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JOB SATISFACTION AND PERSONAL CONDITIONS

The personal conditions represent a compilation of factors that are inherent to each nurse as a human being. These variables are demographic characteristics and include sixteen variables like age, sex, designation, education, professional qualification, marital status, number of children, habitat, religion, caste, residence, family type, experience prior to the appointment in the hospital, participation in in-service training, area of work and length of service, . These factors are intrinsic to the nurse and have the potential to shape attitudes towards elements of the job and influence satisfaction.

In this chapter the influence of personal condition on the job satisfaction of the nursing personnel working in Sir Sunderlal Hospital has been studied. The data has been analysed through ANOVA, t-test and Chi-square. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests.

3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

3.1.1 AGE

The age of the respondents ranges from 23 to 60 years. Age of the respondents had been divided into four categories as shown in table 3.1 and figure 3.1. Most of the respondents fall in the age group of 31-40 years i.e. 101(35.9%), 81 (28.8%) respondents were in age group 41-50, 58(20.6%) in 51-60 and rest 41 (14.6%) were in age group 21-30 years.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (in years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2 SEX

The majority of the nurses surveyed were female. Of the 281 respondents, 253 (90%) were female and 28 (10%) were male nurses as shown below in table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 DESIGNATION

The majority of nurses 223 (79.4%) were Staff nurse, 55 (19.6%) were Sister and 3 (1.1%) were Assistant Nursing Superintendent (ANS) as depicted in table 3.3.
### Table 3.3

**Distribution of respondents according to designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff nurse</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Nursing Superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.2*

**Distribution of the respondents according to their designation.**

### 3.1.4 EDUCATION

In the table 3.4, the educational qualification of the respondents highlighted that most of the respondents 177 (63%) were educated up to 12th class, 69 (24.6%) were graduate, 24 (8.5%) were post-graduate and rest 11 (3.9%) were educated up to 10th class.
### Table 3.4

**Distribution of respondents according to education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10th class</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 12th class</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1.5 PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION

As depicted in table 3.5, out of 281 (100%) respondents, 256 (91.1%) had qualified Diploma in General Nursing and Midwifery, whereas only 25 (8.9%) had BSc (Nursing) degree as depicted in table 3.5.

### Table 3.5

**Distribution of respondents according to Professional Qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Nursing Midwifery</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Sc (Nursing)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1.6 MARITAL STATUS

According to marital status, 246 (87.5%) respondents were married, 29 (10.3%) were unmarried and 6 (2.1) were widowed. Distribution of respondents under this variable is shown in table 3.6.

### Table 3.6

**Distribution of respondents according to marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.7 NUMBER OF CHILDREN

As depicted in the table 3.7, out of 250 married and widowed respondents, 128(45.6%) respondents have two children, 65 (23.1%) have one child, 25(8.9%) have three children, 5(1.8%) have four and 2(0.7%) have five children.

Table 3.7
Distribution of respondents according to number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.8 HABITAT

The table 3.8 showed that out of 281 respondents, 237 (84.3%) hailed from urban area and 44 (15.7%) were from rural area.

Table 3.8
Distribution of respondents according to habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.9 FAMILY TYPE

As many as 156 (55.5%) respondents were living in nuclear family and rest 125 (44.5%) were living in joint family as is shown in table 3.9.
### Table 3.9

Distribution of respondents according to family type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.10 RESIDENCE

Most of the respondents 178 (63.3%), were residing in the private accommodation, than in Government accommodation 66 (23.5%) and rest 37 (13.2%) were residing in the Nurses’ Hostel within the BHU campus as is depicted in table 3.10.

### Table 3.10

Distribution of respondents according to type of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government accommodation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private accommodation</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.11 RELIGION

The table 3.11 showed that 185 (65.8%) were Hindu, 90 (32.0%) were Christian, 4 (1.4%) were Muslim and 2 (0.7%) were Sikh.

