Factors of job satisfaction of non-medical employees in healthcare industry
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Abstract: This research aims to assess the job satisfaction of workers of various IT employees in the Health care sector. It focuses on the relative relevance of factors of job satisfaction and their impact on employee’s actual job satisfaction. A sample of 114 employees from the hospital sector was used for this analysis. The study indicates the organizational development, policies of compensation and benefit, promotion and career development, work task, relationship with supervisor of the hospital are major factors of job satisfaction. The study is useful for evaluating employee satisfaction with their careers, whether or not they like jobs or specific aspects or measurements of work, such as job efficiency and supervision.
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INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction, while obviously related, is not the same as motivation. Job design seeks to increase job satisfaction and efficiency; strategies include task rotation, task extension and job enrichment. The management style and community, the engagement of workers, competitiveness and autonomous work groups are other factors on satisfaction. A very significant trait that is often evaluated by organisations is work satisfaction. Employee satisfaction or job satisfaction is one of the main priorities of all HR workers regardless of what they are. A happy employee is not only a retained employee, but also an internal and external spokesperson for the brand. He or she can help dispel others’ apprehensions and can defend the company in different forums. Happy workers are more committed to the organisation and its priorities, go the extra mile to accomplish their goals and take pride in their work, their teams and their accomplishments. Most companies consider work satisfaction to be based on two factors – salary and ‘recreational activities.’ Employee satisfaction needs to be approached in both short-and long-term visions. In the short term, it is specifically related to turnover and employee-organization matching. It is important that people see the business in a positive light in their early days of employment, otherwise it will not take long for them to look for change. In the longer term, it is more harmful if the employee is not happy but chooses to work for the company for other purposes. The employee begins to search for excuses that will displeasure the company further. For example, if a poor evaluation is the main reason behind her dissatisfaction, the employee could then believe that there is favouritism or that the company does not regard her as a valued asset. Such perceptions corrupt the importance that employees place on the enterprise, and this is projected extrinsically, even among the audience for whom the equity of the organisation is affected. The dissatisfied employee shares her negative perceptions more in external forums than in internal factors, for fear of consequences. And when an current employee talks ill of the company, it decreases the likelihood of the listener entering the company and has an effect on the credibility of the organisation. It is therefore also necessary that HR recognise such employees and work towards alleviating their problems and turning negative experiences into positive ones. Employment satisfaction is a very significant aspect of the employee's life cycle and incentive to stay loyal to and employed by the company. A variety of events or tasks of the HR team directly or indirectly affect the level of satisfaction of employees. HR must also note that the manner in which an organisation works through its policies, senior management and culture will have an effect on how happy employees are and will help them reap the benefits of financial, cultural and brand equity. Employee satisfaction and job fulfilment go hand in hand. Employees are the happiest at work because they realise they're doing important work and working for something special. This evokes a kind of emotional connexion to their work that literally cannot be re-created or artificially made. However, there are elementary management strategies that executives and leaders can use to stimulate this sense of satisfaction and bring it to the forefront of their heads.

Our research idea is based on the rich knowledge acquired by our peer teams across the university. (A.C.Gomathi, S.R.Xavier Rajarathinam, A.Mohammed Sadiq, Rajeshkumar, 2020; Danda et al., 2009; Danda and Ravi, 2011; Dua et al., 2019; Ezhillarasan et al., 2019; Krishnan and Chary, 2015; Manivannan, I., Ranganathan, S.,...)
The objective of the study is to examine the factors of job satisfaction in employees working in the hospital industry.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

(Parvin and Kabir, 2011) have studied the factor affecting employee job satisfaction in the pharmaceutical sector. The authors have studied salary, efficiency in work, fringe supervision, and co-worker relation are the most important factors contributing to job satisfaction. He also analyses the effects on attitudes towards workplace satisfaction of the medication type, work experience, age, and sex differences. The study has been done to gain competitive advantage and adapt to the dramatically changing environment and also it is important to achieve management efficiency by increasing employee satisfaction in organisation and the result is to highlight some of these problems and present a picture of the level of job satisfaction among employees of pharmaceutical companies.

