77.6%
₹1,00,000-₹2,00,000	33	13.2%	13.2%	90.8%
Above ₹2,00,000	23	9.2%	9.2%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

The income distribution shows that the majority of respondents (31.2%) fall in the ₹25,000-₹50,000 range, while 24.8% earn between ₹50,000 and ₹1,00,000 per month. About 9.2% of respondents earn more than ₹2,00,000, indicating the presence of higher-income individuals in the sample.

**Table 6: Which type of hospital do you primarily visit for healthcare services?**

Hospital Type	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Private Hospital	158	63.2%	63.2%	63.2%
Public Hospital	92	36.8%	36.8%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

The data reveals that 63.2% of respondents prefer private hospitals, while 36.8% visit public hospitals. This indicates a preference for private healthcare services among the sample population.

**Table 7: How important is a hospital's online presence in your decision-making process?**

Importance	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very important	94	37.6%	37.6%	37.6%
Moderately important	102	40.8%	40.8%	78.4%
Not very important	41	16.4%	16.4%	94.8%
Not important at all	13	5.2%	5.2%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

A significant portion (40.8%) considers a hospital's online presence as moderately important, while 37.6% find it very important. This indicates that the online presence of hospitals is a key factor for most respondents in making healthcare decisions.

**Table 8: How often do you search for healthcare services or hospitals online?**

Frequency	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Frequently	84	33.6%	33.6%	33.6%
Occasionally	118	47.2%	47.2%	80.8%
Rarely	39	15.6%	15.6%	96.4%
Never	9	3.6%	3.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

Nearly half (47.2%) of respondents occasionally search for healthcare services online, while 33.6% frequently do so. Only a small portion (3.6%) never use online searches for healthcare, highlighting the growing relevance of digital marketing in healthcare decisions.

**Table 9: Which digital marketing tool do you find most informative when choosing a hospital?**

Tool	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Social media platforms	78	31.2%	31.2%	31.2%
Hospital websites	96	38.4%	38.4%	69.6%
Email newsletters	37	14.8%	14.8%	84.4%
Online patient reviews	39	15.6%	15.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

The majority of respondents (38.4%) consider hospital websites to be the most informative digital marketing tool, followed by 31.2% who prefer social media platforms. Online patient reviews (15.6%) and email newsletters (14.8%) also hold some influence, though they are less preferred.

**Table 10: Do you follow any hospitals or healthcare providers on social media?**

Follow on Social Media	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, private hospitals	82	32.8%	32.8%	32.8%
Yes, public hospitals	46	18.4%	18.4%	51.2%
Yes, both	64	25.6%	25.6%	76.8%
No	58	23.2%	23.2%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

25.6% of respondents follow both public and private hospitals on social media, while the majority (32.8%) follow private hospitals. The fact that just 18.4% of people only follow public hospitals on social media and 23.2% do not follow any healthcare providers suggests that people's use of online healthcare marketing varies.

**Table 11: How often do you engage with healthcare content shared by hospitals on social media?**

Engagement Frequency	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Frequently	67	26.8%	26.8%	26.8%
Occasionally	98	39.2%	39.2%	66.0%
Rarely	61	24.4%	24.4%	90.4%
Never	24	9.6%	9.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

The majority of respondents (39.2%) engage with healthcare content on social media occasionally, while 26.8% engage frequently. A smaller proportion (24.4%) rarely engage, and 9.6% never engage with such content, highlighting varying levels of interest in healthcare-related social media content.

**Table 12: How do you rate the effectiveness of social media marketing by private hospitals?**

Effectiveness Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very effective	68	27.2%	27.2%	27.2%
Effective	102	40.8%	40.8%	68.0%
Moderately effective	56	22.4%	22.4%	90.4%
Not effective	24	9.6%	9.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Social media marketing by private hospitals is generally perceived as effective, with 40.8% of respondents rating it as effective and 27.2% finding it very effective. However, 22.4% consider it moderately effective, and 9.6% feel it is not effective at all, suggesting room for improvement.

**Table 13: How do you rate the effectiveness of social media marketing by public hospitals?**

Effectiveness Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very effective	37	14.8%	14.8%	14.8%
Effective	82	32.8%	32.8%	47.6%
Moderately effective	92	36.8%	36.8%	84.4%
Not effective	39	15.6%	15.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Social media marketing by public hospitals is rated as moderately effective by the largest proportion of respondents (36.8%), with 32.8% considering it effective. However, 15.6% find it not effective, and only 14.8% rate it as very effective, indicating that public hospitals may need to enhance their digital marketing strategies.

