

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY THE VARIOUS LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION AMIDST DOCTORS WORKING IN COIMBATORE CITY HOSPITALS

GEETHA M*

Dr.S. Franklin John**

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction is the level of contentment a person feels regarding his or her job. Job satisfaction can be influenced by a person's ability to complete required tasks, the level of communication in an organization, and the way management treats employees. There are two different levels of job satisfaction: affective job satisfaction and cognitive job satisfaction. Affective job satisfaction is a person's emotional feeling toward the job. Cognitive job satisfaction is how satisfied a person feels concerning an aspect of his or her job, such as pay, hours, or benefits. It is not always easy to measure job satisfaction as the definition of satisfaction can be different for different people. Overall job satisfaction is actually a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction: Intrinsic job satisfaction is when workers consider only the kind of work they do, the tasks that make up the job. Extrinsic job satisfaction is when workers consider the conditions of work, such as their pay, coworkers, and supervisor. Hence a study was conducted to measure the extent level of job satisfaction among doctors working in Coimbatore City.

Key words: Doctors, Job Satisfaction, Levels, Impact, Coimbatore

* PhD Scholar, Nehru College of Management Nehru Gardens, Thirumalayam Paalayam Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu-641105

** Research Supervisor, Principal and Professor, Nehru College of Management Nehru Gardens, Thirumalayam Paalayam Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu-641105

INTRODUCTION

According to John Storey, (1995), “Human resource management is a distinctive approach to employment management which seeks to achieve competitive advantage through the strategic deployment of a highly committed and capable workforce, using an integrated array of Cultural, structural and personal techniques”.

Human Resource Management (HRM) is a relatively new approach to manage people in any organisation. This approach considers people as the key resource. It is concerned with the people dimension in management of an organisation. Since an organisation is a body of people, their acquisition, development of skills, motivation for higher levels of attainments, as well as ensuring maintenance of their level of commitment are all significant activities. These activities fall in the domain of HRM. HRM is a process, which consists of four main activities, namely: acquisition, development, motivation, as well as maintenance of human resources. Human Resource Management is responsible for maintaining good human relations in the organisation. It is also concerned with development of individuals and achieving integration of goals of the organisation and those of the individuals.

Doctors are termed as the human capital of hospitals. So without proper compensation management, they cannot be properly managed and retained. And we all know that hiring cost is much higher than retaining cost. We all know about the famous phrase, "health is wealth". So without a proper health protecting structure (hospitals), we cannot assure about a country's prosperity. And it is necessary that doctors in hospitals are well compensated to achieve their goals effectively and efficiently. Doctors are the corner stone of hospitals or so called in an organization.

JOB SATISFACTION

Job Satisfaction is the level of contentment a person feels regarding his or her job. This feeling is mainly based on an individual's perception of satisfaction. Job Satisfaction can be influenced by a person's ability to complete required tasks, the level of communication in an organization, and the way management treats employees. There are often two different levels of Job Satisfaction: affective Job Satisfaction and cognitive Job Satisfaction. Affective Job Satisfaction is a person's

emotional feeling toward the job as a whole. Cognitive Job Satisfaction is how satisfied a person feels concerning an aspect of his or her job, such as pay, hours, or benefits. It is not that always easy to measure Job Satisfaction as the definition of satisfaction can be different for different people.

Job Satisfaction is a complex and important concept for human resource managers to understand. Most employees do not believe their work is being properly rewarded. Nor do they believe that their companies are doing enough to attract high quality performers, train them, or manage them effectively. Overall Job Satisfaction is actually a combination of both the intrinsic and extrinsic Job Satisfaction: Intrinsic Job Satisfaction is when workers consider only the kind of work they do, the tasks that make up the job. Extrinsic Job Satisfaction is when workers consider the conditions of work, such as their pay, coworkers and supervisor.

Profession and Job Satisfaction:

The doctor's Job Satisfaction is much important for hospital management in creating patient caring culture in the hospital and high turnover of doctors with altruistic attitude. The level of satisfaction of doctors with the working conditions and other related factors seem to play significant role in dealing with the patients. A satisfied work force of doctors may provide greater support to patients.

Job Satisfaction has inspired far less research interest than job stress and theories of Job Satisfaction are largely undeveloped. Sources of Job Satisfaction for doctors focus largely on their interactions with patients, but doctors derive satisfaction in addition from the autonomy, variety and responsibility they have for their work. Again, these sources of satisfaction have been identified largely by junior doctors and general practitioners and the extent to which they are relevant to the work experiences of hospital consultants remains unknown. Although doctors often report very high levels of satisfaction with particular aspects of their role, there has been very little exploration of the extent and manner in which Job Satisfaction is related to job stress. Where a relationship is reported, the association appears to be moderate and negative, indicating that doctors experiencing greater stress at work experience less job satisfaction. The relationship

between the satisfaction doctors derive from their work may have with their mental health has not been explored.

Many organizational scholars have shown interest in why some people report being satisfied with their jobs, while others express lower levels of job satisfaction. However, not much is known about which factors influence Job Satisfaction in hospital staff.

