

Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation

Impact of Working Environment on Job Performance : A Study of Female Nursing Staff¹

SHIVANILAL*

I. Introduction

THE INDIAN HEALTH care industry is growing rapidly because of its wide expansion, innovative services and increasing investments by the government and private investors worldwide. The health care services in India fall under State list and Concurrent list respectively. While some matter such as societal health and healthcare centres comes in the State list, some others such as measures of population control and family wellbeing and health awareness, and control on the essential drugs are incorporated in the Concurrent list. In the case of health, the term infrastructure plays a wider role than mere physical infrastructure. For smooth operation and expansion of health care services, it needs to have proper clinical services and infrastructure such as hospitals, laboratories and skilled healthcare.

Jaipur is a fast growing city and multiple tertiary centres have come up bringing together the state of the art medical infrastructure, excellent technology and a highly integrated and comprehensive information system coupled with the quest for exploring and developing newer therapies in the field of medicine.

1.1 Work Environment and Job Performance Defined

By work environment, mean the whole lot that forms part of employees' association with the occupation itself, such as interpersonal relationship with co-workers and seniors, effective grievance handling, autonomy,

1 The Thesis was submitted to North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, in February 2011, for the award of Ph.D. Degree awarded in September 2011, under the supervision of Prof. Aditi Jain Senior Assistant Professor, The IIS University, Department of Commerce, SFS, Mansarovar, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302020 INDIA

* Former Assistant Professor, Taxshila Business School, 219, Officers Campus (Main), Sirsi Road, Khatipura, Jaipur 302012, INDIA

participative decision making, organizational culture, room for self-development etc. According to Gibson (1990:58), "Performance is measured in terms of productivity, job satisfaction, turnover and absenteeism."

II. The Study: Objective Hypothesis, Data and Research Methodology

2.1 Objectives of the Study

- To explore the relationship between the factors affecting working environment and the job satisfaction and job performance among female nursing staff in the selected hospitals.
- To compare the factors affecting working environment in the selected government and private hospitals.
- To compare the level of job satisfaction and job performance among female nursing staff in the selected government and private hospitals.

2.2 Hypothesis of the Study

A hypothesis is a precise and testable statement of what researchers predict will be the outcomes of the study.

Hypothesis H01: *There is a significant impact of working environment on job satisfaction and job performance of female nursing staff of selected hospitals.*

Hypothesis H02: *There is a significant difference between working environment of government and private sector hospitals.*

Hypothesis H03: *There exist a significant difference between job satisfaction and job performance of female nursing staff in selected government and private sector hospitals.*

2.3 Data and Research Design

The present study is empirical in nature based on descriptive research design to study and observe the impact of working environment on job satisfaction and job performance in selected government and private hospitals. It is a cross-sectional research, consisting of a sample of the population of interest, has been undertaken. The survey was conducted under natural (un-manipulated) field conditions Probability Sampling Method "Stratified Random Sampling Method".

2.3.1 Universe of the Study

Table I
Sampling Plan Structure

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Sampling Method | Stratified Random Sampling Method |
| 2. Sample size | 500 female nurse |
| 3. Area of Survey | Jaipur |

Source: Self Computed

2.3.2 Sampling Technique And Sample Size

The sample is determined using Morgan formula to calculate sample size for finite population at 5% significance level and a margin of error at 3.5%, a Sample of 515 female nurses was taken on the basis of Stratified Random Sampling from the following hospitals of Jaipur

Table II
Sampling Technique and Sample Size

| S.No. | Name of Government Hospitals | Total Nurses in the Hospital | Sample Size | Name of Private Hospitals | Total Nurses in the Hospital | Sample Size |
|-------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | SMS Hospital | 800 | 233 | Fortis Escort Hospital | 250 | 78 |
| 2 | Zanana Hospital | 151 | 44 | Mahatma Gandhi Hospital | 91 | 28 |
| 3 | Mahila Chikitsalaya | 78 | 23 | Santokba Durlabhji Hospital | 300 | 94 |
| | Total | 1029 | 300 | Total | 641 | 200 |

