ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of
ZBW
Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Saleem, Muhammad; Tufail, Muhammad Waseem; Atta, Amina; Asghar, Shazia

Article

Innovative workplace behavior, motivation level, and perceived stress among healthcare employees

Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)

Provided in Cooperation with:
Johar Education Society, Pakistan (JESPK)

Suggested Citation: Saleem, Muhammad; Tufail, Muhammad Waseem; Atta, Amina; Asghar, Shazia (2015) : Innovative workplace behavior, motivation level, and perceived stress among healthcare employees, Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS), ISSN 2309-8619, Johar Education Society, Pakistan (JESPK), Lahore, Vol. 9, Iss. 2, pp. 438-446

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/188205

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Pak J Commer Soc Sci
Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences
2015, Vol. 9 (2), 438-446

Innovative Workplace Behavior, Motivation Level, and Perceived Stress among Healthcare Employees

Muhammad Saleem (Corresponding author)
Department of Psychology – FSSK, University Kebangsaan, Malaysia (UKM)
Email: chsaleem_1@hotmail.com

Muhammad Waseem Tufail
Department of Applied Psychology, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
Email: waseemtufail.pk@gmail.com

Amina Atta
Department of Applied Psychology, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan,
Email: amina_atta77@yahoo.com

Shazia Asghar
Department of Applied Psychology, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan,
Email: shaziaasghar.pk@hotmail.com

Abstract

The current study aims to explain innovative workplace behavior, motivation level, and perceived stress among healthcare employees. The sample of one hundred (N =100) doctors from Sheikh Zaid Hospital Rahim Yar Khan were recruited conveniently (M 50; F 50). Three highly valid instruments were employed; Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), Motivation Questionnaire (MQ), and Innovative Work Scale (IWS). Quantitative cross-sectional research design was applied. Data were tabulated through SPSS (21.0.). Statistical techniques; mean, standard deviation, regression, and chi-square were used to test the hypotheses. The results depict there is a significant inverse relationship between perceived stress and motivation. Likewise, significant but inverse relationship exists between perceived stress and innovative workplace behavior of doctors. Conclusively, study proves the potential negative effect of perceived stress on motivation and innovative work behavior among health care employees. Future avenues and limitations of current study are also cordoned off.

Key terms: innovative workplace behavior; perceived stress; motivation; doctors; Pakistan

1. Introduction

Innovative workplace behavior is a constituent of proper and quick public health services. Health care profession requires the innovative behavior due to its needs of maintaining hospital management and diagnosing and treating diseases to make innovative use of resources (Kumar, 2011). Yet the element that leads to efficient workplace behavior is motivation (Gracia-Prado, 2005). For a well-developed health care system, sufficient,

highly motivated and skillful employees are essential components (Buchan, 2004; Bhatiya & Purohit, 2014). For medical professionals, innovative workplace behavior is crucial for the provision of health care services. To maintain positive patient and physician relationships, sharing information about health, using better treatment and diagnosing strategies are the agents of an efficient job performance (Kumar, 2011). Innovative work behavior refers to managing abilities to create new and productive ideas related to workplace demands (Scott & Bruce, 1998; Janssen, 2000).

Similarly, to fulfill the workplace demand necessitate motivation at workplace to increases the work efficiency of workers (Alavi, Abdi, Mazuchi, Beghami & Heidari, 2013; Venkatesh & Cherurveettil, 2012). Employees' motivation and performance is the pivotal element in achieving the goals and objectives of any organization. Motivation level significantly affects the performance of employees, and it is motivation that decides the work competency and work place behavior of the employees (Avasilcai & Rusu, 2013). Work competency and satisfaction is influenced by motivational level. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation influence positively external work place environment, nature of provisional tasks and incentives to enhance motivation that are involved in workplace behavior of employees (Avasilcai & Rusu, 2013).