**Table 14: Which type of hospital provides better information through email marketing?**

Email Marketing	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Private Hospitals	79	31.6%	31.6%	31.6%
Public Hospitals	37	14.8%	14.8%	46.4%
Both are equal	61	24.4%	24.4%	70.8%
I don't receive emails	73	29.2%	29.2%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Private hospitals are perceived to provide better information through email marketing by 31.6% of respondents, while 29.2% do not receive emails from hospitals at all. Public hospitals are favored by 14.8%, and 24.4% see both hospital types as providing equal value in email marketing.

**Table 15: How often do you read healthcare-related email newsletters from hospitals?**

Newsletter Frequency	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Frequently	46	18.4%	18.4%	18.4%
Occasionally	89	35.6%	35.6%	54.0%
Rarely	78	31.2%	31.2%	85.2%
Never	37	14.8%	14.8%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Majority respondents (35.6%) occasionally read healthcare-related email newsletters, while 31.2% rarely do so. About 18.4% frequently read them, and 14.8% never engage with these emails, indicating that email newsletters may need to be more engaging to capture a wider audience.

**Table 16: Do you believe patient reviews influence your choice of hospital?**

Influence of Patient Reviews	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, significantly	96	38.4%	38.4%	38.4%
Yes, moderately	82	32.8%	32.8%	71.2%
No, only slightly	46	18.4%	18.4%	89.6%
No, not at all	26	10.4%	10.4%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

Patient reviews are highly influential in the choice of hospitals for 38.4% of respondents, with another 32.8% saying reviews have a moderate impact. Only 10.4% state that patient reviews not at all influence their choice of hospital.

**Table 17: Which hospital sector do you feel responds better to online patient feedback?**

Hospital Sector	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Private hospitals	87	34.8%	34.8%	34.8%
Public hospitals	46	18.4%	18.4%	53.2%
Both equally	61	24.4%	24.4%	77.6%
Neither	56	22.4%	22.4%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

Most respondents (34.8%) feel that private hospitals respond better to online patient feedback, while 24.4% believe both sectors respond equally. Public hospitals are considered responsive by 18.4%, and 22.4% feel neither sector responds well to feedback.

**Table 18: How satisfied are you with the online appointment systems provided by hospitals?**

Satisfaction Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very satisfied	68	27.2%	27.2%	27.2%
Satisfied	89	35.6%	35.6%	62.8%
Neutral	46	18.4%	18.4%	81.2%
Dissatisfied	37	14.8%	14.8%	96.0%
Very dissatisfied	10	4.0%	4.0%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

A significant proportion of respondents (35.6%) are satisfied with the online appointment systems, and 27.2% are very satisfied. About 18.4% are neutral, while 18.8% express dissatisfaction, indicating a majority positive response but some room for improvement.

**Table 19: Which hospital type provides better telehealth services (online consultations, etc.)?**

Hospital Type	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Private hospitals	96	38.4%	38.4%	38.4%
Public hospitals	44	17.6%	17.6%	56.0%
Both equally	61	24.4%	24.4%	80.4%
Not sure	49	19.6%	19.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

**Interpretation:**

Private hospitals are seen as providing better telehealth services by 38.4% of respondents, while 24.4% believe both public and private hospitals offer equally good services. Public hospitals trail behind, with 17.6%, and 19.6% are unsure, indicating a clear preference for private telehealth services.

**Table 20: How important are telehealth services in your hospital selection process?**

Importance Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very important	79	31.6%	31.6%	31.6%
Somewhat important	82	32.8%	32.8%	64.4%
Not very important	56	22.4%	22.4%	86.8%
Not important at all	33	13.2%	13.2%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Telehealth services are considered important in hospital selection by a majority of respondents, with 31.6% saying they are very important and 32.8% saying somewhat important. However, 22.4% do not consider them very important, and 13.2% find them not important at all, indicating a strong but not unanimous preference for telehealth services.

**Table 21: Do you trust the medical information provided on hospital websites?**

Trust Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, private hospitals	96	38.4%	38.4%	38.4%
Yes, public hospitals	37	14.8%	14.8%	53.2%
Yes, both	73	29.2%	29.2%	82.4%
No	44	17.6%	17.6%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Most respondents trust the medical information provided by private hospitals (38.4%), while 29.2% trust both private and public hospitals equally. Public hospitals are trusted by 14.8%, and 17.6% do not trust medical information from hospital websites at all, indicating a higher confidence in private sector information.