Source: Self Computed

2.3.3 Data Collection Methodology

The questionnaire was framed with the view to gather information on 20 components of working environment, 3 factors of job satisfaction and 5 factors of job performance from 500 respondents. Respondents were asked to rate these items on five point Likert Scale [strongly disagree (SD) to strongly agree (SA)] hence primary data collection method used. The secondary data was collected through research journals, standard publications, periodicals and web. There are two categories in which the sample has been divided i.e. private and government hospital. The questionnaire was designed into 3 parts as:

i. Work Environment Dimensions

- Job Aid; Supervisor Support; Work Culture and Physical Environment; Security Provision.

ii. Job Performance Dimensions

- Career Growth; Relation with Co-Workers; Relation with Supervisors; Rewards and Recognition of Work; Relation with patients and attendants.

iii. Job Satisfaction Dimensions

- Working Conditions; Work Load; Manageable Stress.

2.4 Research Methodology

2.4.1 Research Questions

- Do the selected aspects of the working environment have an association with job satisfaction?
- Do the selected aspects of working environment have an association with job performance?
- Does the working environment influence the level of job satisfaction and job performance?
- What are the factors that influence the working environment of the hospitals?
- Which aspect of working environment can better explain job satisfaction and job performance?
- What is the mindset of female nurses when it comes to prefer among different aspects of working environment?
- What is the difference of opinion among female nursing staff employed in private and government hospitals regarding working environment, job satisfaction and job performance?

2.4.2 Research Gap

- Most of working environment studies at international level.
- Meagre studies from Rajasthan.
- Earlier studies do not cover different dimensions of work environment and job satisfaction and performance.
- The earlier studies had been restricted to either private or government sector hospitals.

2.4.3 Justification of the Study

Since nurses honour us with their excellence everyday so the study proves to be of eminent significance for:

- i. The higher administration of the health departments.
- ii. The nursing professionals.
- iii. The researchers, academicians and the students.
- iv. Useful information for economic and social progress of country.
- v. Moreover, the study helped to understand the preferences of female nursing staff with regards to working environment and their job satisfaction and job performance.

III. Pilot Study

3.1 Reliability Testing

Table III
Reliability Statistics of Working Environment Dimensions

| Reliability Statistics | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Working Environment | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| Job Aid | 0.629 | 5 |
| Supervisor Support | 0.857 | 5 |
| Work Culture and Physical Environment | 0.508 | 5 |
| Security Provisions | 0.587 | 5 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table IV
Reliability Statistic of Job Performance and Job Satisfaction Dimensions

| Reliability Statistics | | |
|------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Variable | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| Job Satisfaction | 0.947 | 3 |
| Job Performance | 0.78 | 5 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

3.2 Measurement of Sample Adequacy and strength of the relationship among factors

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test has been applied to measure the sample adequacy and strength of the relationship among factors. The KMO measure is greater than 0.5 i.e. 0.945 which is satisfactory for the sampling adequacy and to proceed hypothesis testing. From the

same table, we can see that the Bartlett's test of sphericity is significant that is, its associated probability is less than 0.05. In fact, it is actually 0.000, i.e. the significance level is small enough to reject the null hypothesis. This means that correlation matrix is not an identity matrix.

Table V
KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | 0.945 |
|--|--------------------|--------------|
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 3134.271 |
| | Df | 78.000 |
| | Sig. | 0.000 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

IV. Descriptive Analysis And Data Interpretations

4.1 Demographic information of the respondents with interpretations using table and pie chart.

Table VI
Respondents Working in Public and Private Hospital

| Sector | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Government | 300 | 60.0 |
| Private | 200 | 40.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table VII
Marital Status of Respondents

| Marital Status | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Married | 420 | 84.0 |
| Unmarried | 80 | 16.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table VIII
Respondents Family Type

| Family | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Joint | 160 | 32.0 |
| Nuclear | 340 | 68.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table IX
Respondents Work Experience

| Experience | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Upto one year | 60 | 12.0 |
| 1-4 years | 360 | 72.0 |
| 5-8 years | 40 | 8.0 |
| 13-16 years | 40 | 8.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table X
Respondents Salary Earned

| Salary | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| 0-2 lakhs | 340 | 68.0 |
| 2-5 lakhs | 120 | 24.0 |
| 5-10 lakhs | 40 | 8.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

