

Study to Evaluate Level of Job Satisfaction among Health Care Personnel

Suruchi Pandey¹, Jasneet Kaur²

¹Associate Professor, Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies, Symbiosis International deemed University, Pune, ²Assistant professor Symbiosis College of Nursing, Symbiosis International deemed University, Pune

Abstract

Health care Industry has been getting growing significance in economy development and overall wellbeing of nation. This segment has government, public owned and private operators working to cater to the needs of the society. Health care and hospitals are considered to be very critical and stress associated functions unlike other work or business. The reasons are obvious the life and death scenario, patients treatment and recovery process, complex instruments, relatives and friends stress, sometimes lack of medicines or treatment and add to it emergency situations. The employees working in this industry are doing noble job and have noble reasons to make them feel special about contribution they give to organisation.

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the level of job satisfaction among the health personnel of Hospital and to describe variables related to their job satisfaction. The opinions of health personnel regarding satisfaction with their jobs were studied using a Job Satisfaction questionnaire. Two levels of analyses were carried out. Job satisfaction item and a four items construct called nature of job satisfaction were selected as dependent variables. Pearson correlations were used to determine whether the independent variables were significantly correlated with job satisfaction.

The key results were that overall job satisfaction was moderately high (2.23 on a scale of 3); however there are differences in satisfaction models between categories of personnel. In addition, there are significant differences in the correlations between job satisfaction and the independent variables among the groups of personnel.

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Health Care, Personnel/ Human Resource, Hospitals

Introduction

Role of Health care personnel is critical to any hospital, society and nation. They struggle to meet their needs and at the same time they are responsible for meeting needs of their patients. Hospital managers have responsibilities to both staff and patients. The health care industry will grow multi folds and time to come and will be in need of staff. The industry should be capable of attracting and retaining the staff. WHO report¹ has indicate short fall of health care staff by approximately 40 %.

However, despite importance of human factors in the quality of care and despite great changes in the work environment that is expected to increase stress among hospital staffs there are no systematic efforts to measure

staff satisfaction in many of the hospitals. The human resource link is weak however many of private sector hospitals are doing remarkable job by having world class human resource practices.² Still most of the hospitals are in public sector and hardly any practices or provision of taking care of their own people exists. National Health Mission² has also emphasised on raising the satisfaction level of health care workers. This was with directions to improve working conditions, reduction of work load and stress.³

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the level of job satisfaction among the staff of hospital and to describe variables related to the job satisfaction of staff. Also study aims establish a system of indicators and reference levels for measurement of job satisfaction as a component of human resources development.

Objective-

- To understand what variables are associated with a certain level of job satisfaction of health care personnel.
- To assess if there is a difference in the level of job satisfaction between the professional groups.
- To demonstrate if the variables of job satisfaction vary by different professional groups.
- To find out satisfaction level in hospital staff (physicians, nurses, Paramedical Staff, Non Medical staff) with respect to their jobs.

Hypothesis-

There is a positive correlation between 6 variables (relationship with superior, knowledge of the work

place, work stress, Sense of belongingness, unrealistic expectation and recognition) and job satisfaction.

Research Methodology

A analytical survey was conducted in Hospital where the opinions of staff regarding satisfaction with their jobs were studied using a questionnaire. A quantitative approach with analytical survey design for this study was preferred because questionnaires provide anonymity, is fairly economical, and a large number of staff members can be involved.

Selection of Sample

The survey was conducted on the Staff members of the Hospital. The sample selected was by the method convenience sampling among the 4 groups. Sample size was of 100, 25 from each group

Nurse / Attendants	25
Physician/ Doctors	25
Paramedical Staff (physiotherapist, Nursing assistants, x-ray , laboratory assistant etc.)	25
Non-medical profession (psychologist, patient insurance team , Administration and support staff, clerks, social workers etc.)	25

Data Collection

Primary data was collected through questionnaires.

Job satisfaction questionnaire consists of two sections. The first section includes demographic data (sex, age, profession). The second section included independent variables consisted of constructs measuring relationship with hospital (4 items) relationship with superior (6 items), strategic knowledge of workplace (5

items), work stress (5 items), unrealistic expectations (5 items), recognition (3 items) and sense of belonging (single item), Overall job satisfaction (single item). Job satisfaction is measured using the responses to a single item on the questionnaire using a 5-point likert scale (1-very dissatisfied to 5-very satisfied). The job satisfaction questionnaire developed by the foundation for Health Services Research was used for the study.