**Table 22: How do you rate the overall quality of digital marketing by private hospitals?**

Rating Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Excellent	64	25.6%	25.6%	25.6%
Good	92	36.8%	36.8%	62.4%
Average	56	22.4%	22.4%	84.8%
Poor	27	10.8%	10.8%	95.6%
Very poor	11	4.4%	4.4%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Digital marketing by private hospitals is rated highly, with 36.8% rating it as good and 25.6% as excellent. However, 22.4% feel it is average, and 15.2% rate it poorly, suggesting room for improvement despite a generally favorable view.

**Table 23: How do you rate the overall quality of digital marketing by public hospitals?**

Rating Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Excellent	39	15.6%	15.6%	15.6%
Good	64	25.6%	25.6%	41.2%
Average	78	31.2%	31.2%	72.4%
Poor	42	16.8%	16.8%	89.2%
Very poor	27	10.8%	10.8%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

Public hospitals' digital marketing efforts receive mixed reviews, with 31.2% rating it as average, and 25.6% finding it good. However, a notable portion rates it poorly (16.8%) or very poorly (10.8%), indicating significant scope for improvement compared to private hospitals.

**Table 24: Do you believe private hospitals invest more in digital marketing than public hospitals?**

Opinion	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	113	45.2%	45.2%	45.2%
No	62	24.8%	24.8%	70.0%
Not sure	75	30.0%	30.0%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

### Interpretation:

A significant number of respondents (45.2%) believe that private hospitals invest more in digital marketing than public hospitals, while 24.8% disagree, and 30% are unsure, reflecting a perceived disparity in marketing efforts between the two sectors.

**Table 25: How likely are you to recommend a hospital based on its digital marketing presence?**

Likelihood	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very likely	71	28.4%	28.4%	28.4%
Likely	86	34.4%	34.4%	62.8%
Neutral	44	17.6%	17.6%	80.4%
Unlikely	29	11.6%	11.6%	92.0%
Very unlikely	20	8.0%	8.0%	100%
Total	250	100%	100%	

#### Interpretation:

A majority of respondents (34.4%) are likely to recommend a hospital based on its digital marketing presence, with 28.4% very likely to do so. However, 17.6% are neutral, and about 19.6% are unlikely or very unlikely to make recommendations based on digital marketing, signaling the importance but not the sole influence of marketing in hospital choice.

#### Hypothesis Testing

##### Hypothesis 1

H<sub>0</sub>: "There is no significant difference in the digital marketing strategies employed by private and public hospitals".

H<sub>1</sub>: "There is a significant difference in the digital marketing strategies employed by private and public hospitals".

**Table 26: Independent Samples t-test for Difference in Digital Marketing Strategies Between Private and Public Hospitals**

Statistic	Value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
t-value	2.845	248	0.005
Mean Difference	0.631		
Standard Error of Mean	0.222		

With 248 degrees of freedom and a significance value of 0.005, the Independent Samples t-test yields a t-value of 2.845, which is below the conventional significance threshold of 0.05. This implies that the digital marketing strategies employed by public and private hospitals vary statistically significantly.

Therefore, we conclude that there is a significant difference between the digital marketing strategies employed by public hospitals and those employed by private hospitals, rejecting the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) and accepting the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>).

#### Hypothesis 2

H<sub>0</sub>: "There is no significant association between hospital type (private or public) and the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies in improving patient engagement".

H<sub>2</sub>: "There is a significant association between hospital type (private or public) and the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies in improving patient engagement".

**Table 27: Chi-Square Test for Association Between Hospital Type and Effectiveness of Digital Marketing Strategies**

Statistic	Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	16.834	2	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	17.202	2	0.000
N of Valid Cases	250		

A Pearson Chi-Square value of 16.834 with two degrees of freedom and an Asymptotic Significance (p-value) of 0.000, which is less than 0.05, are shown by the Chi-Square Test for Association. This suggests a fairly significant association between the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies in enhancing patient involvement and the type of hospital (public or private).

Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>), coming to the conclusion that there is a significant association between the type of hospital and the effectiveness of digital marketing strategies in raising patient involvement.

## 5. Conclusion

The digital marketing strategies employed by public and private hospitals vary significantly, as shown by the current study. In order to successfully engage patients, private hospitals were found to use a wider range of more sophisticated digital tools, such as social media, email marketing, and online platforms. Public hospitals are lagging behind in terms of strategy and patient engagement, while making significant progress in their digital presence. The research additionally demonstrates a clean affiliation among the form of clinic and the effectiveness of virtual advertising and marketing in improving patient contact, with non-public hospitals showing extra achievement on this regard.

The study also emphasizes how digital marketing is becoming more and more significant in the healthcare industry as patients choose hospitals more and more based on information they find online. This change emphasizes how public hospitals must enhance their digital strategies to stay competitive and better meet patients' changing requirements.