### Table 3.11

Distribution of respondents according to religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.12 CASTE

According to caste, most of the respondents were in General category (65.8%), 47 (16.7%) were in Other Backward Class category, 35 (12.5%) were in Schedule Caste category and 14 (5.0%) were in Schedule Tribe category as tabulated in table 3.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Caste</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Tribe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Class</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12
Distribution of respondents according to caste

3.1.13 EMPLOYEES ‘EXPERIENCE PRIOR JOINING TO SIR SUNDERLAL HOSPITAL

In relation to the Employees’ experience prior joining to Sir Sunderlal Hospital, 214 (76.2%) of the respondents were those who joined Sir Sunderlal hospital with no prior experience, 59 (21.0%) were those who had experience of working in Government sector earlier and 8 (2.8%) were those who had worked in Private sector earlier. The distribution of respondents under this variable is shown in table 3.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience prior joining the Sir Sunderlal Hospital</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With no prior experience</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in government sector earlier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in private sector earlier</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.14 IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Out of 281 (100%) respondents, 177 (63%) had attended the in-service training programme and 104 (37.0%) had not attended it. The table 3.14 showed the distribution of respondents accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of respondents according to participation in in-service training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.15 AREA OF WORK

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the different wards were divided into five main areas –Surgical ward, Medical ward, Critical care units, specialized ward and others. Surgical ward includes Surgical ward of Modern and Indian Medicine, Burns, Plastic surgery. Medical ward includes medicine ward of both Modern and Indian Medicine. Critical care units includes Intensive care units adults, Neonatal ICU, Emergency and operation theatre area. Specialized ward includes Paediatric, Neurology, cardiology, Nephrology, orthopaedics, Eye/Ear Nose Throat, Gynaecology and Obstetrics. Others include Special ward A and B, Out Patient Departments, Laboratories and Nursing office.

The respondents working in Critical care units were (n=91, 32.4%), in Specialized area (n=65, 23.1%), in Medical wards (n=61, 21.7%), in other area (n=35, 12.5%) and in Surgical ward (n=29, 10.3%) as shown in table 3.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of respondents according to area of work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical care units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.16 LENGTH OF SERVICE

As depicted in the table 3.16, most of the respondents (n=108, 38.4%) had 11-20 years of service, 81 (28.8%) had 21-30, 66 (23.5%) had 1-10 and 26 (9.3%) had 31-40 years of service in Sir Sunderlal Hospital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.16
Distribution of respondents according to length of service

3.2 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED PERSONAL CONDITIONS VARIABLES AND JOB SATISFACTION

The relationship between personal conditions variables and job satisfaction has been studied by analysing the data with the help of mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, t-test, and Chi-square as presented in various tables. The job satisfaction in the present study has been divided into three levels such as low job satisfaction, medium job satisfaction and high job satisfaction which has been measured through summation score approach by applying Likert scale. The respondents having mean job satisfaction level below 2.5 are under the category of low job satisfaction, from 2.5 to 3.5 are included in the category of medium job satisfaction and those who have mean job satisfaction above 3.5 are included in the category of high job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Level of job satisfaction</th>
<th>Range of score</th>
<th>Mean of job satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low job satisfaction</td>
<td>96-240</td>
<td>&lt;2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium job satisfaction</td>
<td>241-336</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High job satisfaction</td>
<td>337-480</td>
<td>&gt;3.5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17
Overall Job Satisfaction of the Respondents
The table 3.17 and figure 3.3 showed that the overall nursing personnel of this hospital were having medium level of job satisfaction.

3.2.1 INFLUENCE OF THE AGE ON JOB SATISFACTION

To investigate the influence of age on the job satisfaction, age had been divided into four class interval and in each age group the mean of the overall job satisfaction of the respondents had been compared as shown in table 3.18.

Table 3.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age(in Years)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>330.83</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>319.3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>331.06</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>5.704*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>348.76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The job satisfaction was lower in the age group 31-40 and higher in age group 51-60. One way analysis of variance showed statistically significant differences (p<.001) between the satisfaction level of nurses in different age groups.
### Table 3.19
Association between age and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (in Years)</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1(2.4)</td>
<td>17(41.5)</td>
<td>23(56.1)</td>
<td>41(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2(2.0)</td>
<td>69(68.3)</td>
<td>30(29.7)</td>
<td>101(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3(3.7)</td>
<td>42(51.9)</td>
<td>36(44.4)</td>
<td>81(100)</td>
<td>19.091*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>23(39.7)</td>
<td>35(60.3)</td>
<td>58(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The value of chi square ($\chi^2 = 19.091$, $p<.05$) for the age and job satisfaction was significant that indicated there was association between age and job satisfaction.