Result

Section I : Variables (Relationship with Superiors, Knowledge of Workplace, Work stress, Unrealistic Expectation, Sense of Belongingness, Recognition) with Job Satisfaction

Table.1 Variables and Job Satisfaction

Variables * Job Satisfaction Ranking Crosstabulation

Count		Job Satisfaction Ranking			Total
		Low	Medium	High	
Variables	Relationship with superiors	30	40	30	100
	Knowledge of workplace	25	53	22	100
	Work Stress	26	38	36	100
	Unrealistic Expectation	9	23	68	100
	Sense of Belongingness	17	42	41	100
	Recognition	42	42	16	100
Total		149	238	213	600

The table 1 shows the fact that the Mean Job satisfaction ranking out of 3 is maximum (2.59) for the variable Unrealistic Expectations, Which means that all the 4 groups rated this variable as least bothering factor and had high Job satisfaction. However on the contrary all the groups rated the Recognition Factor as least satisfactory variable out of all the 6 variables (rating of 1.74/3). That means recognition play crucial role in job satisfaction of health care workers. “There is a positive correlation between Overall Job satisfaction and Variables, (Relationship with superiors, Knowledge of the workplace, Recognition, Sense of Belongingness)”.

Section II Relationship with superiors and Professional Groups

Table 2.Ranking of Relationship with superiors and Professional group

Professional Group	Respondents	Mean Ratings (3)	ANOVA (F Value)	P - Value	Correlation value
Nurses	25	2.36	9.95	0	0.253
Physicians	25	1.48			
Paramedical	25	2.36			
Non -Medical	25	1.8			
Total	100	2.0			

Table 2 shows that some groups reported better relationship with their superiors than others. Physicians reported the lowest mean score (1.48/3). Nurses and Paramedical scored 2.39/3 in their relationship with the superiors. Nonmedical staff report it 1.8 close to average. Physicians are usually operating independently

and have rarely any one above them keeping in constant touch. However other staff have hierarchy and perhaps they have better connection with the superiors. The P Value is 0 suggesting that the groups have impact on the variable mentioned above (Relationship with superiors). There is 25% positive correlation between the factor and

the variable.

Section III : Knowledge of Workplace for the professional groups

Table 3. Knowledge of workplace for the professional groups

Professional Group	Respondents	Mean Ratings (3)	ANOVA (F Value)	P - Value	Correlation value
Nurses	25	2.08	3.741	0.014	- 0.015
Physicians	25	2.28			
Paramedical	25	1.76			
Non Medical	25	1.76			
Total	100	1.96			

Table shows Physicians reported significantly higher mean scores in knowledge of the hospital goals, plans, budget, results and staffing problems compared with Nurses (2.08), 1.76 for both Paramedical and Non medical group. P Value (0.014) suggests high impact of both the factor and variable. However there is no or poor correlation of the job satisfaction with the variable, Suggesting that high knowledge of workplace cannot guarantee job Satisfaction.

Section IV: Nature of Satisfaction and professional groups

Table 4: Nature of Satisfaction and Professional Groups

Professional Group	Respondents	Mean Ratings (3)	ANOVA (F Value)	P - Value	Correlation value
Nurses	25	2.44	5.07	0.003	0.11
Physicians	25	2.80			
Paramedical	25	2.60			
Non Medical	25	2.24			
Total	100	2.52			

The table above shows that the Nature of Satisfaction is highest among the physicians (2.80/3) and lowest among the Non Medical personnel (2.24/3). P Value indicates that the professional groups have high impact on the nature of satisfaction. However the correlation is very low at 0.11 for all the groups with the Nature of Satisfaction , probably due to low predictability.

Section V : Unrealistic Expectations and Professional groups

Table 5: Unrealistic Expectations and Professional Groups

Professional Group	Respondents	Mean Ratings (3)	ANOVA (F Value)	P - Value	Correlation value
Nurses	25	2.48	0.897	0.414	- 0.19
Physicians	25	2.76			
Paramedical	25	2.60			
Non Medical	25	2.52			
Total	100	2.59			

None of the categories of the hospital staff reported that their superiors, patients/patients` families or colleagues presented unrealistic expectations that was stressful. The `unrealistic expectations` scores were all relatively lowest for Nurses (2.48) and highest for Physicians (2.76),out of the possible Ranking of 3, with no significant differences between categories. The Job satisfaction does have negative impact on the variable (Unrealistic Expectation), Pearson`s Correlation is negative in this case. P Value (.414) also suggests that the Null Hypothesis is proved.