4.2 Descriptive analysis with interpretations using table and pie chart of Work Environment dimensions

Table XI
Respondents Response Regarding Job Clarity

| Job Clarity | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 40 | 8.0 |
| Disagree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Agree | 280 | 56.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XII
Respondents Response Regarding Freedom of Work

| Freedom of Work | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Disagree | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 400 | 80.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XIII
Respondents Response Regarding Manageable Working Hours.

| Manageable Working Hours | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Disagree | 160 | 32.0 |
| Agree | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XIV
Respondents Response Regarding Disciplined Environment

| Disciplined Environment | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Disagree | 220 | 44.0 |
| Agree | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XV
Respondents Response Regarding Smooth Leave Sanction

| Smooth Leave Sanction | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Disagree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Agree | 200 | 40.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XVI
Respondents Response Regarding Well Communication

| Well- Communication | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 220 | 44.0 |
| Disagree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Neutral | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XVII
Respondents Response Regarding Work Recognition of Nurses

| Recognition | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Disagree | 100 | 20.0 |
| Agree | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XVIII
Respondents Response Regarding Sound Feedback System at Workplace

| Sound Feedback System | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Disagree | 100 | 20.0 |
| Agree | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XIX
Respondents Response Regarding Cordial Relation with the Supervisor

| Cordial Relation with Supervisor | Frequency | Percent |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Disagree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Agree | 440 | 88.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XX
Respondents Response Regarding Effective Grievance Handling at Workplace

| Effective Grievance System | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Disagree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Neutral | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 340 | 68.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXI
Respondents Responses Regarding Healthy Relations with Colleagues

| Healthy Relation with Colleagues | Frequency | Percent |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Disagree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Neutral | 80 | 16.0 |
| Agree | 360 | 72.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXII
Respondents Response Regarding High Degree of Work Pressure

| High Degree of Pressure | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Disagree | 40 | 8.0 |
| Neutral | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXIII
Respondents Response Regarding Adequate Resources Provided at Workplace

| Adequate Resources | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Disagree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Neutral | 120 | 24.0 |
| Agree | 80 | 16.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXIV
Respondents Response Regarding Fringe Benefits Provided at Workplace

| Fringe benefits like housing, conveyance, medical, etc. | Frequency | Percent |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Disagree | 100 | 20.0 |
| Agree | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXV
Respondents Response Regarding Clean and Hygienic Workplace

| Clean & Hygienic Work Place | Frequency | Percent |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Disagree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Agree | 200 | 40.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXVI
Respondents Response Regarding Provisions Against Misbehaviour of Physicians

| Provisions against misbehaviour of physician | Frequency | Percent |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Disagree | 140 | 28.0 |
| Neutral | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 140 | 28.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXVII

Respondents Response Regarding Provisions against Misbehaviour of Colleagues

| Provisions against misbehaviour of colleagues | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Disagree | 100 | 20.0 |
| Neutral | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 240 | 48.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 120 | 24.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXVIII

Respondents Response Regarding Provisions against Misbehaviour of Patients

| Provisions against misbehaviour of patients | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Strongly Disagree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Disagree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Neutral | 40 | 8.0 |
| Agree | 100 | 20.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXIX

Respondents Response Regarding Provisions for Disciplinary Actions

| Sufficient Provisions for disciplinary actions | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Disagree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Neutral | 120 | 24.0 |
| Agree | 320 | 64.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXX

Respondents Response Regarding Barriers for Reporting the Grievance at the Workplace

| Barriers for reporting's | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Disagree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Neutral | 80 | 16.0 |
| Agree | 180 | 36.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 60 | 12.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