### 3.2.2. INFLUENCE OF SEX ON JOB SATISFACTION

The mean value of job satisfaction in both males and females was shown in table 3.20. The comparison showed that males had higher job satisfaction than female. The mean score of job satisfaction in females were 328.56 whereas in males it was 347.57. The t-test value was insignificant as $p>.05$ which indicated there was no difference in level of job satisfaction in males and females.

### Table 3.20
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction amongst male and females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>347.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51.80</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>328.56</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.21
Association between sex and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1(3.6)</td>
<td>10(35.7)</td>
<td>17(60.7)</td>
<td>28(100)</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5(2.0)</td>
<td>141(55.7)</td>
<td>107(42.3)</td>
<td>253(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)
The value of Chi square \( (\chi^2 = 4.119, p > 0.05) \) for sex and job satisfaction was insignificant. Hence, it can be inferred that there was no association between sex and level of job satisfaction (table 3.21).

**3.2.3 INFLUENCE OF DESIGNATION ON JOB SATISFACTION**

According to designation, the respondents were divided into three categories: Staff nurse, Sister and Assistant Nursing Superintendent (ANS). The mean score of job satisfaction was low amongst Staff nurse (mean = 325.87) and high amongst Sister (mean = 346.96) and then amongst Assistant Nursing Superintendent (mean = 368.00) as depicted in the table 3.22, it showed that the respondents at higher position were more satisfied than at lower positions. This finding was supported by ANOVA which indicated that there was statistically significant \((p < 0.05)\) difference in mean score of job satisfaction among nursing personnel with different designations.

**Table 3.22**

Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff nurse</td>
<td>325.87</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>42.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>346.96</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46.68</td>
<td>6.305*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Nursing Superintendent</td>
<td>368.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 3.22 showed that the most of the Staff nurses (57.8%) were satisfied at medium level with their job whereas most of the Sisters (60%) and 100% of Assistant Nursing Superintendent were highly satisfied. The Chi-square value \((\chi^2 = 12.168, p < 0.05)\) demonstrated statistically significant association between designation.
and level of job satisfaction. Hence, it can be inferred that the designation of nursing personnel influence their level of job satisfaction.

3.2.4 INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON JOB SATISFACTION

According to education, the respondents were divided into four categories as depicted in the table 3.24. The mean score of job satisfaction was low in respondent educated up to 12th Class (mean =327.08) and higher in respondents with postgraduate degree (mean =341.00). It showed that the respondents with higher degrees were more satisfied then less educated. But this difference was not statistically significant as established by ANOVA test (F=1.101, p= 0.349).

Table 3.24
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10th class</td>
<td>339.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 12th class</td>
<td>327.08</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>333.94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>341.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.25
Association between education and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 - 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10th class</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>6(54.5)</td>
<td>5(45.5)</td>
<td>11(100)</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 12th class</td>
<td>6(3.4)</td>
<td>94(53.1)</td>
<td>77(43.5)</td>
<td>177(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>39(56.5)</td>
<td>30(43.5)</td>
<td>69(100)</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post- Graduates</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>12(50.0)</td>
<td>12(50.0)</td>
<td>24(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.25 showed the value of Chi square ($\chi^2 = 3.916$, p>.05) for education and level of job satisfaction. Therefore, education had no significant effect on the level of job satisfaction of nursing personnel.

119
3.2.5 INFLUENCE OF PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION ON JOB SATISFACTION

According to professional qualification, the respondents were divided into two categories as depicted in the table 3.26. The mean score of job satisfaction in nursing personnel with Diploma in General Nursing and Midwifery (mean = 330.58) was slightly higher than the nursing personnel having BSc (nursing) degree (mean = 329.12). But this difference was not statistically significant as established by t-test (t=1.527, p>.05).