Objective of the study

- To study the demographic profile of the respondents.
- To measure the level of Job Satisfaction among the respondents of varied demographic profile.
- To determine the association between Job Satisfaction among the respondents of varied demographic profile.
- To assess the difference in the levels of Job Satisfaction among respondents of varied demographic profile.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Mai-Stiina Lampinen, Elina Annikki Viitanen and Anne Irmeli Konu (2015) in their study the purpose was to identify how the factors associated with sense of community at work are connected with Job Satisfaction among the front-line managers and middle managers in social and health-care services in Finland. Alongside job meaningfulness, open communication and good flow of information within the organization, sense of security provided by close relationships at work and managers' own superiors' appreciation of their leadership skills all are related to managers' Job Satisfaction. The findings of this study can be used in the development of leadership to support managers in coping at work.

Mohammad Sayed A, and Akhtar N (2014) study shows the effects of perceived work life balance and Job Satisfaction on organizational commitment among healthcare employees. It was predicted that perceived work life balance fosters Job Satisfaction which leads to the organizational commitment among employees in the long run. Results showed that respondents have moderate level of perceived work life balance, Job Satisfaction and organizational

commitment. Author concludes that work life balance and Job Satisfaction are important for developing and enhancing organizational commitment among healthcare workers.

Shinde, M B and Durgawale PM (2014) narrates that the low Job Satisfaction among nurses and the achievement of positive outcome such as a low patient fall rate are issues that affect both quality and cost of patient care. Although the cost of nurse job dissatisfaction has not been directly measured, the high cost of turnover rate has been well established. Poor patient outcome such as an increased patient fall rate also increases the cost of healthcare. Moreover, poor patient outcomes increase the length of stay, increase resource utilization, and increase the cost of treatment. Dissatisfied not only give poor quality, less efficient care. Nurses who were not satisfied at work were also found to distance themselves from their patients and their nursing chores.

Sathyajith S and Dr. R. Haridas (2014) had conducted a study to assess Job Satisfaction among nurses of private hospitals in Kerala state and they found that 30 (15%) are highly satisfied on their job, 144 (72%) are moderately satisfied and 26 (13%) shows low level of satisfaction. Significant relation was found between Job Satisfaction and age, sex, experience.

A study by **Apeksha Gulavani and Mahadeo Shinde (2014)** illustrates that their objective was to assess occupational stress and Job Satisfaction among nurses working in tertiary care hospitals and to find out correlation between occupational stress and Job Satisfaction among nurses. Descriptive study design was used with explorative research approach; study sample was 100 nurses selected by convenient sampling technique. Experience specific measure to reduce stress of nurse associated with frequently occurring causes and measures to improve Job Satisfaction associated with compensation and independence will be helpful to improve performance of the nurses.

Sharma. M.et.al. (2014) conducted a cross-sectional study by using comprehensive customized questionnaire among Indian physicians to assess the level of Job Satisfaction from their job and also to identify the factors influencing it. A total of 170 physicians were selected from two medical institutes using multistage sampling method. The results of this study showed that about

74% of physicians were satisfied from their job. Physical work conditions, freedom to choose desired method of working, attitude of fellow workers, recognition for good work, attitude of immediate boss, rate of pay, opportunity to use abilities, inter and intra departmental management, attention paid to the suggestions were the nine factors significantly associated with Job Satisfaction of physicians. According to author the pattern of high proportion of satisfaction of the Indian physicians reported was similar to the physicians' satisfaction working particularly in developed countries.

Elarabi HM and Johari F (2013) contended the factors that affect Job Satisfaction and job performance and the relationship between Job Satisfaction and job performance. The study had identified four factors: work comfort, Work treatment, salary, incentives and evaluated their impact on Job Satisfaction of the medical staff working in government hospitals in Libya. Employees and medical staff were not satisfied with all the factors affecting Job Satisfaction which lead to low job performance in the hospital. The study concluded that the performance of medical staff and medical service quality in hospitals could be enhanced when employees are satisfied and are well treated by their managers in addition to good salaries and effective incentive system.

Singh Rajkumar G (2013) depicts from his study on hospital employees to probe the factors influencing Job Satisfaction. The author states that positive performance of employee in the organization is an outcome of his satisfactory job experience. Study investigated the factors influencing the Job Satisfaction among the private hospital employees of Manipur state in India. There was a significant association between Job Satisfaction of employees and relationship behavior factors, pay and compensation factors and training and career growth factors. Pay and compensation factors were the most important factors positively correlated with employee Job Satisfaction.

Rosales RA, Labrague JL and Rosales GL (2013) research narrated that the study aimed to determine the level of Job Satisfaction and burnout among nurses in three government hospitals of Samar and Philippines. Findings revealed that the highest ranked subscale was Emotional exhaustion; on the other hand depersonalization subscale was the lowest scored subscale. The

analyses also showed that there is a significant relationship between the respondent's level of burnout and their level of Job Satisfaction. The result showed a statistically significant relationship between the nurse-respondents level of burnout and their level of Job Satisfaction which may effect on the quality of care given to their patients.