Employees who are internally motivated, perform well and behave positively at their workplace because, their source of motivation is their inner ability to acquire skills and to do work in a productive and efficient way (Longzeng, Li-Qun, Yichi & Tielin, 2012), the extrinsic motivation is important as well because, many individual do not take interest in doing productive work for a longer period of time in the absence of rewards. So, it is the fact that both internal and external motivation boosts the performance of employees of an organization (Alimi & Fatima, 2011).

In line with above cited scenario medical professionals experience workplace stress in their daily life and this workplace stress affects the job performance and satisfaction with job (Ho et al., 2011). Job stress of medical professionals may be varied due to the specific domain of health profession. It was identified that long period timing of job and shortage of workforce create stress among employees.

It is essential to use resources to bridge the gap and to reduce the workplace stress of the doctors so that their innovative workplace behavior is increased (Chew et al., 2013).

1.1 Objectives of the Study

- To find out the role of perceived stress with motivation level among employees.
- To relate the various degrees/level of perceived stress with innovative work behavior of employees.
- To check the association between innovative workplace behavior and motivation of health care employees.

1.2 Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that…

- Perceived stress is a predictor of high and low motivation level among the employees.
- Innovative work behavior is linked with various degrees of perceived stress.

- Innovative workplace is associated with motivation among health care professionals.

2. Method

2.1 Participant Characteristics

The sample comprised of one hundred male and female doctors who belong to Sheikh Zaid Hospital (RYK).

2.2 Inclusion Criteria

All participants were in-service doctors from different wards of Sheikh Zaid Hospital, including house jobians and permanent doctors, regardless of gender.

2.3 Exclusion Criteria

Considering the very busy routine of most senior doctors, FCPS and BDS were excluded from this study.

2.4 Demographic Measurement

Demographic questionnaire was used for collecting demographic information such as, age, gender, socio-economic status, designation, and field of specialization.

2.5 Procedure and ethics

First of all, the purpose of the study was explained to the hospital management for the sake of formal permission. All participants were debriefed and informed consent was obtained. Instructions were given to the participants before administering the questionnaires. Anonymity, confidentiality and privacy were keenly maintained. After completion of all questionnaires scoring was done according to manual instructions for every questionnaire respectively. Formal permission to use questionnaires was obtained from formal authors. All questionnaires were used in English language, considering the population is educated enough to comprehend the items well.

2.6 Sampling Strategy

Convenient sampling technique was employed to collect the data.

2.7 Measures and covariates

2.7.1 Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)

Perceived Stress Scale developed by © Sheldon Cohen (1988) contains 10 items; responses include from Never to ….. very often, other responses are, almost never, sometimes never, fairly often, and very often taped how unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloaded respondents find their lives and includes a number of direct queries about current levels of experienced stress. PSS scores are obtained by reversing responses (e.g., 0 = 4, 1 = 3, 2 = 2, 3 = 1 & 4 = 0) to the four positively stated items (items 4, 5, 7, & 8) and then summing across all

Scale items. If individual scored 20, it shows highest level of perceived stress

2.7.2 Motivation Questionnaire (MQ)

The Motivation Questionnaire is designed to help understand and explore the conditions that will tend to increase or reduce your enthusiasm and motivation at work. This is

developed by © John Smith (2004), consists of 20 items. Each item responded by encircling the providing options, if individual got 10 score, shows the highest motivation level.

2.7.3 Innovative Work Scale (IWS)

The innovative work scale developed by © Ettlie O'Keefe (1982) contains 18 statements. Each item is answered by responding encircle the giving options from strongly agree (SA) …. to strongly disagree (DS), to obtain higher score indicated the more willing you are to be innovative, and attitude toward innovation is more positive than that of people who score low. A score of 72 or greater is considered high, while a score of 45 or less is considered low.

2.7.4 Research Design

Quantitative cross-sectional survey research design is employed for the current study.