4.3 Descriptive analysis with interpretations using table and pie chart of job satisfaction dimensions.

Table XXXI

Respondents Response Regarding Working Conditions Provided at Workplace

| Working Conditions | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 300 | 60.0 |
| Neutral | 80 | 16.0 |
| Satisfied | 80 | 16.0 |
| Highly Satisfied | 40 | 8.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXXII
Respondents Response Regarding Workload at the Workplace

| Workload | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 300 | 60.0 |
| Dissatisfied | 40 | 8.0 |
| Neutral | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXXIII
Respondents Response Regarding Manageable Stress at the Workplace

| Manageable Stress | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 300 | 60.0 |
| Neutral | 160 | 32.0 |
| Satisfied | 40 | 8.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

4.4 Descriptive analysis with interpretation using table and pie chart of job performance dimensions

Table XXXIV
Respondents Response Regarding Respect from Co-worker at Workplace

| Respect from Co-workers | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Dissatisfied | 100 | 20.0 |
| Satisfied | 400 | 80.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXXV
Respondents Response Regarding Relation with Supervisor at Workplace

| Relation with Supervisors | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Dissatisfied | 60 | 12.0 |
| Satisfied | 440 | 88.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXXVI
Respondents Response Regarding Reward and Recognition Provided to the Nurses at the Workplace

| Rewards & Recognition | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 300 | 60.0 |
| Dissatisfied | 40 | 8.0 |
| Satisfied | 160 | 32.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXXVII
Respondents Response Regarding Behaviour of Patients and Attendants at the Workplace

| Behaviour of patients & attendants | Frequency | Percent |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 120 | 24.0 |
| Dissatisfied | 120 | 24.0 |
| Satisfied | 200 | 40.0 |
| Highly Satisfied | 60 | 12.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

Table XXXVIII
Respondents Response Regarding Career Growth at Work Place

| Career Growth | Percentage |
|---------------------|------------|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 240 |
| Dissatisfied | 60 |
| Neutral | 80 |
| Satisfied | 120 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

4.5 Rank analysis of health nurses responses using Weighted Average and their discussion of results.

Table XXXIX
Rank Analysis of Health Nurse's Responses Using Weighted Average

| S. No. | Factors | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | Weighted Total | Weighted Rank Mean | Rank |
|--------|---|-------------------|------------|------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|
| JA1 | Job Clarity | 40 | 60 | 0 | 280 | 120 | 1880 | 125.3333 | 2 |
| JA2 | Freedom of Work | 0 | 40 | 0 | 400 | 60 | 1980 | 132.0000 | 1 |
| JA3 | Manageable working Hours | 180 | 160 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 1140 | 76.0000 | 5 |
| JA4 | Disciplined Environment | 120 | 220 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 1200 | 80.0000 | 4 |
| JA5 | Smooth Leave Sanction | 180 | 120 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 1220 | 81.3333 | 3 |
| | Overall JA | 520 | 600 | 0 | 1200 | 180 | 7420 | 494.6667 | II |
| SS1 | Well Communication | 220 | 120 | 40 | 120 | 0 | 1060 | 70.66667 | 5 |
| SS2 | Recognition | 240 | 100 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 1080 | 72.0000 | 4 |
| SS3 | Sound Feedback System | 240 | 100 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 1080 | 72.0000 | 3 |
| SS4 | Cordial relation with supervisor | 0 | 60 | 0 | 440 | 0 | 1880 | 125.3333 | 1 |
| SS5 | Effective Grievance System | 0 | 120 | 40 | 340 | 0 | 1720 | 114.6667 | 2 |
| | Overall SS | 700 | 500 | 80 | 1220 | 0 | 6820 | 454.6667 | IV |
| WCPE1 | Healthy Relation with Colleagues | 0 | 60 | 80 | 360 | 0 | 1800 | 120.0000 | 2 |
| WCPE2 | High Degree of Pressure | 0 | 40 | 40 | 240 | 180 | 2060 | 137.3333 | 1 |
| WCPE3 | Adequate Resources | 240 | 60 | 120 | 80 | 0 | 1040 | 69.33333 | 4 |
| WCPE4 | Fringe benefits like housing, conveyance, medical, etc. | 240 | 100 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 1080 | 72.0000 | 5 |
| WCPE5 | Clean & Hygenic Work Place | 240 | 60 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 1160 | 77.33333 | 3 |
| | Overall WCPE | 720 | 320 | 240 | 1040 | 180 | 7140 | 476.0000 | III |
| SP1 | Undisciplined Behaviour of physicians | 0 | 140 | 40 | 180 | 140 | 1820 | 121.3333 | 2 |
| SP2 | Undisciplined Behaviour of colleagues | 0 | 100 | 40 | 240 | 120 | 1880 | 125.3333 | 1 |
| SP3 | Undisciplined Behaviour of patients | 180 | 180 | 40 | 100 | 0 | 1060 | 70.66667 | 5 |
| SP4 | Sufficient Provisions for disciplinary actions | 0 | 60 | 120 | 320 | 0 | 1760 | 117.3333 | 3 |
| SP5 | Barriers for reporting | 0 | 180 | 80 | 180 | 60 | 1620 | 108.0000 | 4 |
| | Overall SP | 180 | 660 | 320 | 1020 | 320 | 8140 | 542.6667 | I |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