Senbounsou Khamlub, Md Harun-Or-Rashid, Mohammad, et al., (2013) studied the assessment of Job Satisfaction levels among health-care workers and factors correlated with their overall Job Satisfaction. This cross-sectional study was conducted with 164 health-care workers using self-administered questionnaires on a six point Likert scale. In conclusion, health-care workers at health centers in Lao PDR were generally satisfied with their job except for their salary. The main factors that correlate with their overall Job Satisfaction were conflict resolutions at work, relationships with other co-workers, and organizational structure.

Kath, Shirey, Acron, et al (2012) states in their study that among nurse managers, Job Satisfaction has been found to be an important predictor of organizational commitment. In addition, issues such as work-related stress, autonomy and social support have been found to influence Job Satisfaction among nurse managers. Both supervisor and coworker support has been found to moderate the negative effects of stress on Job Satisfaction experienced by nurse managers in the working hospitals.

Whereas the other study conducted by **Saini R, Kaur S and Das K (2012)** founded that workload, decreased job autonomy, inadequate supervisor support, less opportunities of learning on job and inappropriate feedback to be significant predictors of stress among nurses. Nurses with high levels of personal accomplishment perceived significantly lesser degree of stress. More than half (56%) prefer to choose the same job if they were given another chance and 11(44%) responded that they will try another job, if given an option to choose a job.

A study examined by **Rosales RA, Labrague LJ, Rosales GL. (2012)** reveals that among healthcare professionals, nurses have been found to be most prone to burnout. Moreover, studies have shown that burnout among nurses has a negative effect on the quality of patient care and

patient satisfaction. Burnout and low Job Satisfaction indeed contributes into the nurses' inefficiency and affects their dedication to job quality and care given.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study has the quantitative approach of research and it is descriptive in nature. The study has used demographic profile and Job Satisfaction items and has opted the standard tool from Brayfield and Rothe for the Job Satisfaction questionnaire. Job Satisfaction using the Job Satisfaction Index developed by Brayfield & Rothe in the year 1951 was used. The purpose of this Job Satisfaction scale is to know the levels of satisfaction on the present job of the respondents for the various reasons that were stated. The scale contains 18 questions in the 5-point likert scale containing five choices namely: 5 – Very Satisfied; 4 - Satisfied; 3 – Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied; 2 – Dissatisfied; 1 – Very Dissatisfied. Reliability analysis refers to whether an instrument produces the same result each time it is administered to the same kind of person in the same setting. Cronbach's Alpha is used for the reliability analysis and the value was .7 and it is used for the present study.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Frequency tabulation

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

| PARTICULARS | DESCRIPTION | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Age (in years) | Less than 30 | 295 | 65.8 |
| | 30-40 | 111 | 24.8 |
| | 40-50 | 22 | 4.9 |
| | Above 50 | 20 | 4.5 |
| Sex | Male | 183 | 40.8 |
| | Female | 265 | 59.2 |
| Marital status | Single | 262 | 58.5 |
| | Married | 186 | 41.5 |
| Educational qualification | BDS | 154 | 34.4 |
| | MBBS | 122 | 27.2 |
| | MD | 88 | 19.6 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----|------|
| | MS | 33 | 7.4 |
| | MDS | 15 | 3.3 |
| | DM | 12 | 2.7 |
| | MCH | 24 | 5.4 |
| Designation | Professor | 25 | 5.6 |
| | Associate professor | 19 | 4.2 |
| | Assistant professor | 33 | 7.4 |
| | Senior resident | 72 | 16.1 |
| | Junior resident | 299 | 66.7 |
| Working experience (in years) | Less than 5 | 301 | 67.2 |
| | 6-10 | 100 | 22.3 |
| | 11-15 | 19 | 4.2 |
| | 16-20 | 6 | 1.3 |
| | Above 20 | 22 | 4.9 |
| Location of residence | Rural | 64 | 14.3 |
| | Urban | 338 | 75.4 |
| | Semi-urban | 46 | 10.3 |
| Annual income (in lakhs) | 2-5 | 308 | 68.8 |
| | 5-8 | 92 | 20.5 |
| | 8-10 | 23 | 5.1 |
| | More than 10 | 25 | 5.6 |
| Discipline | General physician | 130 | 29.0 |
| | Dental | 169 | 37.7 |
| | ENT | 24 | 5.4 |
| | Cardiology | 12 | 2.7 |
| | Pediatric | 24 | 5.4 |
| | Anesthesia | 35 | 7.8 |
| | Gynecology | 9 | 2.0 |
| | General medicine | 26 | 5.8 |
| | Orthopedics | 9 | 2.0 |
| | Dermatology | 10 | 2.2 |

