

## FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYEES WORKING IN HOSPITALS

*Parinda V. Doshi*

*Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Management, M. S. University of Baroda,  
Vadodara, Gujarat, India*

**Received: 10 Apr 2019**

**Accepted: 20 Apr 2019**

**Published: 26 Apr 2019**

### **ABSTRACT**

*The health sector is one of the fastest growing sectors in India. Health sector includes services like hospitals, medical devices, clinical trials, outsourcing, telemedicine, medical tourism, health insurance, and medical equipment. Hospitals industries alone cover 80 percent of the total healthcare sector in India. Hospitals are service delivering units where employees play a major role in the success of the units. Thus, it becomes important for the organization to see that employees working in the hospitals are satisfied with the work and the organization in which they are working. The current research was conducted with an aim to identify factors affecting the job satisfaction of employees working in hospitals. A measure of central tendency's and factor analysis was performed to identify the factors affecting job satisfaction of the employees working in the hospitals. Role clarity; knowledge to perform the work; support of top management and peers; ease in understanding and following the procedures; availability of sufficient materials and equipment's; cleanliness in the work area; praise, recognition and reward for the work and; co-operation among different departments were observed to be affecting satisfaction of the employees working in the hospitals.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Healthcare, Hospitals, Job Satisfaction, Employees' Satisfaction*

### **INTRODUCTION**

India stands second in terms of population in the world. Due to a large number of the population it has a wide scope of development of different sectors. Health care is one among them. A health care industry includes hospitals, medical devices, clinical trials, outsourcing, telemedicine, medical tourism, health insurance, and medical equipment. Indian health care sector was observed to be US\$ 61.79 billion in 2017 and is expected to reach US\$ 132.84 billion by 2022. (Indian Brand Equity Foundation, n.d.& Invest India, n.d.). Rising income level, greater health awareness, increased precedence of lifestyle diseases and improved access to insurance are some of the reason for the increase in the healthcare industry in the country. The government also through schemes like Ayushman Bharat had contributed to the development of the sector in the country. The sector is expected to give jobs to nearly 40 million people in the country by 2030 from which nearly 100,000 jobs are expected to be created from Ayushman Bharat Scheme. In healthcare; hospital industry alone accounts to contribute 80 percent of the total market of the country (Indian Brand Equity Foundation, n.d.). Thus, it is a huge source of employment generation in the sector. Hospital industries are the service industry where employees are directly connected to the final users of the services. Users of the services will be satisfied by the services only when they

feel that employees of the hospitals have served them well. Employees of the hospital can generate this type of feeling in the users only when they are satisfied by the work and the organization in which they are working. As a low level of job satisfaction leads to a poor performance by the healthcare employees, resulting in patient's dissatisfaction (Tzeng&Ketefian, 2002). Thus job satisfaction is highly important for well-functioning of the organization.

Concept of job satisfaction has been widely studied and discussed within several disciplines including nursing, psychology, sociology, and management. Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as "a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering". It is observed as feelings an employee has about the job in general (Smith, Kendall& Hulin, 1969). For Ma, Samuels & Alexander (2003) it is an evaluation that employee makes for the job and surrounding environment at workplace. Pilkington & Wood (1986) viewed job satisfaction as a degree of positive affective orientation towards the job. Thus, the concept of job satisfaction is observed to be varied from person to person and within any one person from time to time.

Job satisfaction helps in retention of employees in the organization increases their commitment towards the work they performed and the organization in which they are functioning. Employees cannot be satisfied by a single variable (content), many variables like working environment, employees' salary, employee development platform and employees' welfare activities in the organization play an important role in providing satisfaction from the job. Little satisfaction from each service encounter leads to overall satisfaction with the service. Employee satisfaction is a kind of psychological feedback related to two factors: one is the expectation of employees for the jobs and the other is the real feelings of employees. Employee satisfaction largely depends on true feelings of employees arising from the organizational climate. Therefore organization should make constant efforts to improve organizational climate which the improvement in various practices and procedure of the organization.