(Goodell and Van Ess Coeling, 1994) have studied the advantages of satisfying nurses in their work are frequently believed, and there is limited research evidence to support such assumptions. The author has studied nurse job satisfaction on turnover, quality of care, and patient satisfaction, nurse intent to stay, nurse retention. The study has been done on work satisfaction, quality of care and patient satisfaction among nurses. The consequences for nurse managers who use work satisfaction as a management method are explored.

(Sneed and Herman, 1990) have studied about the effect of job characteristics and organisational commitment on the job satisfaction of hospital food service workers. The authors have studied about the relationships among job characteristics, organisational commitment, job satisfaction and demographic variables for hospital foodservice employees. The study has been done in an empirical method using 172 samples. From the sample, results show that nutritionists and food service managers can increase organisational commitment and job satisfaction by increasing the variety and feedback of employees.

(Spector, 1997) analysed variable in organizational behaviour research and he explained the summary of the application, analysis, causes and effects of work satisfaction to students and professionals. The author has studied techniques for job satisfaction and included cultural and gender differences in job satisfaction, organizational and personal causes and also job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The study has been done on how people are satisfied with the work and with their organization commitment.

(Kalleberg, 1977) studied to develop a theory of job satisfaction which incorporates differences in work values and perceived job satisfaction. The author analysed the relationship between employee satisfaction and job values and job benefits correlated with six work dimensions: intrinsic, comfort, economical, co-worker relationships, employment prospects and adequacy of resources. He has also done to extend workers who are all able to attain job rewards in their employment situation. The study has been done to establish a structure that connects the variance in employee job satisfaction. The factors that affect the degree of their influence in American society over the achievement of work rewards.

(Larson et al., 1984) have studied about challenges in assessing work satisfaction in the light of the findings of a 6-month survey by nurse workers in a university-affiliated acute care hospital. The authors have studied about Job satisfaction, including the turnover of staff and the quality of care. The study proved job satisfaction scores were significantly affected by the job perceptions of the respondents and the importance they put on the different components of the working environment.

(Saari and Judge, 2004) In the area of employee behaviour and work satisfaction, the three essential discrepancies between HR activities and scientific research were studied. The investigators investigated the origins of employee attitudes, the effects of positive or negative workplace satisfaction, and how the effect of employee attitudes can be calculated. The study has been done on Employee attitude research can provide a clearer understanding of the relationship between the worker and the site and the various internal and external factors that affect employee attitudes. Good or negative work satisfaction results. Happy workers can contribute to higher output rates and happy clients. Many management and HR practitioners, however, must determine what is more competitive.

(Porter et al., 1974) have studied the improvements over time in measures of organisational commitment and work satisfaction as each linked to the resulting turnover of 60 recently hired psychiatric technician trainees. The authors have studied about Relationships between employee attitudes, organizational commitment and turnover. The study has been done on suggesting that such relationships are best at points in the nearest time when a person leaves the organisation. Organizational dedication differentiated stronger between stayers and leavers than the different components of work satisfaction.