- Among 448 respondents 65.8% of respondents are less than 30 years of age, 24.8% of respondents are between 30-40 years of age, 4.9% of respondents are between the age 40-50 years of age and remaining 4.5% of the respondents are above 50 years of age.
- Among 448 respondents 40.8% of the respondents are male in gender and the remaining 59.2% of the respondents are female in gender.
- Among 448 respondents 58.5% of the respondents are not married and the remaining 41.5% of the respondents are married.
- Among 448 respondents 34.4% of the respondents have BDS as their qualification, 27.2% of the respondents have MBBS as their qualification, 19.6% of the respondents have MD as their qualification, 7.4% of the respondents have MS as their qualification, 3.3% of the respondents have MDS as their qualification, 2.7% of the respondents have DM as their qualification and remaining 5.4% of the respondents have MCH as their qualification as in whole.
- Among 448 respondents 5.6% of the respondents are professors in designation, 4.2% of the respondents are associate professors by designation, 7.4% of the respondents are assistant professors by designation, 16.1% of the respondents are senior residents by designation and the remaining 66.7% of the respondents are junior residents by designation.
- Among 448 respondents 67.2% of the respondents are having less than 5 years of working experience, 22.3% of the respondents are having 6-10 years of working experience, 4.2% of the respondents are having 11-15 years of work experience, 1.3% of respondents are having 16-20 years of work experience and then the remaining 4.9% of the respondents are having more than 20 years of the work experience.
- Among 448 respondents 14.3% of the respondents are living in the rural areas, 75.4% of the respondents are having the urban locality and the remaining 10.3% of the respondents are having semi-urban as their living locality.
- Among 448 respondents 68.8% of the respondents are having 2-5 lakhs of annual income, 20.5% of the respondents are having 5-8 lakhs of the annual income, 5.1% of the respondents are having 8-10 lakhs of annual income and then the 5.6% of the respondents are having more than 10 lakhs of the annual income.
- Among 448 respondents 29% of the respondents are having General Physician as their discipline, 37.7% of the respondents are having Dentistry as their discipline, 5.4% of the

respondents are having ENT as their discipline, 2.7% of the respondents are having Cardiology as their discipline, 5.4% of the respondents are having Pediatric as their discipline, 7.8% of the respondents are having Anesthesia as their discipline, 2.0% of the respondents are having Gynecology as their discipline, 5.8% of the respondents are having General Medicine as their discipline, 2% of the respondents are having Orthopedics as their discipline and 2.2% of the respondents are having Dermatology as their discipline as in whole.

LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Age and Job satisfaction level cross tabulation

| AGE In years | LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|----------------------------|------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|------|-------|
| | LOW | | MEDIUM | | HIGH | | |
| < 30 | Count | 13 | Count | 264 | Count | 18 | 295 |
| | Expected count | 11.2 | Expected count | 268.0 | Expected count | 15.8 | 295.0 |
| 30-40 | Count | 2 | Count | 105 | Count | 4 | 111 |
| | Expected count | 4.2 | Expected count | 100.8 | Expected count | 5.9 | 111.0 |
| 40-50 | Count | 2 | Count | 20 | Count | 0 | 22 |
| | Expected count | 0.8 | Expected count | 20.0 | Expected count | 1.2 | 22.0 |
| > 50 | Count | 0 | Count | 18 | Count | 2 | 20 |
| | Expected count | 0.8 | Expected count | 18.2 | Expected count | 1.1 | 20.0 |
| Total | Count | 17 | Count | 407 | Count | 24 | 448 |
| | Expected count | 17.0 | Expected count | 407.0 | Expected count | 24.0 | 448.0 |
| Pearson Chi-Square Value = 6.997^a | | | | Sig. = .321 | | | |

It is interpreted that out of 448 respondents 295 respondents fall below 30 years of age in which 13 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 264 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 18 respondents have the high level of Job Satisfaction. 111 respondents fall between the age group 30-40 years in which 2 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 105 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 4 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 22 respondents fall between the age group 40-50 years in which 2 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction and 20 respondents have the medium level of Job Satisfaction. 20

respondents come under the age more than 50 years of which 18 respondents have the medium level of Job Satisfaction and 2 respondents have the high level of Job Satisfaction.

To test whether there is significant association between the levels of Job Satisfaction and age of the respondents, chi-square analysis was carried out. The significance value is 0.321 which indicate the significant level to be greater than 0.05 and it is inferred that there is no association between the age of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

Gender and Job satisfaction level cross tabulation

| GENDER | LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| | LOW | | MEDIUM | HIGH | | | |
| Male | Count | 6 | Count | 165 | Count | 12 | 183 |
| | Expected | 6.9 | Expected | 166.3 | Expected | 9.8 | 183.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Female | Count | 11 | Count | 242 | Count | 12 | 265 |
| | Expected | 10.1 | Expected | 240.7 | Expected | 14.2 | 265.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Total | Count | 17 | Count | 407 | Count | 24 | 448 |
| | Expected | 17.0 | Expected | 407.0 | Expected | 24.0 | 448.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Pearson Chi-Square Value = 1.065^a | | | | Sig. = .587 | | | |

It is interpreted that out of 448 respondents 183 respondents are male in which 6 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 165 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 12 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 265 respondents are female and in which 11 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 242 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 12 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction.