In order to provide employee satisfaction, it is necessary to understand the needs of employees and make conscious efforts for fulfillment of the physical, social,emotional and development needs of the employees. Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause an employee to be satisfied with the job. Thus, although job satisfaction is under the influence of many external factors, it remains something internal that has to do with the way how the employee feels. Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that employees have towards their work. Good friendly environment at workplace has also been observed as an important factor proving positive feeling to the employees. Interpersonal relationship of employees in the organization is thus an important factor providing job satisfaction (Lodisso, 2019). The section below discusses in detail selected works on job satisfaction.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid &Sirola (1998) assessed the direct and indirect impact of pay policies upon the turnover intentions of nurses working in the hospitals. Results of the study examined the relative impact of job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and organizational commitment upon the turnover intentions of nurses. It was also observed that the pay structure of the organization affected job satisfaction of the nurses working in the hospitals. Furnham, Petrides, Jackson & Cotter (2002)investigated the extent to which personality traits predict work-related aspects which employees perceived important to their job satisfaction. Two studies were carried on by the authors one study was relating to hygiene and motivation factor affecting job satisfaction and the other study was relating to 'Big Five' (neuroticism, extraversion,

openness, agreeableness, & conscientiousness) personality traits and the relation of the same with satisfaction from the job persons are doing. In the first study, it was observed that extraverts' people were more sensitive to motivator factors, while neurotics were more sensitive to hygiene factors. In the second study conscientiousness and openness were found associated with both hygiene and motivator while no association was observed respect to extraversion and neuroticism.

Ma, Samuels & Alexander (2003) identified age, level of education, years of service, salary, hospital bed size, caresetting, job position, hospital retirement plan, teaching hospital status, and geographic area as factors affecting job satisfaction of nurses working in the hospitals. Gormley (2003) reviewed six studies published between 1976 and 1996 and identified professional autonomy, leader expectations, role conflict, role ambiguity, consideration of the leader, initiating structure behavior of the leader, organizational climate and organizational characteristics as factors affecting job satisfaction of nurses working in hospitals. Lee & Cummings (2008) reviewed literature on job satisfaction of front line nurse managers. From the literature they identify six components that were examined by different authors to measure their effect on job satisfaction. The component identified by the authors is : organizational change (which includes decentralization, change in communication channels and change in a number of employees supervised), organizational support from seniors, participative organization, job characteristics (which include empowerment, power, and job autonomy), managerial role and educational development.

Parvin & Kabir (2011) examine the effect of working conditions, pay, and promotion, job security, relationship with co-workers and relation with supervisor on satisfaction from the job in selected pharma companies. Result of the study shows significant effect of the factors namely: salary, efficiency in work, fringe supervision, and co-worker relation on job satisfaction of the employees working in pharma companies. Yuan & Jiaqing (2019) develop a conceptual model for factors affecting the job satisfaction of employees working in hotel industries. They identified five aspects reflecting job satisfaction of hotel employees: job content satisfaction, job environment satisfaction, job return satisfaction, management status satisfaction and career development satisfaction. Okhakhume & Tosin (2019) undertook a study to determine joint contribution and investigate the relative contribution of job stress and job satisfaction on the correctional officers' psychological well-being. Result of the study found job stress and job satisfaction having a significant joint influence on the psychological well-being of correctional officers.

Obeta, Goyin, Udenze & Ojo (2019) surveyed professional of Jos University Teaching Hospital [JUTH] namely: Doctors, Pharmacists, Medical Laboratory Scientists, Nurses, Radiographers and Physiotherapists. Study observed most professional staff not satisfied with their pay and remuneration and working tools or equipment, and other job satisfaction indices like number of fellow professional colleagues in the department; conferences allowances; the way policies are put to practice; presence of professionals in the management team, chance to do research on the job and chance for advancement in academics and training on the job. A significant positive relationship was observed between job satisfaction and motivations for improved professional service delivery. Liu, Yu, Ding, Li & Zhang (2019) conducted research investigating the satisfaction of doctors. Job satisfaction was measured by observing satisfaction of doctors towards types of patients, including types of patients that doctors thought should be treated in different healthcare institutions, types of patients they were treating, what types of patients they expected to treat, work time, life stress, work stress and the sources of work stress. From the result, it was examined that job satisfaction was influenced by their professional title, patient composition, and work stress. Some factors like department, work hours, patients' respect and life stress were also found relating to doctors' job satisfaction.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH STUDY

The current research was undertaken with an aim to identify factors affecting the job satisfaction of people working in hospitals. Different factors were identified based on the review of literature and an attempt was made by the researcher to identify which factors played an important role in satisfying the job they are doing in hospitals.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research was undertaken using explorative and descriptive research design. Data were collected during January to March in the year 2018, through structured non-disguised questionnaire from employees working in different hospitals in Vadodara city of Gujarat State. Twenty four questions were asked to the respondents. From it, four questions intend to collect demographic details regarding gender, marital status, department and experience in the hospital. Remaining twenty questions were asked to know the factors affecting job satisfaction. Employee's satisfaction towards the job was collected through five points Likert scale ranging from '1' disagree, '2' somewhat disagree, '3' neutral, '4' somewhat agree and '5' agree. 140 questionnaires were printed and circulated among the employees using a convenience sampling method. Out of the total circulated questionnaires 99 questionnaires were found to be completely filled up and were further processed for interpretation. Table 1 showcases the demographic details of the respondents.