(Huang et al., 2016) They have emanated the effect of the safety environment on job satisfaction, employee engagement and attrition using the theory of social exchange as the theoretical framework. The author has studied about Job satisfaction integrated between the safety environment, employee participation and turnover rate. The theory of social exchange was used to describe the relationship. The study has been done on Safety climate.
expectations related to employee results beyond incidents to injuries. Employee safety expectations of the climate have been linked to work satisfaction and commitment. (Danzer, 2019) have Analysed the job satisfaction disparity between public and private sector employees in Ukraine. The author studied Job satisfaction, Self-selection, Quasi-experiment, Privatization, Fringe benefits, Emerging economies and they have, the spontaneous self-selection of workers into sectors is accounted for and corrected by the use of a quasi-experimental recognition strategy. The study has been done to indicate a negative selection of individuals in the public sector. Public-sector employees are better off partially because of more substantial fringe benefits. (Côté et al., 2020) have studied the relationship between Presenteeism and Job Satisfaction and a mediated moderation paradigm focused on work participation and perceived organisational support. The authors have studied about the Employee perceptions of organisational support moderate the association between work engagement and job satisfaction. Work participation and perceived organisational encouragement help to understand the negative effects of Presenteeism on job satisfaction. The study focused on the impact of the presentism on work attitudes. The connection between presentism and work satisfaction is influenced by job commitment. (Bhardwaj et al., 2020) have observed from Employee satisfaction with their place in various commercial banks, including private banking sector in Rajasthan, and to investigate how different variables affect employee satisfaction. The author studied about the factors that contribute to a higher degree of job satisfaction and they have considerations apply to the reorganisation, promotion, protection at work and working relations. The study indicates that the majority of bank workers in the banking sector are happy as far as the culture of work is concerned, but wages and timing remain a major concern for them. (Wang et al., 2020) have studied Job Satisfaction, Job suitable roles and professional fitness. The authors have studied technology fit, job fit and professional fit to examine the transition in employee satisfaction and they have developed it with spillover theory and empirically tested a model to explore the relationship between individual satisfaction with IT at work and job satisfaction. The study proves that IT satisfaction has a positive effect on the work satisfaction of workers. Job fit mediates and enhances the influence of IT satisfaction in the workplace on job satisfaction. (Meng and Berger, 2019) analysed the Effects of organisational culture and leadership on work satisfaction of PR professionals- measuring the mutual mediating effects of engagement and confidence. The author have studied about organizational culture and excellent leader performance on public relations and they followed the strong company culture is vital to improve the overall work satisfaction of PR professionals. The study has been done on Leadership success greatly affects the participation of PR professionals, confidence in the company and work satisfaction. The participation of Professionals and their trust in the company create a mutual mediating impact on their job satisfaction. Work engagement is a good indicator of job satisfaction through its direct influence on trust.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to assess the job satisfaction of IT employees from the healthcare department. The study is based on factors affecting job satisfactions. This is done by employing a questionnaire which contains demographic profile and situational factors on job satisfaction for healthcare employees. The sample size of the study is 114. The response was collected from health care in the IT department. The questionnaire is designed from the work of Raddaha, Alasad, Albikawi, Z.Bataresh, Realat, Saleh and Froelicher (2010).

Fig.1: The pie chart depicts the percentage of gender in the sample. 51% of the sample were Male and 49% were Female employees.

Fig.2: The pie chart describes the age of the employee respondents. 46% of employees were of age 18-25 years, 36% of employees were of age 26 - 40, 17% of 41-55 age group and 1% of 55 and till retirement.
DATA ANALYSIS
The version 27 of SPSS was used for this analysis. Sampling techniques can be used in research survey software for optimum derivation. The samples are collected from the healthcare industry and the samples are collected from the IT department. The tools used for this study are Frequency analysis and are a part of descriptive statistics. In statistics, frequency is the number of times an event occurs. Frequency Analysis is an important area of statistics that deals with the number of occurrences (frequency) and analyzes measures of central tendency, dispersion, percentiles, etc. Analysis of mean or mean analysis is defined as the systematic statistical procedure used in depicting significant difference among information groups in visual form. This method compares the average of each group to the mean of the overall process to discover statistical differences of significance. ANOM method is mostly active in quality control. It can be used for both binomial and normal distribution.

