

Work Environment and Situational Motivation of Doctors in Public Sector Hospitals

Shama Mazahir,¹ Shazia Khalid²

Abstract

Objectives: To explore the relationship between work environment and situational motivation among doctors.

Methods: Cross sectional research design was used and a sample of N = 100 doctors were employed through purposive sampling technique from public hospital of Lahore. Work Environment Survey and The Situational Motivation Scale were used to assess studied variables. Pearson Product moment correlation and hierarchical regression were used to analysis data.

Results: Mean age of the participants was 33 years and mean education level was 18.38 years. Results showed that work environment has significant negative predicting relation with situational motivation of the doctors.

Conclusion: Working environment influence doctors' motivation level. These findings have implications in organizational and educational setting, as it helps

public hospital's administration to address problems in working environment.

Key words: Work Environment, Situational Motivation, Doctors.

Introduction

Motivation is the force that directs behaviors towards goal. To be successful in career life, motivation is a key dynamic. Motivation is influenced by many factors like interests, preferences, opportunities, situations and social support etc. Doctors spend half of their day in hospitals, therefore, hospital's environment play very important role in their motivation for work.¹

Arnetz² argue that in organizations, employees reported to have issues with their supervisor who is not giving them the admiration, they deserve. Supervisors also show strict behaviors to subordinates. Furthermore, he describes that top management limits employees to their tasks. Petterson³ argues that interaction between colleagues during a task is crucial for accomplishing the organizational goals and visions. Further, he describes that the communication of information must be properly done in a timely manner so that the operations of the tasks are running smoothly. If there is a clash between colleagues, then it is difficult to achieve the objectives of organization.⁴ Thus, this research was conducted to investigate the effect of work environment on situational motivation of doctors.

Some of the past researches demonstrated the link between work environment and motivation as Elnaga⁵ explored the relation among job motivation, work environment and job satisfaction. Results of this research showed that job satisfaction is affected by motivation and work environment. Some studies expose the relation of different aspects of work environment

¹ MS Clinical Psychology (Scholar), Centre for Clinical Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

² Assistant Professor, Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Date of Submission: 24-03-2016

Date of 1st Revision Received: 24-10-2016

Date of 2nd Revision Received: 06-12-2016

Date of Acceptance for publication: 18-01-2017

Conflict of Interest: None

Funding Source: None

Contribution

All Authors have contributed in Study Design, Data Collection, Data Analysis, Data Interpretation, Manuscript Writing and Approval.

(like, job satisfaction; commitment etc.) with motivation, as Pepe⁶ studied employees' level of job satisfaction and commitment influenced by extrinsic motivational dissatisfies result into turnover intentions. He suggested that employees' perception regarding supervisor's support has positive connection with their organizational commitment and job satisfaction and hence, this leads to decrease in their turn over intentions. Some of the motivational researches explored different components of work environment as its determinants. One of the researches conducted on factors influencing workers' motivation in banking setting of Pakistan, used a sample of 150 workers of the various banks in Pakistan. Result showed that financial rewards, personal traits, high salary plans, job design and supervision had positive impact on employee motivation⁷. Similarly, Malik et al⁸ studied motivational elements among doctors. A sample of 360 physicians was used. Findings of this research showed that intrinsic and socio-cultural aspects like helping others, prestige and professional growth were vital motivators. While, different organizational aspects less pay and limited chances for higher qualification and incentives other than pay, poor working conditions, personal safety and less personal and social time were demotivators.

It was hypothesized that there is likely to be relation between work environment and situational motivation of doctors. It is also hypothesized the work environment is likely to predict the situational motivation of doctors.

Methods

Cross sectional research design was used in this research. A sample of N = 100 doctors was collected from government hospital through purposive sampling technique. Participants with age more than 25years and having more than one-year of working experience were included in this research.

Following Assessment tools were used in this study;

- Work Environment Survey (WES) questionnaire was developed by Public Service Secretariat (PSS) and Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency (NLSA) in 2007.⁹ This survey consisted of 54 items, which are divided into seven domains, i.e., co-worker and supervisor relationships, physical work environment, organizational commitment, current job qualities, opportunities for training and development, communication practices and alignment with departmental vision and goals.
- The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS) was developed by Guay, Valler and Blanchard in 2000.¹⁰ This scale consisted of 16 items, which were divided into four subscales, i.e., intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, external regulation and a motivation.

The research plan was first proved by Department Doctoral Program Committee (DDPC). Then keeping in view the ethical consideration, permission was obtained from the authors of the questionnaires. Permission was also sought through hospital administration. Informed consent was obtained participants. Purpose of the research was explained to the participants. Response rate of the participant is 53%, as participants interest level was low. They reported that they were tried and busy therefore refuse to cooperate. SPSS was used for data analysis. Pearson product moment and hierarchal regression was used to analyze the data.