**Table 1: Demographic Details of Respondents**

|                                    |                    |           |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| <b>Gender</b>                      | Male               | 55        |
|                                    | Female             | 44        |
|                                    | <b>Total</b>       | <b>99</b> |
| <b>Marital Status</b>              | Married            | 51        |
|                                    | Unmarried          | 48        |
|                                    | <b>Total</b>       | <b>99</b> |
| <b>Department</b>                  | Medical            | 41        |
|                                    | Non- Medical       | 44        |
|                                    | Nursing            | 14        |
|                                    | <b>Total</b>       | <b>99</b> |
| <b>Experience in this Hospital</b> | Less than 6 months | 16        |
|                                    | 6 months-11 months | 34        |
|                                    | 1 year to 5 year   | 24        |
|                                    | More than 5 years  | 25        |
|                                    | <b>Total</b>       | <b>99</b> |

From the table, it is observed that male and female both prefer to work in hospitals. Moreover there is not much difference in the number of married and unmarried employees working in the hospitals. Numbers of responses led to the interpretation that the work environment of the hospitals is suitable for married as well as unmarried employees. In order to measure the satisfaction of employees in hospitals, employees were bifurcated into three departments namely medical (doctors), Non-medical (support staff) and nursing. Majority of responses were collected from the medical and non-medical department which account to nearly 85 percent of the responses. In terms of experience, it was observed that nearly 49 percent of the respondents had more than one year of working in the hospitals from which 25 percent of respondents were working for more than five years.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Data were analyzed using Excel and SPSS. Reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Reliability Test. The instrument is said to be reliable when Cronbach Alpha is more than '.600'. Cronbach's Alpha for twenty items of the questionnaire came to be '.895' which shows that the research instrument was found reliable and the data was fit for further processing. A measure of central tendency and factor analysis was carried out to achieve the objective of the study.

### Measure of Central Tendency

Table 2 displays the result of measures of central tendency. Mean value of the factors affecting job satisfaction was above 3.78 which led to the conclusion that there was a higher level of agreement for the factors perceived important for delivering satisfaction from the job. The median value for the factors was observed to be 4 which means that respondents agree for the importance of the factors. While mode value of factors affecting job satisfaction was 4 and 5.4 mode value shows that majority of respondents somewhat agree for the factors been observed in the hospitals while mode value 5 shows that majority of respondents agree for the factors present in the hospitals.

**Table 2: Measures of Central Tendency for Factors Measuring Satisfaction**

| Sr. No. | Satisfaction Relating To The Factors                 | Mean | Median | Mode |
|---------|--|------|--------|------|
| 1       | Cleanliness in common areas                          | 3.78 | 4      | 4    |
| 2       | Availability of Sufficient materials and equipment's | 4.12 | 4      | 5    |
| 3       | Job clarity  | 4.18 | 4      | 4    |
| 4       | Cooperation between department                       | 4.12 | 4      | 4    |
| 5       | Liberty to do the work                               | 4.00 | 4      | 5    |
| 6       | Process and procedure are easy to work               | 4.05 | 4      | 4    |
| 7       | Salary structure & other ( non-monetary) benefits    | 3.85 | 4      | 4    |
| 8       | Cooperation between co-workers                       | 3.93 | 4      | 5    |
| 9       | Efficient conflict resolution                        | 3.97 | 4      | 4    |
| 10      | Fair treatment by supervisor                         | 3.90 | 4      | 4    |
| 11      | Value to suggestions                                 | 3.68 | 4      | 4    |
| 12      | Communication by top management                      | 3.90 | 4      | 4    |
| 13      | Praise & recognitions for good work                  | 3.90 | 4      | 5    |
| 14      | Management control                                   | 3.98 | 4      | 5    |
| 15      | Awareness of employee rights                         | 3.82 | 4      | 4    |
| 16      | Good place to work                                   | 3.96 | 4      | 5    |
| 17      | Will recommend to others                             | 4.05 | 4      | 4    |
| 18      | Scheduling of duty                                   | 3.92 | 4      | 4    |
| 19      | Clear understanding of roles & responsibility        | 3.94 | 4      | 4    |
| 20      | Responsibility sharing                               | 4.09 | 4      | 4    |

### Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was carried out to identify the factors considered important for measuring the satisfaction of employees working in the hospitals. Adequacy of the data was checked based on the results of Kaiser – Mayer – Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Homogeneity of Variance). KMO values if less than 0.6 indicate the sampling is not adequate and that remedial action should be taken. Results of the research study showed that KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.794 which indicated that the present data were suitable for the application of factor analysis. Similarly, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (0.00) too was significant ( $p < .05$ ), which indicated that sufficient correlation existed between the items to proceed with the application of factor analysis.