RESULTS
ANALYSIS OF AGE VS FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION FOR EMPLOYEE
Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among age with respect to Factors affecting job satisfaction for employee
Alternative Hypothesis: There is significant difference among age with respect to Factors affecting job satisfaction for employee

Table 1: Analysis Of Age Vs Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction For Employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL. NO.</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>F-VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>4.832</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2.694</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fringe benefit</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>3.580</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (10) shows the one-way anova analysis of age vs pay factor. It is visible that ‘p’ value of pay factor (0.003) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among age with respect to pay factor. From the promotion factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of promotion factor (0.050) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among age with respect to promotion factor. From the supervision factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of the supervision factor (0.011) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among age with respect to supervision factor. From fringe benefit factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of fringe benefit factor (0.111) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among age with respect to fringe benefit factor. From the contingent rewards factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of contingent rewards factor (0.061) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among age with respect to contingent rewards factor. From the operating conditions factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of operating conditions factor (0.481) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among age with respect to operating conditions factor. From the co-workers factor, it is visible that ‘p’
value of co-workers factor (0.132) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among age with respect to co-workers factor. From the nature of work factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of nature of work factor (0.058) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among age with respect to nature of work factor.

**ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION VS FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION FOR EMPLOYEE**

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among education with respect to Factors affecting job satisfaction for employee.

Alternative Hypothesis: There is significant difference among education with respect to Factors affecting job satisfaction for employee.

**Table 2: Analysis Of Education Vs Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction For Employee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO.</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>F-VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2.378</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>4.541</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fringe benefit</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>5.322</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (11) shows the one-way anova analysis of education vs pay factor. It is visible that ‘p’ value of pay factor (0.013) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to pay factor. From the promotion factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of promotion factor (0.056) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to promotions. From the supervision factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of supervision factor (0.002) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to supervision factor. From fringe benefit factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of fringe benefit factor (0.005) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to fringe benefit factors. From the contingent rewards factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of contingent rewards factor (0.001) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to contingent rewards factor. From the operating conditions factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of operating conditions factor (0.107) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to operating conditions. From the co-workers factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of co-workers factor (0.298) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to co-workers factor. From the nature of work factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of nature of work factor (0.013) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to the nature of work factor.

**ANALYSIS OF ANNUAL INCOME VS FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION FOR EMPLOYEE**

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among annual income with respect to Factors affecting job satisfaction for employee.

Alternative Hypothesis: There is significant difference among annual income with respect to Factors affecting job satisfaction for employee.

**Table 3: Analysis Of Annual Income Vs Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction For Annual Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO.</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>F-VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>3.562</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>5.272</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fringe benefit</td>
<td>2.535</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>2.037</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (12) shows the one-way anova analysis of annual income vs pay factor. It is visible that ‘p’ value of pay factor (0.017) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to pay factor. From the promotion factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of promotion factor (0.002) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to pay factor. From the supervision factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of supervision factor (0.039) is lesser than 0.05.
is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to supervision factor. From fringe benefit factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of fringe benefit factor (0.061) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to fringe benefit factor. From the contingent rewards factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of contingent rewards factor (0.019) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to contingent rewards factor. From the operating conditions factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of operating conditions factor (0.74) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to operating conditions factor. From the co-workers factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of co-workers factor (0.113) is greater than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is no significant difference among annual income with respect to co-workers factor. From the nature of work factor, it is visible that ‘p’ value of nature of work factor (0.008) is lesser than 0.05. It is interpreted that there is a significant difference among annual income with respect to the nature of the work factor.

CONCLUSION
Employee satisfaction is the terminology used to describe whether workers are satisfied and relaxed and satisfy their expectations and needs at work. There are a number of reasons why a person is working. Some people work for money, quality of life, get what they need from work and personal fulfillment. In order to please workers with their jobs, the company should meet their needs or expectations from the job. If the job can not meet their basic needs or other expectations, they will resign their job and work for other companies that can provide them with their thighs. This may result in a high rate of turnover of the workforce of that organisation. If employee turnover is high, the company needs to spend more resources on hiring and educating new staff. On the opposite, if workers are happy with their jobs, they will carry out their work with a good attitude. It will also raise their morale and increase their efficiency. As workers perform well, the efficiency of the company and the net profit will be increased. This demonstrates how critical job satisfaction in the workplace become

REFERENCES
15. Meng, J., Berger, B.K., 2019. The impact of organizational culture and leadership performance on PR