To test whether there is significant association between the levels of Job Satisfaction and gender of the respondents, chi-square analysis was carried out. The significance value is 0.587 which indicate the significant level to be greater than 0.05 and it is inferred that there is no association between the gender of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

Marital status and Job satisfaction level cross tabulation

| MARITAL STATUS | LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| | LOW | | MEDIUM | HIGH | | | |
| Single | Count | 13 | Count | 233 | Count | 16 | 262 |
| | Expected | 9.9 | Expected | 238.0 | Expected | 14.0 | 262.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Married | Count | 4 | Count | 174 | Count | 8 | 186 |
| | Expected | 7.1 | Expected | 169.0 | Expected | 10.0 | 186.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Total | Count | 17 | Count | 407 | Count | 24 | 448 |
| | Expected | 17.0 | Expected | 407.0 | Expected | 24.0 | 448.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Pearson Chi-Square Value = 3.183^a | | | | Sig. = .204 | | | |

It is interpreted that out of 448 respondents 262 respondents are single in which 13 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 233 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 16 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 186 respondents are married and in which 4 respondents are having low level of Job Satisfaction, 174 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 8 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction.

To test whether there is significant association between the levels of Job Satisfaction and marital status of the respondents, chi-square analysis was carried out. The significance value is 0.204 which indicate the significant level to be greater than 0.05 and it is inferred that there is no association between the marital status of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

Educational qualification and Job satisfaction level cross tabulation

| EDUCATION QUALIFICATION | LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION | | | | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----|----------|-------|----------|-----|-------|
| | LOW | | MEDIUM | HIGH | | | |
| BDS | Count | 11 | Count | 133 | Count | 10 | 154 |
| | Expected | 5.8 | Expected | 139.9 | Expected | 8.3 | 154.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| MBBS | Count | 4 | Count | 112 | Count | 6 | 122 |
| | Expected | 4.6 | Expected | 110.8 | Expected | 6.5 | 122.0 |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|------|----------|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| MD | Count | 2 | Count | 82 | Count | 4 | 88 |
| | Expected | 3.3 | Expected | 79.9 | Expected | 4.7 | 88.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| MS | Count | 0 | Count | 30 | Count | 3 | 33 |
| | Expected | 1.3 | Expected | 30.0 | Expected | 1.8 | 33.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| MDS | Count | 0 | Count | 15 | Count | 0 | 15 |
| | Expected | 0.6 | Expected | 13.6 | Expected | 1.8 | 15.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| DM | Count | 0 | Count | 12 | Count | 0 | 12 |
| | Expected | 0.5 | Expected | 10.9 | Expected | 0.6 | 12.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| MCH | Count | 0 | Count | 23 | Count | 1 | 24 |
| | Expected | 0.9 | Expected | 21.8 | Expected | 1.3 | 24.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Total | Count | 17 | Count | 407 | Count | 24 | 448 |
| | Expected | 17.0 | Expected | 407.0 | Expected | 24.0 | 448.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Pearson Chi-Square Value = 11.972^a | | | | Sig. = .448 | | | |

It is interpreted that out of 448 respondents 154 respondents have BDS as qualification and in which 11 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 133 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 10 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 122 respondents have MBBS as qualification and in which 4 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 112 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 6 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 88 respondents have MD as qualification and in which 2 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 82 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 4 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 33 respondents have MS as qualification and in which 30 respondents have medium level of Self-Efficacy and 3 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 15 respondents have MDS as qualification and in which 15 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction. 12 respondents have DM as qualification and in which 12

respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction. 24 respondents have MCH as qualification and in which 23 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 1 respondent have high level of Job Satisfaction.

To test whether there is significant association between the levels of Job Satisfaction and educational qualification of the respondents, chi-square analysis was carried out. The significance value is 0.448 which indicate the significant level to be lesser than 0.05 and it is inferred that there is association between the educational qualification of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

Designation and Job satisfaction level cross tabulation

| DESIGNATION | LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION | | | | | | TOTAL |
|--|----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------|----------|------|-------|
| | LOW | | MEDIUM | HIGH | | | |
| Professor | Count | 0 | Count | 23 | Count | 2 | 25 |
| | Expected | 0.9 | Expected | 22.7 | Expected | 1.3 | 25.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Associate Professor | Count | 2 | Count | 17 | Count | 0 | 19 |
| | Expected | 0.7 | Expected | 17.3 | Expected | 1.0 | 19.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Assistant Professor | Count | 0 | Count | 33 | Count | 0 | 33 |
| | Expected | 1.3 | Expected | 30.0 | Expected | 1.8 | 33.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Senior resident | Count | 3 | Count | 62 | Count | 7 | 72 |
| | Expected | 2.7 | Expected | 65.4 | Expected | 3.9 | 72.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Junior resident | Count | 12 | Count | 272 | Count | 15 | 299 |
| | Expected | 11.3 | Expected | 271.6 | Expected | 16.0 | 299.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Total | Count | 17 | Count | 407 | Count | 24 | 448 |
| | Expected | 17.0 | Expected | 407.0 | Expected | 24.0 | 448.0 |
| | count | | count | | count | | |
| Pearson Chi-Square Value = 10.761^a | | | | Sig. = .216 | | | |

It is interpreted that out of 448 respondents 25 respondents come under professor designation and in which 23 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction and 2 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 19 respondents come under associate professor designation and in which 2 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction and 17 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction. 33 respondents come under assistant professor designation and in which 33 respondents have medium level of Job Satisfaction. 72 respondents come under senior resident designation and in which 3 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 62 respondents have the medium level of Job Satisfaction and 7 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. 299 respondents come under junior resident designation and in which 12 respondents have low level of Job Satisfaction, 272 respondents have the medium level of Job Satisfaction and 15 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction.