2.8 Operational Definition of the Variables

2.8.1 Perceived Stress

Stress is a mental state that is caused by any environmental threat or disturbance at a workplace due to maladjustment of the employees in any organizational environment (Dewa, Thompson & Jacobs, 2010; Yousuf, 2001).

2.8.2 Innovative Workplace Behavior

Innovative work behavior is the ability to think in a novel and productive way and to implement these ideas to increase work efficiency for personal and organizational satisfaction (King & Anderson, 2002; Mumford, 2003; Zhou & Shalley, 2003).

2.8.3 Motivation

Motivation is a complicated process occurs to meet the needs to achieve the strategic goals of an organization through involving the energetic use of capacities for better work performance (Ivanovic, 2003; Pritchard & Ashwood, 2008; Stroh, Northcraft & Neale, 2002).

3. Results

Table 1: Impact of Perceived Stress on Motivation

R	R Square	Regression Constant	Regression Coefficient	T	P-value
0.461	0.212	9.639	-0.461	-5.141	0.000

The above table shows the dependence of motivation level on perceiving stress. The value of R-Square is 0.212 which shows that there is 21.2% variation in the motivation level is due to perceiving stress. The regression analysis is also determined which shows the regression coefficient is -0.461 indicates there is negative relationship between both variables i.e. as the stress level is high then motivation level is decreased. P-value is 0.000 shows that regression coefficient is significant at 5% level of significance.

Table 2: Impact of Perceived Stress on Innovative Behavior

R	R Square	Regression Constant	Regression Coefficient	T	P-value
0.549	0.302	99.610	-0.549	-6.506	0.000

This table shows the dependence of Innovative behavior on perceiving stress. The value of R-Square is 0.302 which shows there is 30.2% variation in the innovative behavior is due to perceiving stress. From the regression analysis we can conclude that regression coefficient is -0.549 indicates there is negative relationship between both variables i.e. as the stress level is high then innovative behavior is decreased. P-value is 0.000 shows that regression coefficient is significant at 5% level of significance.

Table 3: Chi-Square Testing For Association between Stress Level and Motivation Level

Stress Level	Motivation Level			
	Low	Average	High	Total
Very Low (0-7)	0	1	0	1
Low (8-11)	0	0	7	7
Average (12-15)	1	9	2	12
High (16-20)	65	0	4	69
Very High (20 & over)	7	0	4	11
Total	73	10	17	100
Test of association	Value	d.f	P-value	
Pearson Chi-Square	120.65	8	0.000	

The above contingency table shows the measurement of association between the two variables (Stress level and Motivation level). The table frequencies indicate there is negative relationship between the both variables. If we consider only one cell that is 65 lies at low motivation level and high stress level. Chi-square test is used to check the significance of the association indicate P-value is 0.000.

Table 4: Chi-Square Testing For Association between Innovative Behaviors and Motivation Level

Stress Level	Innovative Behavior		
	Low	High	Total
Very Low (0-7)	0	1	1
Low (8-11)	0	7	7
Average (12-15)	4	8	12
High (16-20)	66	3	69
Very High (20 & over)	7	4	11
Total	77	23	100
Test of association	Value	d.f	P-value
Pearson Chi-Square	120.65	8	0.000

This contingency table shows the measurement of association between Stress level and Motivation level. The table indicates there is negative relationship between the both variables. Chi-square test is used to check the significance of the association indicate P-value is 0.000

4. Discussion

The present study was conducted to explore the employee perceived stress, motivation level, and innovative work place behavior. According to results, there is inverse and significant relationship existed between motivation level and perceived stress. The value of R-Square is 0.212 which shows, there is 21.2% variation in the motivation level is due to experiencing stress. The linear regression analysis determines the regression coefficient is -0.461 that indicates the negative relationship between both variables i.e. as the stress level is high then motivation level is decreased. P-value is 0.000 that shows regression coefficient is significant at 5% level of significance. This shows perceived stress effects motivation level of the workers inversely. A study conducted by Chew et al., (2013), also supports the view and depicts the significant relation of the stress with motivation level. So, the hypothesis that the higher level of stress decreases the motivation of employees is accepted.