From the above Table XXXIX, it is evident that female nursing staff were most satisfied with the security provisions (SP) as it has the highest weighted mean (542.67) followed by Job Aid (JA) with weighted mean of 494.67, work culture and physical environment with weighted mean of 476 and lastly supervisor support with weighted mean of 454.67.

4.6 Job Satisfaction

Table XXXX
Arithmetic Mean of Job Satisfaction Dimensions

| Job Satisfaction | Highly Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neutral | Satisfied | Highly Satisfied | Total | Total weighted mean | Arith | Rank |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|------|
| Working Conditions | 300 | 0 | 80 | 80 | 40 | 500 | 1060 | 2.120 | I |
| Workload | 300 | 40 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 860 | 1.720 | III |
| Manageable Stress | 300 | 0 | 160 | 40 | 0 | 500 | 940 | 1.880 | II |

Source : Self Computed from Primary Data

4.7 Job Performance

Table XXXXI
Arithmetic Mean of Job Performance Dimensions

| Job Performance | Highly Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neutral | Satisfied | Highly Satisfied | Total | Total weighted mean | Arith | Rank |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|------|
| Career Growth | 240 | 60 | 80 | 120 | 0 | 500 | 1080 | 2.160 | IV |
| Relation from Co-workers | 0 | 100 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 500 | 1800 | 3.600 | II |
| Relation with Supervisors | 0 | 60 | 0 | 440 | 0 | 500 | 1880 | 3.760 | I |
| Rewards & Recognition for work | 300 | 40 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 500 | 1020 | 2.040 | V |
| Relation with patients & attendants | 120 | 120 | 0 | 200 | 60 | 500 | 1460 | 2.920 | III |

Source : Self Computed from Primary Data

V. Empirical Analysis And Hypothesis Testing

5.1 Hypothesis Testing I Relationship between factors affecting Working Environment and Job Satisfaction and Performance

Hypothesis H01: There is no significant impact of working environment on job satisfaction and job performance of female nursing staff of selected hospitals.

Hypothesis HA1: There is a significant impact of working environment on job satisfaction and job performance of female nursing staff of selected hospitals.

5.1.1 Multiple Correlation Analysis

Bi variate correlations have been compared between the selected factors affecting working environment and Job Satisfaction and Job Performance. using Multiple-Pearson's Correlation

Table XXXXII
Correlations between factors affecting working environment and Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

| Factors | JA | SS | WCPE | SP |
|---------|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| JS | Pearson Correlation | 0.680** | 0.785** | 0.916** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | N | 500.000 | 500.000 | 500.000 |
| JP | Pearson Correlation | 0.726** | 0.911** | 0.885** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | N | 500.000 | 500.000 | 500.000 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

With the help of above table we can infer that significant positive correlations exist between all the selected factors affecting work environment, job satisfaction and job performance. From the results of correlation, 'Job Satisfaction' was found as having the strongest positive relation with 'WCPE' ($r = 0.916$), followed by SS ($r = 0.785$), 'JA' ($r = 0.680$) and SP ($r = 0.195$) respectively. Moreover, 'Job Performance' have high degree of positive correlation with SS ($r = 0.911$), followed by WCPR ($r = 0.885$), JA ($r = 0.726$) and SP ($r = 0.503$) respectively. The p-values of selected independent factors of working environment were less than 0.05 indicated a significant relationship with Job Satisfaction and Job Performance.