Section VI Recognition at work and professional groups

Table 6: Recognition at work and professional groups

Professional Group	Respondents	Mean Ratings (3)	ANOVA (F Value)	P - Value	Correlation value
Nurses	25	1.76	7.72	0.0	0.006
Physicians	25	2.24			
Paramedical	25	1.56			
Non Medical	25	1.40			
Total	100	1.74			

The Recognition is highest for Physicians with the value of (2.24/3) and lowest for nonmedical staff with a value of (1.4/3). The work of Nonmedical staff is not directly with the client care so they feel left out in the hospital as an organisation. The P Value (0.0) shows

that there is significant impact of professional groups with the variable. However there is no high positive correlation (0.006) to conclude that this variable will lead to high satisfaction.

Section VII Sense of Belongingness and professional Groups

Table 7: Sense of Belongingness and professional Groups

Professional Group	Respondents	Mean Ratings (3)	ANOVA (F Value)	P - Value	Correlation value
Nurses	25	2.24	5.625	0.001	0.12
Physicians	25	2.64			
Paramedical	25	2.20			
Non Medical	25	1.84			
Total	100	2.23			

Discussions

Feeling a part of the organization was significantly correlated with satisfaction by all categories of staff. The sense of belongingness is high among the Physicians (2.64/3) and lowest among the Non Medical Staff (1.84). P Value suggests that the 4 groups have high impact on the variable (Sense of Belongingness).

Section VIII : Work Stress and professional groups

Work Stress overall seems to be moderately high with highest stress reported by the Physicians (2.2/3) and lowest level seen among the Non Medical Staff (1.48/3). Nurses reported average (1.76/3) and paramedical (2.16/3). Despite the patient rush and workload the individual coping of stress played a major role among the staff members as the hospital as an organization has neither any means to measure stress nor provides any mitigating solutions. P Value (0.312) suggests that high stress has negative impact on the Job Satisfaction. Correlation is negative (-0.212) suggesting the two factors cannot be correlated. Work Stress is critical component of job satisfaction for health care employees.

Section IX: Gender with Job Satisfaction

Impact of gender on job satisfaction was measured in this study to make out the difference both gender working in health care services have on job satisfaction. In the study the ratio of women were slightly higher than

the men 58:42. The score for satisfaction seems to be almost equal for Men (2.21/3) and Women (2.24/3). The P Value(0.82) suggests that there is no significant impact of gender on Job Satisfaction. The correlation has not been established with a negative value of (-0.842).

Section X : Age with Job satisfaction

Correlation of age to job satisfaction was studied and it was found that age is not affecting job satisfaction. The Age group 36-45 years (2.30/3) and 56-65 years (2.8/3) have reported high satisfaction mean ranking. The lowest satisfaction was reported by the age group of 25-35 years(2.12/3). 46-55 have reported (2.18/3). The P Value does not support the impact of age with satisfaction in these age groups. There is poor correlation between the two factors (Age and Job Satisfaction) with value of (0.156)

Section XI: Demography (Professional Groups) And Job Satisfaction

From the analysis it was comprehended that Average rating of Job Satisfaction is 2.23 out of 3 points with low significant difference between the four categories. Furthermore, a significant difference in job satisfaction ratings was revealed between Physicians (2.56 ± 0.57) and the Non Medical staff (2.04 ± 0.79). Nurses had rating of (2.24 ± 0.66) and Paramedical staff (2.08 ± 0.57) P-Value of 0.021 suggests significant impact of Professional group on the factor of Overall Job

Satisfaction. The correlation Value is between (+1 to -1) ie 0.069 suggesting a low level of correlation of these two factors.

The percentage of data collected from the 4 Professional Group was kept equal in order to compare the results, i.e 25% for Professional Groups (Nurses, Physicians, Paramedical and Non Medical) each.