**Table 3: Social Network Users' Expectation for Accessibility of Social Networks KMO and Bartlett's Test**

|  |                    |          |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    | 0.794    |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 1079.598 |
|  | Df                 | 190      |
|  | Sig.               | 0.000    |

Table 4 shows the number of components extracted for measuring satisfaction from job. Six components in the initial solution had an Eigen values over 1 and it accounted for about 72.64 per cent of the observed variations. Thus, these six components were taken for measuring satisfaction from the job according to Kaiser Criterion. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Table 4: Total Variance on Job Satisfaction of Employees Working in Hospitals**

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |               |              | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total                               | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total                             | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 7.209               | 36.044        | 36.044       | 7.209                               | 36.044        | 36.044       | 3.223                             | 16.113        | 16.113       |
| 2         | 2.002               | 10.011        | 46.054       | 2.002                               | 10.011        | 46.054       | 2.802                             | 14.011        | 30.124       |
| 3         | 1.685               | 8.426         | 54.480       | 1.685                               | 8.426         | 54.480       | 2.708                             | 13.541        | 43.665       |
| 4         | 1.352               | 6.758         | 61.238       | 1.352                               | 6.758         | 61.238       | 2.286                             | 11.430        | 55.095       |
| 5         | 1.277               | 6.384         | 67.622       | 1.277                               | 6.384         | 67.622       | 1.870                             | 9.349         | 64.444       |
| 6         | 1.004               | 5.022         | 72.643       | 1.004                               | 5.022         | 72.643       | 1.640                             | 8.200         | 72.643       |

Table 5 shows the factor loading score of individual factors of components, based on the rotated component matrix. A factor loading close to 1 indicated a strong correlation between an item and factor, while a loading closer to zero indicated a weak correlation. Table 5 represent factor loading by suppressing the score which is less than 0.5 for easy identification of particular factors playing an important role in constructing the component. The factors are rotated with the used of Varimax with Kaiser Normalization Rotation method. Principle Component Analysis (PCA) method is used for factor extraction and to consider only those factors for interpretation purpose whose values are greater than 0.5.

**Table 5: Factor Loading Score Based on Rotated Component Matrix for Job Satisfaction of Employees Working in Hospitals**

|   | Component |       |       |       |   |   |
|---|-----------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|
|   | 1         | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5 | 6 |
| Sharing of responsibility                         | 0.820     |       |       |       |   |   |
| Scheduling of duty                                | 0.820     |       |       |       |   |   |
| Will recommend to others                          | 0.789     |       |       |       |   |   |
| Clear understanding of roles & responsibilities   | 0.675     |       |       |       |   |   |
| Fair treatment by supervisor                      |           | 0.794 |       |       |   |   |
| Gives value to suggestions given                  |           | 0.728 |       |       |   |   |
| Efficient conflict resolution                     |           | 0.711 |       |       |   |   |
| Communication by top management                   |           | 0.619 |       |       |   |   |
| Management control                                |           |       | 0.738 |       |   |   |
| Job clarity                                       |           |       | 0.687 |       |   |   |
| Awareness of employee rights                      |           |       | 0.673 |       |   |   |
| Praise & recognitions for good work               |           |       | 0.547 |       |   |   |
| Process and procedure easy to work                |           |       |       | 0.791 |   |   |
| Salary structure & other ( non-monetary) benefits |           |       |       | 0.729 |   |   |
| Cooperation between co-workers                    |           |       |       | 0.710 |   |   |

|  |  |  |  |  |       |       |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------|-------|
| Cleanliness in common areas                          |  |  |  |  | 0.776 |       |
| Cooperation between department                       |  |  |  |  | 0.683 |       |
| Availability of sufficient materials and equipment's |  |  |  |  |       | 0.824 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.<sup>a</sup>

a. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.