To test whether there is significant association between the levels of Job Satisfaction and designation of the respondents, chi-square analysis was carried out. The significance value is 0.216 which indicate the significant level to be greater than 0.05 and it is inferred that there is no association between the designation of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

ANOVA

Analysis of Variance of the respondents of varied age group

| DIMENSION | MEAN | | | | SD | | | | F value | Significance (2-tailed) |
|------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|-------------------------|
| | < 30 Yrs | 30-40 yrs | 40-50 yrs | >50 yrs | < 30 Yrs | 30-40 yrs | 40-50 yrs | >50 yrs | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 3.07 | 2.99 | 2.87 | 3.24 | .446 | .321 | .369 | .357 | 3.621 | .013 |

Significance @ 0.05 levels

INFERENCE: As exhibited in the table, the value of F for **Job Satisfaction** was found to be 3.621, which is having significant effects at 0.05 levels, which reveals that this attribute is having significant difference with the age of the respondents and hence H₀ is rejected.

Analysis of Variance of the respondents of varied gender

| DIMENSION | Mean | | SD | | F value | Significance (2-tailed) |
|------------------|------|--------|------|--------|---------|----------------------------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 3.06 | 3.04 | .394 | .428 | .223 | .637 |

Significance @ 0.05 levels

Inference : As exhibited in the table, the value of F for **Job Satisfaction** was found to be .223, which is not having significant effects at 0.05 levels, which reveals that this attribute is not having significant difference with the gender of the respondents hence H0 is accepted.

Analysis of Variance of the respondents of varied marital status

| DIMENSION | Mean | | SD | | F value | Significance (2-tailed) |
|------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|----------------------------|
| | Single | Married | Single | Married | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 3.05 | 3.04 | .453 | .354 | .138 | .710 |

Significance @ 0.05 levels

Inference: As exhibited in the table, the value of F for **Job Satisfaction** was found to be .138, which is not having significant effects at 0.05 levels, which reveals that this attribute is not having significant difference with the marital status of the respondents and hence H0 is rejected.

Analysis of Variance of the respondents of varied locality

| DIMENSION | Mean | | | SD | | | F value | Significance (2-tailed) |
|------------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|------------|---------|----------------------------|
| | Rural | Urban | Semi-urban | Rural | Urban | Semi-urban | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 3.04 | 3.05 | 3.03 | .505 | .401 | .378 | .066 | .936 |

Significance @ 0.05 levels

Inference: As exhibited in the table, the value of F for **Job Satisfaction** was found to be .066, which is not having significant effects at 0.05 levels, which reveals that this attribute is not having significant difference with the locality of the respondents and hence H0 is accepted.

Analysis of Variance of the respondents of varied annual income

| DIMENSION | MEAN | | | | SD | | | | F value | Significance (2-tailed) |
|------------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------------|
| | 2-5 lakh | 5-8 lakh | 8-10 lakh | >10 lakh | 2-5 lakh | 5-8 lakh | 8-10 lakh | >10 lakh | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 3.038 | 3.112 | 2.797 | 3.208 | .344 | .598 | .359 | .333 | 4.973 | .002 |

Significance @ 0.05 levels

Inference: As exhibited in the table, the value of F for **Job Satisfaction** was found to be 4.973 which is having significant effects at 0.05 levels, which reveals that this attribute is having significant difference with the annual income of the respondents and hence H₀ is rejected.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS**

- 65.8% respondents fall under the age group less than 30 years and only 4.5% of respondents fall under the age group of more than 50 years of age.
- 40.8% of the respondents are male. Remaining 59.2% of the respondents are female.
- 41.5% of the respondents are married and the remaining 58.5% of respondents are unmarried.
- 34.4% of the respondents are falling under the BDS qualification and only 2.7% of respondents fall under DM qualification.
- Majority of 66.7% of respondents fall under the designation as junior residents. Only 4.2% of the respondents are Associate Professors in the designation group.
- 67.2% of the respondents have less than five years of working experience and only 1.3% of respondents fall under the group between 16-20 years of working experience.
- 75.4% of the respondents are from the urban locality of residence and 10.3% of respondents come under the semi-urban locality of residence.
- Majority of 68.8% of respondents have the annual income level between 2-5 lakhs and only 5.1% of respondents have between 8-10 lakhs as the annual income.
- 37.7% of the respondents come under the Dental discipline and 2.0% of respondents fall in orthopedics discipline.

LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION

➤ Job Satisfaction level on Age reveals that on 448 total respondents 295 are below 30 years of which 13 have low level of JS, 264 have medium level of JS and 18 have high level of JS. 111 respondents are between 30-40 years of which 2 have low level of JS, 105 have medium level of JS and 4 have high level of JS. 22 respondents are between 40-50 years of which 2 have low level of JS, 20 have medium level of JS and none have high level of JS. 20 respondents are more than 50 years of age in which none have low level of JS, 18 have medium level of JS and 2 has high level of JS. The chi-square test significant value is 0.321 and it is inferred that there is association between the age of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level on Gender reveals that on 448 total respondents 183 are male of which 6 have low level of JS, 165 have medium level of JS and 12 have high level of JS. 265 respondents are female of which 11 have low level of JS, 242 have medium level of JS and 12 have high level of JS. The chi-square test significant value is 0.587 and it is inferred that there is no association between the gender of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level on marital status reveals that on 448 total respondents 262 are single of which 13 have low level of JS, 233 respondents have medium level of JS and 16 respondents have high level of JS. 186 respondents are married of which 4 respondents have low level of JS, 174 respondents have medium level of JS and 8 respondents have high level of JS. The chi-square test significant value is 0.204 and it reveals that there is no association between the marital status of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level on educational qualification reveals that out of 448 respondents 154 respondents have BDS as educational qualification and in which 11 have low level of JS, 133 have medium level of JS and 10 respondents have high level of JS. 122 respondents have MBBS as educational qualification in which 4 respondents have low level of JS, 112 have medium level of JS and 6 respondents have the high level of JS. 88 respondents have MD educational qualification and in which 2 respondents have low level of JS, 82 respondents have medium level of JS and 4 respondents have high level of JS. 33 respondents have MS as educational qualification and in which no respondent have low level of JS, 30 respondents have medium

level of JS and 3 respondents have high level of JS. 15 respondents have MDS as educational qualification and in which no respondent have low level of JS, 15 respondents have medium level of JS and none have high level of JS. 12 respondents have DM as educational qualification and in which no respondent have low level of JS, 12 respondents have medium level of JS and no respondents have high level of JS. 24 respondents have MCH as educational qualification and in which no respondent have low level of JS, 23 respondents have medium level of JS and 1 respondent have high level of JS. The chi-square test significant value is 0.448 and it is inferred that there is no association between the educational qualification of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level on designation reveals that out of 448 respondents 25 respondents come under professor designation and in which no respondent have low level of JS, 23 respondents have medium level of JS and 2 respondents have high level of JS. 19 respondents come under associate professor designation and in which 2 respondents have low level of JS, 17 respondents have medium level of JS and no respondents have high level of JS. 33 respondents come under assistant professor designation and in which no respondent have low level of JS, 33 respondents have medium level of JS and no respondents have high level of JS. 72 respondents come under senior resident designation and in which 3 respondent have low level of JS, 62 respondents have the medium level of JS and 7 respondents have high level of JS. 299 respondents come under junior resident designation and in which 12 respondents have low level of JS, 272 respondents have the medium level of JS and 15 respondents have high level of JS. The chi-square test significant value is 0.216 and reveals that there is no association between the designation of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level on working experience reveals that out of 448 respondents 301 respondents have less than 5 years of working experience and in which 12 respondents have low level of JS, 273 respondents have medium level of JS and 16 respondents have high level of JS. 100 respondents fall between 6-10 years of working experience and in which 3 respondents have low level of JS, 91 respondents have medium level of JS and 6 respondents have high level of JS. 19 respondents fall between 11-15 years of working experience and in which 1 respondent have low level of JS, 18 respondents have medium level of JS and no respondent have high level of

JS. 6 respondents come between 16-20 years of working experience and in which 1 respondent have low level of JS, 5 respondents have medium level of JS and no respondent have high level of JS. 22 respondents come under more than 20 years of working experience and in which no respondents have low level of JS, 20 respondents have medium level of JS and 2 respondents have high level of Job Satisfaction. The chi-square test reveals that significant value is 0.668 hence there is no association between the working experience of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level on locality reveals that out of 448 respondents 64 respondents are from rural locality and in which 4 have low level of JS, 56 respondents have medium level of JS and 4 respondents have high level of JS. 338 respondents come under urban locality and in which 11 are having low level of JS, 311 respondents have medium level of JS and 16 respondents have high level of JS. 46 respondents come from semi urban locality and in which 2 respondents have low level of JS, 40 have medium level of JS and 4 have high level of JS. The chi-square test reveals that the significant value is 0.589 and hence there is no association between the locality of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

➤ Job Satisfaction level of annual income reveals that out of 448 respondents 308 respondents are having annual income between 2-5 lakhs and in which 7 respondents have low level of JS, 289 respondents have medium level of JS and 12 respondents have high level of JS. Among 92 respondents are having annual income between 5-8 lakhs and in which 8 respondents have low level of JS, 74 respondents have medium level of JS and 10 respondents have high level of JS. Among 23 respondents are having annual income between 8-10 lakhs and in which 2 respondents have low level of JS, 21 respondents have medium level of JS and no respondents have high level of JS. Among 25 respondents are having annual income between more than 10 lakhs and in which no respondents have low level of JS, 23 respondents have medium level of JS and 2 respondents have high level of JS. The chi-square test reveals that the significant value is 0.589 and hence there is no association between the annual income of respondents and the levels of Job Satisfaction.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

➤ There is significant difference in well-being factor, self-control factor, emotionality factor, sociability factor, global trait factor, emotion regulation factor, equanimity factor, social skills factor, distress tolerance factor, taking responsibility factor, interpersonal effectiveness factor and the job satisfaction factor among the respondents of different age.

