Patients' experiences of care provided by Emergency Care Practitioners and traditional ambulance practitioners: A survey from London

Supplementary data: Responses to the patient questionnaire, presented by the original response categories and by the bivariate split for each aspect of care, for ECP and EMT/SRPara attended patients, with the p-value of the difference between the two groups.

Aspect of care	Responses	EMT/SRPara-		ECP-attended		P value of
		attended n	0/0	n	0/0	difference
Response time	Very dissatisfied	8	1.8	11	2.9	.771
response time	Dissatisfied	7	1.5	8	2.1	. / / 1
	Fair	13	2.9	11	2.9	
	Satisfied	137	30.0	117	30.8	
	Very satisfied	291	63.8	233	61.3	
	Less than very satisfied	165	36.2	147	38.7	.473
	Very satisfied	291	63.8	233	61.3	.175
Overall care	Very poor	4	0.9	6	1.5	.283
	Poor	4	0.9	9	2.3	.203
	Neither	14	3.0	7	1.8	
	Good	75	16.1	61	15.4	
	Very good	369	79.2	314	79.1	
	Less than very good	97	20.8	83	20.9	1.000
	Very good	369	79.2	314	79.1	1.000
Suitability of	Not suitable at all	7	1.6	7	1.8	.928
treatment and advice	Partly suitable	41	9.4	38	10.0	.,20
	Fully suitable	386	88.9	334	88.1	
	Less than fully suitable	48	11.1	45	11.9	.741
	Fully suitable	386	88.9	334	88.1	
Friendliness and	Very poor	6	1.3	12	3.1	.483
courtesy of	Poor	5	1.1	3	0.8	.,
ambulance staff	Neither	14	3.1	11	2.8	
	Good	71	15.7	57	14.7	
	Very good	356	78.8	306	78.7	
	Less than very good	96	21.2	83	21.3	1.000
	Very good	356	78.8	306	78.7	
Showed concern	Very poor	7	1.5	12	3.1	.524
about patient	Poor	5	1.1	4	1.0	
	Neither	15	3.3	17	4.5	
	Good	87	19.2	70	18.4	
	Very good	338	74.8	278	73.0	
	Less than very good	114	25.2	103	27.0	.579
	Very good	338	74.8	278	73.0	
Listening	Very poor	7	1.6	12	3.2	.137
	Poor	1	0.2	6	1.6	
	Neither	19	4.3	18	4.7	
	Good	91	20.5	77	20.3	
	Very good	325	73.4	267	70.3	
	Less than very good	118	26.6	13	29.7	.351
	Very good	325	73.4	267	70.3	

Aspect of care	Responses	EMT/SRPara- attended		ECP-attended		P value of difference
		n	%	n	0/0	difference
Answering questions	Very poor	4	1.0	12	3.3	.248
	Poor	5	1.3	6	1.7	
	Neither	14	3.5	14	3.9	
	Good	96	24.1	83	23.1	
	Very good	280	70.2	244	68.0	
	Less than very good	119	29.8	115	32.0	.529
	Very good	280	70.2	244	68.0	,
Quality of	Very poor	4	1.0	14	3.9	.104
examinations	Poor	6	1.5	7	1.9	,
	Neither	23	5.7	18	5.0	
	Good	95	23.5	76	21.0	
	Very good	276	68.3	247	68.2	
	Less than very good	128	31.7	115	31.8	1.000
1	Very good	276	68.3	247	68.2	21000
Explaining condition	Very poor	7	1.9	13	3.8	.361
Zinpitaning contactor	Poor	9	2.5	9	2.6	.501
	Neither	22	6.0	26	7.	
	Good	94	25.7	73	21.3	
	Very good	234	63.9	222	64.7	
	Less than very good	132	35.3	121	35.3	.875
	Very good	234	63.9	222	64.7	.073
Thoroughness of	Not at all thorough	14	3.4	14	3.9	.028
assessment	Quite thorough	168	40.8	113	31.5	
	Very thorough	230	55.8	232	64.6	
	Less than very thorough	182	44.2	127	35.4	.015
	Very thorough	230	55.8	232	64.6	
Explained what was	Strongly disagree	7	1.8	11	3.2	.035
going to happen	Disagree	14	3.6	8	2.3	
	Neither	16	4.2	17	4.9	
	Agree	212	55.2	156	45.1	
	Strongly agree	135	35.2	154	44.5	
	Less than strongly agree	249	64.8	192	55.5	.010
	Strongly agree	135	35.2	154	44.5	
Passed on relevant	Strongly disagree	7	1.8	14	4.0	.058
information	Disagree	11	2.9	5	1.4	
	Neither	19	4.9	12	3.5	
	Agree	201	52.3	160	46.2	
	Strongly agree	146	38.0	155	44.8	
	Less than strongly agree	238	62.0	191	55.2	.071
	Strongly agree	146	38.0	155	44.8	
Felt comfortable with	Strongly disagree	8	2.0	14	3.9	.231
the decision	Disagree	9	2.2	10	2.8	
	Neither	15	3.7	13	3.7	
	Agree	209	51.5	158	44.5	
	Strongly agree	165	40.6	160	45.1	
	Less than strongly agree	241	59.4	195	54.9	.240
	Strongly agree	165	40.6	160	45.1	