Results

Descriptive statistics showed that mean age of the participants is 33 years. 62 were male and 38 were female doctors. Mean education level of the doctors is 18.38 years. Their total working experience was 8.57 years. Overall participants' response rate was 53. Description of the variable were shown in table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and reliabilities of study variables (N=100)

Variables	M	SD	Mini-Max	α
Work Environment	--	--	--	--
Co-worker and Supervisor Relationships	39.26	8.21	1-5	.88
Physical Work Environment	11.62	2.70	1-5	.70
Organizational Commitment	19.74	12.60	1-5	.75
Current Job Qualities	60.94	17.24	1-5	.78

Variables	M	SD	Mini-Max	α
Opportunities for Training and Development	18.46	4.44	1-5	.84
Communication Practices	33.14	6.66	1-5	.86
Alignment with Departmental Vision and Goals	19.04	4.38	1-5	.86
Situation Motivation	--	--	--	--
Intrinsic Motivation	14.40	4.75	1-7	.66
Identified regulation	15.00	5.21	1-7	.76
External Regulation	14.78	5.07	1-7	.65
Amotivation	16.58	4.82	1-7	.64

Note: *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; Mini = minimum; Max = Maximum; α = cronbach alpha.

In order to indicate relation among all the work environment components and situational motivation types, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used as indicated in table.

Table 2: Pearson product moment correlation to reflect the relation among studied variables (*N*=100)

Vars.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	-	.75**	.25*	.19	.04	.02	.08	.21*	.21*	-.12	.05	.01	-.10
2. Edu	-	-	.08	.14	-.03	-.06	.08	.03	.05	-.13	.08	.08	-.16
3. CoW	-	-	-	.55**	.63**	.62**	.51**	.50**	.27**	-.30**	-.28**	-.32**	-.26**
4. PWE	-	-	-	-	.53**	.55**	.40**	.43**	.30**	-.21*	-.35**	-.10	-.21*
5. OC	-	-	-	-	-	.56**	.44**	.45**	.41**	-.09	-.13	-.38**	-.23*
6. CJQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	.53**	.55**	.41**	-.24*	-.38**	-.24*	-.14
7. OTD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.68**	.61**	-.13	-.15	-.18	.17
8. CP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.68**	-.21*	-.25*	-.07	-.23*
9. ADV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.03	-.10	-.07	.04
10. IM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.77**	.40**	.40**
11. IR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.41**	.26**
12. ER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.57**
13. Amo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ Vars.=Variables; CoS=Relationship with coworkers and supervisors; PWE=Physical Working Environment; OC= Organizational Commitment; CJQ=Current Job Qualities; OTD=Opportunities of Training and Development; CP=Communication Practices; ADV=Alignment with departmental Visions and Goals; IM= Intrinsic Motivation; IR=Identified Regulation; ER=External Regulation; Amo=Amotivation.

Results indicated that age had significant positive relation with coworkers and supervisors, communication practices and alignment with departmental goals and visions. Educational level of the participants did not indicate any relationship with different aspects of working environment and situational motivation. It

meant that doctors' education level did not associated with their motivation to work. Relation with coworkers and supervisors reflected negative association with all the type of situational motivation. Physical work environment also showed negative linked with intrinsic motivation, identified regulation and a moti-

Table 3: Hierarchical Regression showing effect of work environment and interaction of work environment with age on situational motivation of Doctors (N=100).

Predictors	IM		IR		ER		Amo	
	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	B	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.09		.10*		.00		.10	
Age		.03		.27		.01		-.10
Step 2	.10		.17**		.19**		.09	
Age		.26		.39*		.02		-.01
CoW		-.38*		-.25		-.25		-.18
PWE		.03		-.26*		.18		-.08
OC		.19		.28*		-.32*		-.09
CJQ		-.10		-.22		-.10		.15
CP		.15		-.52		.17		-.15
Total R ²	.76***		.81***		.73***		.63***	

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; β = Standardized Co efficient; ΔR^2 = R Square change; R^2 = R Square; CoS = Relationship with coworkers and supervisors; PWE = Physical Working Environment; OC = Organizational Commitment; CJQ = Current Job Qualities; OTD = Opportunities of Training and Development; CP = Communication Practices; ADV = Alignment with departmental Visions and Goals.

vation. Organizational commitment exhibited negative link with external regulation and a motivation. Current job qualities indicated negative relation with intrinsic motivation, identified regulation and external regulation. Communication practices indicated negative association with intrinsic motivation, identified regulation and a motivation.

In order to indicate the predicting effect work environment and interaction of work environment on situational motivation of the doctors, hierarchical regression was used, which is indicated in the following table 3.

Overall models for intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, external regulation and a motivation in block 2 explained 76%, 81%, 73% and 63% of the variance in intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, external regulation and a motivation respectively, $F(6, 93) = 3.25$, $p < .001$; $F(6, 93) = 4.23$, $p < .001$; $F(6, 93) = 3.14$, $p < .001$; $F(6, 93) = 2.56$, $p < .001$. These models showed that relation with coworkers is significant negative predict of intrinsic motivation. Similarly, physical working environment is significant negative predict of identified regulation and organizational commitment negatively predict external regulation. When age of the doctors was added in block 1, it appeared to be non-significant predictor of intrinsic

motivation, identified regulation, external regulation and a motivation.