Moreover, it is reported that innovative behavior is dependent on perceiving stress. The value of R-Square is 0.302 that shows there is 30.2% variation in the innovative behavior is due to perceiving stress. From the regression analysis we can conclude that regression coefficient is -0.549 indicates there is negative relationship between both variables i.e. if the stress level is high that innovative behavior is decreased. P-value is 0.000 shows that regression coefficient is significant at 5% level of significance. This shows that the stress decreases the innovative workplace behavior and the hypothesis “the higher level of stress decrease innovative behavior” is accepted. On the other hand, study conducted by Singh (2000) showed that productivity is the way to lighten the stress and stress has not strong relationship with innovative behavior. Whereas, the findings obtained from the study of Jamal and Baba, (1992) showed the association between stressors and decreased ability of innovative behavior (Donald, Taylor & Johnsan, 2005).

Another similar research conducted by Tpiberrac, Pekreitnc, and Nratnc (2015), stated that there is negative relation exists between stress experienced at a work and employee job performance. Various level of stress has great impact on employee motivation as well as job performance. The finding of current study shows high level of stress decreased the individual performance whereas moderate level perceiving stress produce better performance at a workplace. It is the responsibility of administration of management that they should facilitate their employee in terms of less stressful and conducive working environment so their workability remain at maximum (Chew et al, 2013).

5. Conclusion

The present research concluded that the motivation level is affected negatively by perceiving stress. The high level of stress decreased the employee performance and innovative workplace behavior, whereas, moderate level of stress maintained the performance at maximum. The low motivation level produces high stress at work. In the current situation, an important conclusion is drawn, if hospital management wants to enhance the doctor’s workability, provide them less stressful environment so that their innovative behavior might remain optimum.

6. Limitations

The sample was taken conveniently and based on young doctors of Sheikh Zaid Hospital Rahim Yar Khan only, so, wide generalizability cannot be expected.

7. Implications

Current study is a bench mark for health care employees that exhibit the relationship among stress, motivation and innovative work behavior. It establishes the inverse relation of stress with motivation and innovative behavior. It will work as a guideline for executives of any organization about how they can get optimum to care about these variables. In future researches relationship of other allied variables is also gauged to connect the dots.

REFERENCES

Alavi, H., Abdi, F., Mazuchi, M., Bighami, M., & Heidari, A. (2013). An investigation on effective factors influencing employee performance: A case study. *Management Science Letters, 3(6),* 1789-1794.

Alimi, B. G., & Fatima, B. B. (2011). The effects of motivation on workers performance (A case study of Maiduguri Flour Mill Ltd. Borno State, Nigeria). *Continental Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(2), 8-13.

Avasilcai, S., & Rusu, G. (2013). Human resources motivation: an organizational performance perspective. *Annals of the Oradea university fascicle of management and technological engineering, 22*(12), 331-348.

Bhatiya, S., & Purohit, B. (2014). What Motivates Government Doctors in India to Perform Better in their Job? *Journal of Health Management, 16*(1), 149-159.

Buchan, J. (2004). What difference does ("good') HRM Make? *Human Resources for Health, 2*(6), 6-13.

Chew, B. H., Ramli, A. S., Omar, M., & Ismail, I. Z. (2013). A preliminary study of job satisfaction and motivation among the Malaysian primary healthcare professionals. *Malaysian Family Physician: the Official Journal of the Academy of Family Physicians of Malaysia, 8*(2), 15-25.

Cohen, S. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States.

Dewa, C. S., Thompson, A. H., & Jacobs, P. (2010). Relationships between job stress and worker perceived responsibilities and job characteristics. *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2*(1), 37-46.