Discussions

Every organisation has different category of staff working with them. The structure of organisation is always such that various levels of people are required to achieve the goals of organisation. Hospitals and health care organisations also have these categories and each has its own role which is critical to the success of hospital and service to patients and their cure. Each category has its own earmarked duties surrounding around patient care and treatment. ⁴

Doctors

Doctors and physicians form most critical part of health care organisations. Contrasted to different other positions, doctors have extent of freedom in their work arrangement this involves a further higher extent of duty. With empowerment doctors also need information on monetary situations or the organisation. This helps them plan ideal treatment and care for their patients. New technologies can be adopted for treatment purposes. Insufficient resources available to a doctor may be one of the variables causing disappointment. The empowerment in decision making and information sharing is most important factor for the job satisfaction of doctors and physicians. This information enables them to take decision in favour of patient and also make them aware of compensation that can be taken away by them.

Attendants

Doctors hold authority over analysis and treatment of the patients inspite of that nurses and attendants hold critical position. ⁶They provide support for all encompassing consideration, including nutrition, sustenance, physical solace, individual cleanliness, hygiene, preparation of treatment, passionate consideration, adhere to schedule of medicine and social help, persistent effort lies with the medical attendant

and, somewhat, with other clinic staff. Besides, different investigations of carried out by researchers on medical attendants have demonstrated that sporadic working hours, frequently including extra time is the principle cause of stress and that exorbitant worry at work might be one of the components causing disappointment or dissatisfaction.

Paramedical Staff

The tasks in the hands of paramedical staff is tiring and huge. The demanding aspect of nature of job impacts the satisfaction levels from work place⁷. Contribution given by nursing collaborators isn't viewed as significant, and isn't given the gratefulness as is expected. When fundamental job stability and pay issues are settled, the most significant reason of satisfaction for workers are associations with colleagues and bosses.

Non Medical Staff

The expert obligations of those working in authoritative and bolster positions, (for example, bookkeepers, secretaries, representatives and tasks faculty) are very not the same as those in direct health care positions. At the point when the managers and support staff has clear objective roles and can elevate these to the staff, the job satisfaction among this set of non-clinical staff increments. Taking care of the requirements of the authoritative and care staff for acknowledgment and settling their work related issues is the most significant errand for the supervisors of those professional who are not directly associated in the provision of direct care to patients.

Conclusions and Recommendation

The degrees of work stress revealed in this study were at moderate levels for all classifications of jobs understudy. Levels of job satisfaction were moderately high. Additionally, unnecessary occupation requests or unreasonable expectations from bosses, patients/ patients' families, and associates were not found to be at high levels.

The study propose that heads of health care organization/ hospitals that are educated about the desires and day by day work related issues of their workers are better ready to comprehend the requirements of their staff. Administrators should: 1) develop successful

connections among supervisors and staff; 2) recognize negative working conditions which influence staff; 3) suitably delegate position to people, and consider them responsible for the work done in their hierarchical units; 4) keep staff educated about changes that will influence them; and 5) express gratefulness and acknowledgment for the endeavors of staff individuals in achieving tasks of health care unit. This will make a great workplace for the health care staff. The outcome of this discussion can be utilized as a lot of reference levels and pointers for the HR improvement part of the quality administration arrangement of Hospital.

Conflict of Interest: NIL

Source of Funding: Self

Ethical Clearance: Institutional Research Committee

References

1. Kaarna M, Pölluste K, Lepnurm R, Thetloff M. The progress of reforms: job satisfaction in a typical hospital in Estonia. *International Journal for Quality Health Care* 2004; 16(3):253-261.
2. Kivimäki M, Vahtera J, Pentti J, Ferrie J. Factors underlying the effect of organizational downsizing on the health of employees: longitudinal cohort study. *Br Med J* 2000; 320: 971-975
3. Lepnurm R, Lepnurm MK. The closure of rural hospitals in Saskatchewan: method or madness. *Soc Sci Med.* 2001; 52: 1689–1707.
4. Dunstone DC, Reames HR. Physician satisfaction revisited. *Soc Sci Med* 2001; 52: 825–837.
5. Karasek RA, Theorell T. *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life.* New York: Basic Books, 1990.
6. Hackett. R.D, Guion. R.M. Revaluation of the absenteeism – job satisfaction relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Decision Processes.* 2000; 35: 340-381.
7. Griffeth RW, Hom PW, Gaertner S. A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management.* 2000; 26(3): 463-488.