5.1.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Table XXXXIII
Regression analysis on selected factors affecting working environment and job satisfaction and job performance

| Dependent Variable | Independent Variable1 | R | R ² | Adjusted R ² | F | Sig. | Unstandardised Coefficient(B) | t | Sig. |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|---|------|-------------------------------|---|-------|
| Job Satisfaction | Model | 0.941 | 0.886 | 0.885 | | 0.00 | -1.157 | | 0.000 |
| | JA | | | | | | -0.165 | | 0.001 |
| | SS | | | | | | 0.270 | | 0.000 |
| | WCPE | | | | | | 1.578 | | 0.000 |
| | SP | | | | | | -0.519 | | 0.000 |
| Job Performance | Model | 0.954 | 0.910 | 0.909 | | 0.00 | 0.001 | | 0.993 |
| | JA | | | | | | -0.377 | | 0.000 |
| | SS | | | | | | 0.805 | | 0.000 |
| | WCPE | | | | | | 0.486 | | 0.000 |
| | SP | | | | | | 0.132 | | 0.000 |

Source: Self Computed from Primary Data

The results presented in table highlights the factors affecting working environment which explain the variation in 'job satisfaction' and 'job performance' among female nursing staff of the selected hospitals of Rajasthan. The results of regression analysis reveal rejection of null hypothesis and acceptance of alternative hypothesis in both the constructed regression models. In other words, fit has been observed between selected factors of working environment and job satisfaction and job performance. In case of job satisfaction, R² value of 0.886 indicates that according to the responses given by the female nursing staff, factors affecting working environment can explain 88.60% of job satisfaction. Similarly, in case of job performance, R² value of 0.910 indicates that according to the responses given by the female nursing staff, factors affecting working environment can affect 91% of job performance of the female nursing staff. The F-ratio reflects if or not the overall regression model is a good quality fit for the statistics. The table reflects that all of the two regression models, factors affecting working environment independent variables) statistically significantly predict the dependent variables job satisfaction and job performance as $F = , p < 0.0005$ i.e., the regression model is a fine fit of the data in all the models. Unstandardized coefficients specify to what extent the dependent variable changes with an independent variable while other independent variables are assumed stable. The models have been constructed

by using unstandardized coefficients since the data is cross sectional in nature. In order to test the statistical significance of each of factors affecting working environment, significance of the t-value is also given in Table XXXXIII. Because every value is lower than 0.05, it reflects existence of vital positive relationships.

5.2 Hypothesis Testing II

Hypothesis H02: *There is no significant difference between working environment of government and private sector hospitals.*

Hypothesis HA2: *There is a significant difference between working environment of government and private sector hospitals.*

Table XXXXIV
Independent Sample t-test showing the difference between working environment of government and private sector hospitals

| Results of Independent Sample t Test | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------|--------------------|--------------------|---|--------|------|------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Group Statistics | | | | | Independent Sample t Test | | | | | | | |
| Dime Sector nasion | N | Mean | Std. Devia tion | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | F | Sig. | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Differ ence | Std. Error Diff. |
| JA | Government | 300 | 2.52 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 287.56 | 0.00 | -25.95 | 498 | 0.00 | -1.12 | 0.04 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.64 | 0.72 | 0.05 | | | | | | | |
| SS | Government | 300 | 2.12 | 0.33 | 0.02 | 84.17 | 0.00 | -35.47 | 498 | 0.00 | -1.52 | 0.04 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.64 | 0.63 | 0.04 | | | | | | | |
| WCPE | Government | 300 | 2.36 | 0.27 | 0.02 | 14.62 | 0.00 | -57.78 | 498 | 0.00 | -1.24 | 0.02 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.60 | 0.18 | 0.01 | | | | | | | |
| SP | Government | 300 | 3.16 | 0.51 | 0.03 | 17.35 | 0.00 | -5.15 | 498 | 0.00 | -0.24 | 0.05 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.40 | 0.51 | 0.04 | | | | | | | |