Donald, I., Taylor, P., Johnson, S., Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., & Robertson, S. (2005). Work environments, stress, and productivity: An examination using ASSET. *International Journal of Stress Management, 12*(4), 409-423.

Dowell, A. C., Hamilton, S., & McLeod, D. K. (2000). Job satisfaction, psychological morbidity and job stress among New Zealand general practitioners. *New Zealand Medical Journal, 113*, 269-272.

Ettlie, J. E., & O'Keefe, R. D. (1982). Innovative Attitudes, Values, And Intentions In Organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 19*(2), 163-182.

Gracia-Prado, A. (2005). Sweetening the carrot: Motivating public physicians for better performance. *Policy Research Paper*. Washington: The World Bank.

Ho, H. H., Tsai, T. Y., Lin, C. L., Wu, S. Y., & Li, C. Y. (2011). Prevalence and associated factors for metabolic syndrome in Taiwanese hospital employees. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health*, *23*(3), 307-314.

Ivanovic, A., Collin, P. H. (2003). *Dictionary of Human Resources and Personnel Management.* London: A & C Black Publishers.

Jamal, M., & Baba, V. V. (1992). Stressful jobs and employee productivity: Results from occupational satisfaction in general practice. *Medical Journal of Australia, 175*, 88-91.

Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness, and innovative work behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*(3), 287-302.

King, N., & Anderson, N. (2002). *Managing innovation and change: a critical guide for organizations*. London: Thomson.

Kumar, V. (2011). Impact of health information systems on organizational health communication and behavior. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*, *9*(2), 1-5.

Longzeng, W., Li-Qun, W., Yichi, Z., & Tielin, H. (2011). Employee experienced HPWPs and job performance : roles of person-job fit and intrinsic motivation. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, *5*(3), 344-363.

Mumford, M. D. (2003). Where have we been, where are we going? Taking stock in creativity research. *Creativity Research Journal, 15*(2&3), 107-120.

Tpiberrac, N., Pekreitnc, N., & Nratnc, X. T. (2015). The impact of occupational stress on performance in health care.

Noblet, A., & Lamontagne, A. D. (2006). The role of workplace health promotion in addressing job stress. *Health promotion international, 21*(4), 346-53.

Nylenna, M., Gulbrandsen, P., Forde, R., & Aasland, O. G. (2005b). Unhappy doctors? A longitudinal study of life and job satisfaction among Norwegian doctors 1994–2002. *BMC Health Services Research*, *5*, 44.

Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Lawthorn, R., & Nickell, S. (1997). *Impact of people management practices on business performance.* London: Institute of Personnel and Development.

Pritchard, R. D., Ashwood, E. L., (2008). *Managing Motivation. A Manger's Guide to Diagnosing and Improving Motivation*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1998). Following the leader: The joint effect of subordinate studies on managers, blue-collar workers and nurses. *International Journal of Management Labour, 14*, 473-502.

Singh, J. (2000). Performance productivity and quality of frontline employees in service organizations. *Journal of Marketing, 64*(2), 15–35.

Smith, J. (2004). Motivation Questionnaire. *Retrieved on December, 10*, 2005.

Stroh, L. K., Northcraft, G. B., Neale, M. A. (2002). *Organizational Behavior. A Management Challenge.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Venkatesh, J., & Cherurveettil, P. (2012). Using application performance models to achieve improved customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Management & Technology, 2*(2), 122-125.

West, M. A. (2002). Sparkling fountains or stagnant ponds: An integrative model of creativity and innovation implementation in work groups. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*(3), 355-387.

Yousuf, M. S. B. (2010). Stress, stressors and coping strategies among secondary school students in a Malaysian government secondary school: Initial findings. *ASEAN Journal of Psychiatry*, 11(2), 143-157.

Zhou, J. & Shalley, C. E. (2003). Research on employee creativity: a critical review and proposal for future research directions, In: J. J. Martocchio, & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, Oxford, England: Elsevier.

.