Discussion and Conclusion

Results of the study showed that different aspects of work environment had negative association with motivation of doctors to work. Okello and Gilson¹¹ suggested that in hospital, setting trust relationship with colleagues and supervisors directly and indirectly influence doctors' motivation. Elements like respect, recognition, rewards, communication positively affect employees' desire to work. Findings revealed that in health setting, the relationship among coworkers and supervisors are non-satisfactory, therefore its leads to decrease in their motivation.^{12,13} Similarly, another research indicates that better supervision has positive impact on employees' motivation.⁸

In government institutes cleanliness is a major concern. Ignorance towards hospital physical structure and its maintenance leads to the unhealthy and dirty environment which may suffocate the doctors and reduce their motivation for learning and serving⁹. Result of this study also indicated that the way hospitals are facilitating doctors, also negatively influence their motivation. Doctors' response towards job qua-

lity's items indicated that in these days, job facilities for the doctors are not much appealing and therefore, they are losing their interest towards their work.^{8,14-17}

Communication is an important factor in any working setting. Communication practice help us to evaluate ourselves, our working and directly affect our motivation. Findings also revealed that communication practices used in hospital leads to decrease in the doctors' motivation towards work.^{18,19}

Conclusion

This study has some limitations, as this research only included quantitative method of study. To improve the validity of the results some qualitative methods should also be explore. These findings have implications on administrative level as it helps administrators to have look on big picture. It also has implications in education setting, where researchers can explore same factors with more different dimensions and more population.

Hence, it is concluded that these days, public hospitals administration needed to pay special attention on their hospitals' environment, so that doctors' working capacities and affectivity can be enhanced.

References

1. Pestonjee DM. Motivation and Job Satisfaction (ed. Ist). Delhi: Macmillan India Limited, 1991.
2. Arnetz B. Staff perception of the impact of health care transformation on quality of care. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 1999; 11(4):345-51.
3. Petterson IA. Psychological stressors and well-being in health care workers: The impact of an intervention program. *Soc. Sci. Med*. 1998; 47 (11): 1763-72.
4. Deci EL. The relation of interest to the motivation of behavior: a self-determination theory perspective. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi & A. Krapp (eds.), *Vie role of interest in learning and development*. 1992; 43-70.
5. Elnaga AA. Exploring the link between job motivation, work environment and job satisfaction. *Eur. J. Bus. Manage*. 2013; 5 (24): 34-40.
6. Pepe M. The impact of extrinsic motivational dissatisfiers on employee level of job satisfaction and commitment resulting in the intent to turnover. *JBER*. 2010; 8 (9): 99-108.
7. Akhtar M, Aziz S, Hussain Z, Ali S, Salman M. Factors Affecting Employees Motivation in Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Asian Business Strategy*. 2014; 4 (10): 125-133.
8. Malik AA, Yamamoto SS, Souares A, Malik Z, Sauerborn R. Motivational determinants among physicians in Lahore, Pakistan. *BMC Health Serv. Res*. 2010; 10: 201.
9. Public Service Secretariat (PSS) and Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency (NLSA). *Work environment survey*. 2007/08.
10. Guay F, Vallerand RJ, Blanchard C. On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The situational motivation scale (SIMS). *Motiv Emot*. 2000; 24 (3): 175-213.
11. Okello DRO, Gilson L. Exploring the influence of trust relationships on motivation in the health sector: a systematic review. *Hum. Resour. Health*, 2015; 13 (16). Doi:10.1186/s12960-015-0007-5.
12. Khan AH, Nawaz MM, Aleem M, Hamed W. Impact of job satisfaction on employee performance: An empirical study of autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage*. 2012; 6 (7): 2697-2705. DOI: 10.5897/AJBM11.2222
13. Paramitha A, Indarti N. Impact of the environment support on creativity: assessing the mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci*. 2014; 115: 102-114.
14. Peters DH, Chakraborty S, Steinhardt L. Job satisfaction and motivation of health workers in public and private sectors: cross-sectional analysis from two Indian states. *Hum. Resour. Health*. 2010; 8 (27).
15. Berg VD. (2011). Exploring possible relationships between motivation and commitment. *Master thesis Psychology*.
16. Batchelor JH, Abston KA, Lawlor KB, Burch GF. The job characteristics model: An extension to entrepreneurial motivation. *Small Business Institute*. 2014; 10 (1): 1-10.
17. Spurk D, Abele AE. Who earns more and why? A multiple mediation model from personality to salary. *J. Bus. Psychol*. 2011; 26: 87-103.
18. Cooper BL, Clasen P, Silva-Jalonen DE, Butler MC. Creative performance on an in-basket exercise: effects of inoculation against extrinsic reward. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 1999; 14 (1): 39-56.
19. Maria AA. All the way from organizational performance to internal communication practices and how to intrinsically motivate your staff in a service oriented organization. A dissertation: Aarhus University, Business and Social Sciences. 2012.