Table 3.26
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to Professional qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>330.58</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc Nursing</td>
<td>329.12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.27
Association between professional qualification and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualification</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>6(2.3)</td>
<td>133(52.0)</td>
<td>117(45.7)</td>
<td>256(100)</td>
<td>3.907</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc Nursing</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>18(72.0)</td>
<td>7(28.0)</td>
<td>25(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>3.907</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.27 showed that the most of the nursing personnel with Diploma in nursing and midwifery (52.0%) and most of the nursing personnel with BSc (nursing) degree (72%) were satisfied at medium level with their job. The Chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 3.907$, p>.05) indicated that there was statistically insignificant association between professional qualification and level of job satisfaction. Hence, it can be inferred that professional qualification of nursing personnel has no effect on their level of knowledge.
3.2.6 INFLUENCE OF THE MARITAL STATUS ON JOB SATISFACTION

To investigate the influence of marital status on the job satisfaction, it had been divided into four categories. As there was no respondent in the category of divorcee so for the purpose of analysis only three categories were utilized. In each category the mean of the job satisfaction of the respondents had been compared as shown in table 3.28. The mean score of job satisfaction was lower in the married group and higher in unmarried and widower respondents. The analysis by ANOVA showed that there was no statistically significant (F= 0.898, p=0.408) difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst respondents of different marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>329.11</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>339.83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>340.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of Chi-square (χ² = 4.839, p>.05) for the marital status and job satisfaction was not significant (table 3.29). Therefore, it is inferred that the marital status of the nursing personnel had no influence on their level of job satisfaction.

3.2.7 INFLUENCE OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN ON JOB SATISFACTION

The children are the responsibility of the parents. The parents has the obligation towards their children for education and fulfillment of their needs.
parents are able to meet those needs with the earnings they get from the job then they are satisfied and if not, then they are dissatisfied. As the number of children will be more then the liability will be more on them which influences the level of job satisfaction. In the given table 3.30, the mean score of job satisfaction had been shown and the analysis by ANOVA showed that there is no statistically significant difference ($F= 1.876, p=0.099$) in mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents having different number of children.

**Table 3.30**

**Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to the number of children of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of children</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>338.37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>321.22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>331.23</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>325.96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>334.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>395.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>1.876</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.31**

**Association between number of children and job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(1.8)</td>
<td>25(43.9)</td>
<td>31(54.4)</td>
<td>57(100)</td>
<td>11.083</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3(4.7)</td>
<td>39(60.9)</td>
<td>22(34.4)</td>
<td>64(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(1.6)</td>
<td>69(53.9)</td>
<td>57(44.5)</td>
<td>128(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>14(56.0)</td>
<td>11(44.0)</td>
<td>25(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4(80.0)</td>
<td>1(20.0)</td>
<td>5(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>2(100.0)</td>
<td>2(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>11.083</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 4.839, p>.05$) for the category of respondents according to number of children they have and the job satisfaction was not significant as shown in table 3.31. It showed that number of children had no impact on level of job satisfaction of the respondents.
3.2.8 INFLUENCE OF HABITAT ON JOB SATISFACTION

According to habitat, the respondents were divided into two categories as depicted in the table 3.32. The mean score of job satisfaction in nursing personnel from rural background (mean =345.39) was higher than the nursing personnel from urban background (mean =327.68). The value of t test (t=2.454, p>0.05) showed that there was no significant difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents hailing from different habitat.

Table 3.32
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to habitat of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>345.39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>327.68</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>2.454</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.33
Association between habitat and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131(55.3)</td>
<td>100(42.1)</td>
<td>237(100)</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20(45.4)</td>
<td>24(54.5)</td>
<td>44(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.2)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.33 showed that the most of the nursing personnel from rural background (54.5 %) had high level of job satisfaction and most of the nursing personnel from urban background (55.3 %) had medium level of satisfaction with their job. The Chi- square value ($\chi^2 = 3.063$, p>.05) indicated that there was statistically insignificant association between habitat and level of job satisfaction. Therefore, it can be interpreted that the level of job satisfaction of nursing personnel was not influenced by their type of habitat.

3.2.9 INFLUENCE OF FAMILY TYPE ON JOB SATISFACTION

According to family type, the respondents were divided into two categories as depicted in the table 3.34. The mean score of job satisfaction in nursing personnel
from joint family (mean = 332.82) was higher than the nursing personnel from nuclear family (mean = 328.56). But the value of t test (t = 0.799, p > .05) showed that there was insignificant difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents of nuclear and joint family.