Source : Self Computed from Primary Data

In the table as given above, it has been examined that mean difference between opinion of female nursing staff in government and private hospitals regarding working environment is significantly different, because all p-values are lower than the significance level (0.05). Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected. It was found that, female nursing staff's opinion regarding healthy working environment offered by private hospitals were significantly higher than the female nursing staff's opinion regarding healthy working environment provided by government hospitals in all selected factors affecting working environment namely JA, SS, WCPE and SP. These results of independent sample t test show that the overall working environment provided by the selected private hospitals is more satisfactory and comfortable for female nursing staff than the working environment provided by the selected government hospitals.

5.3 Hypothesis Testing III

Hypothesis H03: *There is no significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of female nursing staff in selected government and private sector hospitals*

Hypothesis HA3: *There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of female nursing staff in selected government and private sector hospitals*

Table XXXV
Independent Sample t-test showing the difference between job satisfaction and job performance of government and private sector hospitals

| Results of Independent Sample t Test | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-----|------|----------------|---|------|------------------------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Group Statistics | | | | | Independent Sample t Test | | | | | | |
| Dimension | Sector | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | Mean Difference | Std. Error Diff. |
| | | | | | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | | |
| JS | Government | 300 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 813.75 | 0.00 | -157.07 | 498 | 0.00 | -2.27 | 0.01 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.27 | 0.25 | | | | | | | |
| JP | Government | 300 | 2.32 | 0.53 | 55.34 | 0.00 | -34.90 | 498 | 0.00 | -1.44 | 0.04 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.76 | 0.29 | | | | | | | |

Source : Self Computed from Primary Data

In the table as given above, it has been examined that mean difference among job satisfaction and job performance of female nursing staff in government and private hospitals is significantly different, because all p-values are less than the significance level (0.05). Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected.. It was found that, female nursing staff's level of job satisfaction and job performance in private hospitals were significantly higher than the female nursing staff's level of job satisfaction and job performance in government hospitals. These results of independent sample t test show that the job satisfaction and job performance of female nursing staff in the selected private hospitals is more satisfactory than that of female nursing staff of selected government hospitals.

VI. Conclusion

The conclusions drawn from the present study are as follows

- Freedom of work plays the most important role in providing a support system.
- Long and continuous working hours is not a concern for building a healthy working environment
- Cordial relation with the supervisors helps significantly in creating a superior working environment.
- The nurses give less importance to inter personal communication over fulfilling their responsibilities on time.
- High degree of pressure created at work place comprising of excessive work load that negatively affects the working environment
- The nurses consider fringe benefits provided to them is less important in creating a superior vigorous working environment.
- Cordial and amiable relations with their co-workers and provide them a sense of belongingness, security and safety.
- Behaviour of the patients and their attendants is an uncontrollable factor crucial in creating healthy work environment.
- Respondents are extremely dissatisfied and frustrated with the working conditions, workload during their jobs.
- Relationship with supervisors has a direct impact on their job performance.

The nurses of private hospitals were more satisfied with the working environment component provided at the workplace in comparison to the nursing staff of the government hospitals.

From the above mentioned conclusions drawn, the following suggestions are extracted

- The hospitals should focus on the improving the security provisions of female nurses by providing more secured and safe workplace.
- The hospitals immensely need to review their policies and procedures regarding freedom of work, working hours by making them more flexible and manageable, incorporating smooth leave sanction, and workplace discipline
- The hospitals should understand the importance of supervisor support in creating healthy working environment.
- The hospitals should also emphasize more on the work culture and physical environment especially at government hospitals.
- In addition, the government hospitals are required to make more efforts to improve their working environment as compared to private hospitals in terms of job aid, supervisor support, work culture, physical facilities provided and security provisions to retain efficient nursing staff and making it more dynamic.