From the above table 5, it became apparent that first, the second and third component consists of four factors while fourth component consist of three factors, a fifth of two factors and the last 6 components had a single factor only. From the factor loading score it is apparent that for construction of first component 'sharing of responsibility' had the highest loading score and this is most important factor for providing satisfaction in the job followed by 'duty schedule' 'recommend to do the job in the organization to other' and 'have clear understanding of roles & responsibilities to be performed'. For second component 'fair treatment by supervisor' played a leading role followed by 'organizations gives value to suggestions given', 'efficient conflict resolution in organization' and 'proper communication by top management'. 'Management control' played an important role for the formation of third component providing job satisfaction followed by 'job clarity', 'awareness of employee rights' and 'praise & recognition for good work'. Extrinsic factors like 'process and procedure easy to work', 'salary structure & other (non-monetary) benefits' and 'cooperation between co-workers' formed the fourth component of job satisfaction. The fifth component of job satisfaction consists of 'cleanliness in common areas' and 'cooperation between departments'. 'Availability of sufficient materials and equipment's' from the last six components of job satisfaction.

## CONCLUSIONS

Employees in the organization will perform their duty well if they are satisfied with their work and organizational environment. Two types of factors generally have found affecting satisfaction from the job performed by the employee. First is the internal factor which includes factors associated with the job itself and the other is external factors which are related to the environment provided by the organization. Present study observed the role of internal factors namely: Role clarity and the knowledge to perform the same leading to the satisfaction and the external factors like: support of top management and peers, ease in understanding and following the procedures, availability of sufficient materials and equipment's, cleanliness in the work area, praise, recognition and reward for the work, and co-operation among different departments playing significant role in providing satisfaction to the employees working in the hospitals.



## REFERENCES

1. Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., Jackson, C. J., & Cotter, T. (2002). Do Personality Factors Predict Job Satisfaction? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(8), 1325-1342.
2. Gormley, D. K. (2003). Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction in Nurse Faculty: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 42(4), 174-178.
3. Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*, Harper and Brothers, New York, p. 47
4. Indian Brand Equity Foundation. (n.d.). *Indian Health Care Industries Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://www.ibef.org/industry/healthcare-presentation#login-box>
5. Invest India. (n.d.). *Industry Scenario*. Retrieved from <https://www.investindia.gov.in/sector/healthcare>
6. Lee, H. O. W., & Cummings, G. G. (2008). Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Front Line Nurse Managers: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16(7), 768-783.
7. Liu, J., Yu, W., Ding, T., Li, M., & Zhang, L. (2019). Cross-Sectional Survey on Job Satisfaction and Its Associated Factors among Doctors in Tertiary Public Hospitals in Shanghai, China. *BMJ Open*, 9(3), 1-10.
8. Locke, E. A. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(4), 309-336.
9. Lodisso, S. L. (2019). The Effects of Interpersonal Relationship on Employees' Job Satisfaction: The Case of Education Department, Hawassa City Administration. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 21(3), 21-27.
10. Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. (1998). Explaining Nursing Turnover Intent: Job Satisfaction, Pay Satisfaction, or Organizational Commitment? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(3), 305-320.
11. Ma, C. C., Samuels, M. E., & Alexander, J. W. (2003). Factors that Influence Nurses' Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 33(5), 293-299.
12. Obeta, U. M., Goyin, L. P., Udenze, C. & Ojo, J. (2019). Assessment of Job Satisfaction Indices among Health Professionals in Jos University Teaching Hospital: An Analytical Study. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 21(2), 38-50.
13. Okhakhume, O. A. & Tosin, A. O. (2019). Psychological Well-Being of Correctional Officers in Ibadan, Oyo State of Nigeria: Predictive Influence of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(1), 1-9.
14. Ndulue, T. I., & Ekechukwu, H. C. (2016). Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employees Performance: A Study of Nigerian Breweries Plc Kaduna State Branch, Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 33(3820), 1-11.
15. Parvin, M. M., & Kabir, M. N. (2011). Factors Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction of Pharmaceutical Sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113-123.



16. Pilkington, W., & Wood, J. (1986). *Job Satisfaction, Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity-A Study of Hospital Nurses. The Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 3(3), 3-13.
17. Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago, Ill: Rand McNally.*
18. Tzeng, H. M., & Ketefian, S. (2002). *The Relationship between Nurses' Job Satisfaction and Inpatient Satisfaction: An Exploratory Study an A Taiwan Teaching Hospital. Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 16(2), 39-49.
19. Yuan H. & Jiaqing, K. (2019). *Job Satisfaction of Hotel Employees Conceptual Model Construction and Evaluation. International Journal of Business and Economics Research*, 8(1), 1-5.