Table 3.34
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to type of family of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>328.56</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>-0.799</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>332.82</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.35
Association between family type and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>4(2.6) &gt;25</td>
<td>82(52.6) &gt;25</td>
<td>70(44.9) &gt;25</td>
<td>156(100)</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>2(1.6) &gt;25</td>
<td>69(55.2) &gt;25</td>
<td>54(43.2) &gt;25</td>
<td>125(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1) &gt;25</td>
<td>151(53.7) &gt;25</td>
<td>124(44.1) &gt;25</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.35 showed that value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 0.436, p > .05$) for the category of respondents according to their type of family and the level of job satisfaction were not significant. It indicated that the level of job satisfaction of the nursing personnel was not influenced by the type of family they belong.

3.2.10 INFLUENCE OF THE TYPE OF RESIDENCE ON JOB SATISFACTION

To investigate the influence of residential type on the job satisfaction, it had been divided into three categories. In each categories the mean of the overall job satisfaction of the respondents had been compared as shown in table 3.36. The mean score of job satisfaction was lower in the respondents living in Government accommodation (mean = 324.11) and higher in respondents living in Private accommodation (333.29). The analysis by ANOVA showed that there was no
statistically significant \((F= 1.093, p>.05)\) difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst respondent living in different type of accommodation.

**Table 3.36**

*Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to residential type of respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostel</td>
<td>328.11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.85</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government accommodation</td>
<td>324.11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private accommodation</td>
<td>333.29</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.37**

*Association between residential type and job satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostel</td>
<td>1(2.7)</td>
<td>19(51.4)</td>
<td>17(45.9)</td>
<td>37(100)</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government accommodation</td>
<td>2(3.0)</td>
<td>40(60.6)</td>
<td>24(36.4)</td>
<td>66(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private accommodation</td>
<td>3(1.7)</td>
<td>92(51.7)</td>
<td>83(46.6)</td>
<td>178(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The value of Chi-square \((\chi^2 = 2.412, p>.05)\) for the type of residence the respondents were living and the level of job satisfaction was insignificant. Hence, it is inferred that the type of residence the nursing personnel are living have no effect on their level of job satisfaction.

**3.2.11 INFLUENCE OF THE RELIGION ON JOB SATISFACTION**

According to religion, the respondents are divided into two categories as depicted in the table 3.38. The category of religion was reduced to two as the number of respondents in Sikh and Muslim religion were very few and would have altered the findings. The mean score of job satisfaction in nursing personnel from Non-Hindu religion (mean = 334.34) was higher than the nursing personnel from Hindu religion (mean = 328.43). The value of t-test \((t=-1.066, p>.05)\) showed that there was no significant difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents of different religion.
Table 3.38

Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to religion of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>328.43</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>44.12</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Hindu</td>
<td>334.34</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.39

Association between religion and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 - 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>5(2.7)</td>
<td>100(54.1)</td>
<td>80(43.2)</td>
<td>185(100)</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Hindu</td>
<td>1(1.0)</td>
<td>51(53.1)</td>
<td>44(45.8)</td>
<td>96(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.39 showed that the most of the nursing personnel of Hindu religion (54.1 %) and most of the nursing personnel from Non- Hindu religion (53.1 %) are satisfied at medium level with their job. The Chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 0.923$, $p > 0.05$) demonstrate statistically insignificant association between religion of the respondents and level of job satisfaction. Hence, there was no relationship between the religion and level of job satisfaction of nursing personnel.