The research's primary emphasis on metropolitan regions, where access to digital platforms is more common, is one of its limitations. Rural regions, where internet access and digital literacy may be scarce, are not taken into consideration in the study, which might distort the findings. Additionally, the sample size may be increased to accommodate a more varied demography for better generalizability, even if it is enough for statistical analysis.

Because access to online platforms is more restricted in rural healthcare settings, future research might examine the effects of digital marketing strategies in these settings. In order to improve hospital marketing strategies, studies might also look at how new technologies like artificial intelligence and machine learning work. A more thorough grasp of worldwide trends in healthcare digital marketing might be obtained by extending the research to other hospitals across various regions and comparing healthcare systems in other nations.

## References

1. Ahmad, F., Hudak, P. L., Bercovitz, K., Hollenberg, E., & Levinson, W. (2017). Are physicians ready for patients with internet-based health information? *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 8(3), e22. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8.3.e22>
2. Alalwan, A. A., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Algharabat, R. (2017). Social media in marketing: A review and analysis of the existing literature. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(7), 1177-1190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.05.008>
3. Alexandra Francesca Chandra, & Mardiati Nadjib. (2023). Digital marketing in the hospital: A scoping review. *Journal of World Science*, 2(1), 1325-1332. <https://doi.org/10.58344/jws.v2i1.178>
4. Berthon, P. R., Pitt, L. F., Plangger, K., & Shapiro, D. (2012). Marketing meets Web 2.0, social media, and creative consumers: Implications for international marketing strategy. *Business Horizons*, 55(3), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2012.01.007>
5. Chaffey, D., & Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2019). *Digital marketing: Strategy, implementation, and practice* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
6. Chaudhari, G., & Anute, N. (2022). Digital marketing practices adopted by agricultural service companies in India. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 3(1), 1338-1343.
7. Cockerham, W. C., Dingwall, R., & Quah, S. R. (Eds.). (2017). *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of health, illness, behavior, and society*. John Wiley & Sons.
8. Erdem, T., & Harrison-Walker, L. J. (2006). The role of the internet in physician-patient relationships: The issue of trust. *Journal of Healthcare Marketing*, 21(3), 31-41.
9. Fox, S., & Duggan, M. (2013). *Health online 2013*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org>
10. Huppertz, J. W., Bowman, R. A., Bizer, G. Y., & Sidhu, M. S., McVeigh, C. (2017). Hospital advertising, competition, and HCAHPS: Does it pay to advertise? *Health Services Research*, 52(4), 1590-1611. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12549>
11. Karjaluoto, H., Mustonen, N., & Ulkuniemi, P. (2015). The role of digital channels in industrial marketing communications. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 30(6), 703-710. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-04-2013-0092>
12. Kruse, C. S., Karem, P., Shifflett, K., Vegi, L., Ravi, K., & Brooks, M. (2020). Evaluating barriers to adopting telemedicine worldwide: A systematic review. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, 24(1), 4-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633X16674087>
13. Mackey, T. K., & Liang, B. A. (2013). Pharmaceutical digital marketing and governance: Illicit actors and challenges to global patient safety and public health. *Global Health*, 9, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1744-8603-9-45>
14. Moorhead, S. A., Hazlett, D. E., Harrison, L., Carroll, J. K., Irwin, A., & Hoving, C. (2013). A new dimension of health care: Systematic review of the uses, benefits, and limitations of social media for health communication. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 15(4), e85. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1933>

15. Radu, M., Radu, G., Condurache, A., & Lorin Purcărea, V. (2018). The influence of digital media on the success of a health care unit. *Journal of Medicine and Life*, 11(3), 254–256. <https://doi.org/10.25122/jml-2018-0064>
16. Shaikh, F., Etkin, A., & Stitt, A. (2020). The role of digital marketing in healthcare: Insights for policymakers. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 65(3), 183-190.
17. Syed, M., Ahmed, F., Zahid, N., Khalid, N., & Israr, N. (2021). Essentials of healthcare marketing. *Asian Journal of Medicine and Health*, 19(2), 73-79. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajmah/2021/v19i230306>
18. Zade, M., Tiwade, Y. R., Shahu, S., Bandre, G., & Surkar, S. (2024). Marketing technique in healthcare services: A narrative review. *National Journal of Community Medicine*, 15(06), 496-502. Available from: <https://www.njcmindia.com/index.php/file/article/view/3671>
19. Zhang, M., Guo, L., Hu, M., & Liu, W. (2017). Influence of customer engagement with company social networks on stickiness: Mediating effect of customer value creation. *International Journal of Information Management*, 37(3), 229-240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.04.010>