➤ There is significant difference in well-being factor, emotion regulation factor, equanimity factor, social skills factor and taking responsibility factor among the respondents of varied gender

There is no significant difference in self-control factor, emotionality factor, sociability factor, global trait factor, distress tolerance factor, interpersonal effectiveness factor and the job satisfaction factor among the respondents of different gender.

➤ There is significant difference in well-being factor, global trait factor, emotion regulation factor, equanimity factor and interpersonal effectiveness factor among the respondents of varied marital status. There is no significant difference in self-control factor, emotionality factor, sociability factor, social skills factor, distress tolerance factor, taking responsibility factor and the job satisfaction factor among the respondents of different marital status.

➤ There is significant difference in well-being factor, self-control factor, emotionality factor, sociability factor, global trait factor, emotion regulation factor, equanimity factor, distress tolerance factor, taking responsibility factor, interpersonal effectiveness factor and the job satisfaction factor among the respondents of different annual income.

There is no significant difference in social skills factor among the respondents of different annual income.

➤ There is significant difference in equanimity factor among the respondents of different locality. There is no significant difference in well-being factor, self-control factor, emotionality factor, sociability factor, global trait factor, emotion regulation factor, social skills factor, distress tolerance factor, taking responsibility factor, interpersonal effectiveness factor and the job satisfaction factor among the respondents of different locality.

CONCLUSION

Job satisfaction of employees is one of the major factors determining the achievement of objectives. Managing a firm today, more than ever is a challenging activities industry today

requires human resources, who can perform work roles effectively one of the most difficult & challenging task of management is retaining their work force & motivating them to perform better to increase the productivity. Satisfaction with one's job can affect not only motivation at work but also career decisions, relationships with others and personal health. Those who work in a profession that is extremely demanding and sometimes unpredictable can be susceptible to feelings of uncertainty and reduced job satisfaction. Job satisfaction of healthcare workers is also an essential part of ensuring high quality care. Dissatisfied healthcare providers not only give poor quality, less efficient care; there is also evidence of a positive correlation between job satisfaction and patient satisfaction. Given the pivotal role that healthcare professionals play in determining the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of health care systems, it is imperative to understand what motivates them and the extent to which contextual variables and the organization satisfy them.

REFERENCES

1. Mai-Stiina Lampinen, Elina Annikki Viitanen and Anne Irmeli Konu (2015) Leadership in Health Services Vol. 28 No. 3, 2015 pp. 228-244
2. Mohammad, Syed, A., & Akhtar, N. (2014). The Influence of Work Life Balance and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment of Healthcare Employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 4(2), 18–24. <http://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v4i2.5667>
3. Shinde, M. B., & Durgawale, P. M. (2014). Nursing Audit of Health Workers Providing Health Services in Rural Area with Special Emphasis to Community Satisfaction in Satara District. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 3(2), 94-104. www.ijsr.net.
4. Sathyajith S, Haridas R. Job satisfaction among nurses of privet hospitals of Kerala. *IJM* (internet). 2013 March- April (cited 2014 Jan 2). available at www.iaeme.com/ijm.asp
5. Apeksha Gulavani and Mahadeo Shinde (2014), occupational stress and job satisfaction among nurses, *international journal of science and research*, volume 3 issue 4.
6. Sharma, M., Goel, S., Singh, S. K., Sharma, R., & Gupta, P. K. (2014). Determinants of Indian Physicians' Satisfaction & Dissatisfaction from Their Job. *The Indian Journal of Medical Research*, 139(3), from the pages starting from 409 and ending till 417. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4069735/>

7. Elarabi H. M., & Johari, F. (2013). The Determinant Factors Effecting the Job Satisfaction and Performance in Libyan Government Hospital. *Asian Social Science*, 10(8), 55–65. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n8p55>
8. Singh, Rajkumar Giridhari. (2013) Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction Among Hospital Employees. *OPUS: Annual HR Journal*, [S.l.], p. 29-43, ISSN 0973-9866. Available at: <http://www.i-scholar.in/index.php/oahj/article/view/43487>
9. Rosales RA Labrague LJ Rosales GL. Nurses job satisfaction and burnout: is there a connection. *Int J Adv Nsg stud* (internet).2012(cited 2013 Nov 17); 2(1):(about 10pp).
10. Senbounsou Khamlub, Md. Harun-Or-Rashid, Mohammad, et al., (2013), Nagoya J. Med. Sci. 75. 233 ~ 241, 2013
11. Kath, L.M., Stichler, J.F. and Ehrhart, M.G. (2012), “Moderators of the negative outcomes of nurse manager stress”, *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 215-221.
12. Saini R, Kaur S, Das K. Assessment of stress and burnout among intensive care nurses at tertiary care hospital (internet).2011(cited 2012 Jun 20).16(1)