3.2.12 INFLUENCE OF THE CASTE ON JOB SATISFACTION

According to caste, the respondents are divided into four categories as depicted in the table 3.40. The mean score of job satisfaction in nursing personnel from Schedule caste (mean = 337.89) was highest and of the nursing personnel from Other Backward Class (mean = 327.83) was the lowest. The value of ANOVA ($F=0.400$, $p > 0.05$) showed that there was no significant difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents of different caste.
Table 3.40
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to Caste of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>329.66</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Caste</td>
<td>337.89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Tribe</td>
<td>331.07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Class</td>
<td>327.83</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.41
Association between caste and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 - 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4(2.2)</td>
<td>101(54.6)</td>
<td>80(43.2)</td>
<td>185(100)</td>
<td>3.299</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Caste</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>18(51.4)</td>
<td>17(48.6)</td>
<td>35(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Tribe</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>6(42.9)</td>
<td>8(57.1)</td>
<td>14(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Class</td>
<td>2(4.3)</td>
<td>26(55.3)</td>
<td>19(40.4)</td>
<td>47(100)</td>
<td>3.299</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.41 showed that value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 3.299, p>.05$) for the respondents of various caste and the level of job satisfaction were not significant indicating that there is no statistically significant association between the level of job satisfaction and the caste of the respondents.

3.2.13 INFLUENCE OF NURSING EXPERIENCE PRIOR JOINING SIR SUNDERLAL HOSPITAL ON JOB SATISFACTION

To investigate the influence of the nursing experience of the respondents before joining Sir Sunderlal Hospital on the job satisfaction, it had been divided into three categories. In each category the mean of the overall job satisfaction of the respondents had been compared as shown in table 3.42. The mean score of job satisfaction was lower in the respondents who have worked in private sector earlier and higher in respondents who have no experience before joining Sir Sunderlal Hospital. The analysis by ANOVA showed that there was no statistically significant ($F= 1.78, p>.05$) difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst respondents.
appointed to the hospital with no prior experience or having experience of working in government or private sector earlier.

Table 3.42

Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction according to the respondents’ nursing experience gained prior joining Sir Sunderlal Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing experience prior joining the Sir Sunderlal hospital</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With no prior experience</td>
<td>333.12</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in government sector earlier</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in private sector earlier</td>
<td>320.85</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.43

Association between nursing experience prior joining Sir Sunderlal Hospital and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing experience prior joining the Sir Sunderlal hospital</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With no prior experience</td>
<td>5(2.3)</td>
<td>109(50.9)</td>
<td>100(46.7)</td>
<td>214(100)</td>
<td>3.638</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Government sector earlier</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4(50.0)</td>
<td>4(50.0)</td>
<td>8(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in private sector earlier</td>
<td>1(1.7)</td>
<td>38(64.4)</td>
<td>20(33.9)</td>
<td>59(100)</td>
<td>3.638</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 3.638, p>.05$) showed that there was no statistically significant association between the level of job satisfaction and the respondents’ experience prior joining Sir Sunderlal Hospital.

3.2.14 INFLUENCE OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING ON JOB SATISFACTION

The effect of in-service training on job satisfaction had been analysed by classifying the respondents into two categories. The first category consists of those respondents who had participated in in-service training programme (attended). The second category consists of those respondents who had not participated in in-service
training programme (not attended). Their mean value had been tabulated in table 3.44. The respondents who had attended the in-service training programme had low satisfaction than the other category but the analysis by Independent t-test shows that the difference in mean score of job satisfaction between the two categories was statistically insignificant (t=-1.006, p>.05).

### Table 3.44

Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents according to their participation in in-service training programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-service training</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>328.41</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>-1.006</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not attended</td>
<td>333.92</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.45

Association between in-service training and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-service Training</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>3(1.7)</td>
<td>100(56.5)</td>
<td>74(41.8)</td>
<td>177(100)</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not attended</td>
<td>3(2.9)</td>
<td>51(49.0)</td>
<td>50(48.1)</td>
<td>104(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.45 showed that the value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 1.696, p>.05$) was not statistically significant which indicated that the respondents classified on the basis of participation in in-service training programme had the same level of job satisfaction.

### 3.2.15 Infl uence of Area of Work on Job Satisfaction

The mean value of job satisfaction for each of the five areas of work were shown in table 3.46. The comparison showed that nursing personnel working in surgical wards have lower level of job satisfaction (mean=299.38) and those who were working in specialized areas have higher level of job satisfaction (mean=345.23). The value of ANOVA indicated that there was significant difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst respondents working in different areas of the hospital ($F=6.765, p<.05$).
Table 3.46
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents according to their area of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Work</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surg ward</td>
<td>299.38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49.74</td>
<td>6.765*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical ward</td>
<td>321.70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical care</td>
<td>332.95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>345.23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>337.51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.47
Association between area of work and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (&gt;3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surg ward</td>
<td>3(10.3)</td>
<td>20(69.0)</td>
<td>6(20.7)</td>
<td>29(100)</td>
<td>27.803*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical ward</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>42(68.9)</td>
<td>19(31.1)</td>
<td>61(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical care</td>
<td>2(2.2)</td>
<td>47(51.6)</td>
<td>42(46.2)</td>
<td>91(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>1(1.5)</td>
<td>26(40.0)</td>
<td>38(58.5)</td>
<td>65(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>16(45.7)</td>
<td>19(54.3)</td>
<td>35(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.47 showed that value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 27.803, p<.05$) calculated for the analysis of area of work against job satisfaction was significant indicating that there was significant association between area of work and job satisfaction of the respondents.

3.2.16 INFLUENCE OF LENGTH OF SERVICE ON JOB SATISFACTION

The mean value of job satisfaction for each of the four classes of length of service were shown in table 3.48. The comparison showed that nursing personnel who have experience of 11 to 20 years have lower level of job satisfaction and those who have 31-40 years of experience have higher level of job satisfaction. The value of ANOVA indicates there was significant difference in mean score of job satisfaction amongst respondents with different length of service ($F=3.007, p<.05$).
Table 3.48
Comparison of mean score of job satisfaction amongst the respondents according to their length of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service (in years)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>329.36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>323.94</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>333.07</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>3.007*</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>352.08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330.45</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.49
Association between length of service and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service (in Years)</th>
<th>Low Job Satisfaction (&lt;2.5)</th>
<th>Medium Job Satisfaction (2.5 – 3.5)</th>
<th>High Job Satisfaction (≥3.5)</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>1(1.5)</td>
<td>32(48.5)</td>
<td>33(50.0)</td>
<td>66(100)</td>
<td>10.813</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>3(2.8)</td>
<td>69(63.9)</td>
<td>36(33.3)</td>
<td>108(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2(2.5)</td>
<td>40(49.4)</td>
<td>39(48.1)</td>
<td>81(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>10(38.5)</td>
<td>16(61.5)</td>
<td>26(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(2.1)</td>
<td>151(53.7)</td>
<td>124(44.1)</td>
<td>281(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The value in parentheses indicates percentages)

The table 3.49 showed that value of Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 10.813$, p<0.1) calculated for the analysis of length of service against job satisfaction was significant indicating that there is slight significant association between length of service and job satisfaction.

3.3 OTHER SOCIO–PERSONAL VARIABLES

a. Experience on the particular designation

The respondents were also categorized according to experience on particular designation.

Out of total 281 respondents, 62 (22.1 %) had 21-25 years of experience and 33 (11.7 %) had 26-30 years of experience on designation staff nurse.

On the designation of Sister out of total 55, 26(46.4%) had experience of 1-5 years and only 5(9.0%) had experience more than 20 years.
On the designation of ANS, out of total 3, 1 respondent had 8 years of experience and two of them had experience up to 4 years. It shows that the promotional opportunity is very poor in this hospital. This could be one of the reasons of dissatisfaction with the job.

b. Reason for leaving the previous job before joining Sir Sunderlal Hospital

The 8 respondents out of total 67 have joined the Sir Sunderlal Hospital after resigning from the previous government job and 59 have joined leaving the private job. The most common reason for leaving the job was better job opportunity at Sir Sunderlal Hospital (90%) and the next reason was family reason. In eastern Uttar Pradesh, Sir Sunderlal Hospital is the only tertiary care central government hospital. This may be the reason that young nurses are aspired to join it.

3.4 CONCLUSION:

This chapter provided an overview of the influence of personal condition variable on job satisfaction. Almost 16 socio-personal condition variable of the respondents (age, sex, education, professional qualification, designation, marital status, family type, religion, caste, residence, experience prior joining the Sir Sunderlal Hospital, habitat, area of work, number of children length of service and in-service training) was included in the study. Firstly, the distribution of respondents according to various socio personal variables were tabulated and then the effect of each variable was analysed using ANOVA, t-test and Chi-square and it was found that out of these 16 variables— age, designation, length of service and area of work had significant effect on job satisfaction of the respondents.