www.ijhsr.org

ISSN: 2249-9571

Original Research Article

# Stress, Job Satisfaction and Ways of Coping among Suspended Health Services Staff

Anna Depasta<sup>1</sup>, Mary Pavlou<sup>2</sup>, George Koulierakis<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Administrative personnel, Social Service office, Agios Savvas Ongology Hospital

<sup>2</sup>Head Nurse of Pathology & Hypatology Department, Nikaia and Piraeus General Hospital "Agios

Panteleimon"- Western Attica General Hospital "Agia Barbara"

<sup>3</sup>Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology, National School of Public Health

Corresponding Author: Mary Pavlou

#### **ABSTRACT**

**Introduction:** The aim of this study was to document the levels of subjective stress, job satisfaction and the ways of coping among nurses and administrative staff of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Health Regions who were suspended and forced to turnover in September 2013.

**Method:** 275 employees were invited to participate in the study, 245 of which responded (response rate: 89.09%). Participants filled in the Greek versions of the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), the Ways of Coping Questionnaire, the Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI), and a questionnaire on demographics.

**Results:** Most employees (65.6%) were married, with children (72.6%), graduates of secondary education (38.8%), had worked 16-26 years before the turnover (62.4%) and had no liability position (38.8%). Their average age was 45.3 years. Fear of dismissal was their biggest suspension-related concern (40.3%); half of them mentioned that they primarily faced psychological problems. 66.8% preferred their previous job, mainly because of good working conditions. Stress levels were moderate (18.9± 6.9). The results showed high levels of satisfaction with the working conditions (15.2± 4.1), the job itself (14.5± 3.2) and the Director (14.6± 3.5) and low satisfaction as regards promotion opportunities (7.2 ±2.5) and salary (8.4± 3.4). Most participants chose to cope not only through "positive reappraisal" (22.4± 3.2), but also through "wishful thinking" (11± 2.9) and "denial" (10.9± 2.6).

**Conclusions:** Specific consequences of suspension and the vulnerable points of the process were recorded. It is suggested that there be detachment of suspension from turnover and the creation of a new, flexible system of internal turnover in the public health sector, which will combine the administrative needs in human resources and the staff's individual choices for a professional career.

**Keywords:** suspension, stress, job satisfaction, coping strategies, health services

## INTRODUCTION

Turnover is defined as any movement from one work position to another within the public sector (internal turnover), between the public and the private sectors (external turnover) and between the public sector and international organizations. [1] There are many types of turnover: voluntary and involuntary, internal

and external, turnover of skilled or unskilled staff. Turnover may also be horizontal, that is, within the framework of the same rank, or vertical, in other words, from a higher to a lower level in rank, and vice versa. Finally, turnover may be voluntary or involuntary and involve either physical relocation or a shift in the type of work. [2] The reasons for voluntary turnover may be

the search for better working conditions, higher income and/or more convenient working hours. [3] On the other hand, involuntary turnover is decided on by the administrative board or government laws.

Job related stress is defined the disruption of the balance between the resources required working by the environment and those available to [4,5] employees. Thus, stress the consequence of that disruption in employees' external and internal working environment and results when the available resources are insufficient in order to satisfy employees' personal goals and the demands of the work environment. [6] Research has shown different levels of job related stress amongst professional categories, between the two genders, educational levels and liability positions. [7,8]

Job satisfaction is defined as the multitude of emotions a person has for his job and includes dimensions such as: selfrespect, respect stemming from society, communication, relationships with the colleagues, working conditions, type of the job, the nature of the organization, payments and motivation, insurance, lump sum, personal development, promotion opportunities, recognition and security. [9] In another way of defining, job satisfaction is considered the positive attitude that is derived from completing a specific work efficiently, through which the employee fulfills his own professional values. [10] The relationship between turnover and job satisfaction has been substantiated. More specifically, research among health staff has been focused on revealing the areas and the relationships in the workplace from which the staff members derive satisfaction, so as to enforce them, thus deterring the staff from expressing willingness to change posts or even job.

Working conditions of the health services staff in Greece are very challenging, mainly due to the poor standard of the buildings and the lack of equipment.

[11] Additionally, processes such as the objective evaluation, which are generally

applied to the private sector in order to ensure the optimum staff performance - are far away to be implemented in the public sector. Thus, it is not surprising that increased intention to leave the posts or even the organization due to lack of job satisfaction has been documented among clinical staff. [13]

The conflict between work and family reservation, as well as the commitment to one's career are important factors affecting the intended turnover or even permanent dismissal from work amongst health on staff, both small services moderately-sized hospitals. [14] Moreover, job satisfaction, the quality of the work environment; job related stress and one's loyalty to the organization as a whole were the essential predictive factors of the intention of the health services staff to leave their job and turnover, in general. [15,16] Other studies report that the working climate, the encouragement for ongoing and the interventions education improving the quality of the working conditions not only have a significant impact on job satisfaction, but also strongly influence an employee's decision to remain within the organization. [17,18] Finally, the moral satisfaction, the recognition and the upgrading of health services professionals by the organization have been reported as the deterring factors for the employees' leavings and searching for better working conditions in another organization. [19]

The strategies used for coping with stressful situations have been defined as the efforts made by the individual, both in a cognitive and a behavioral level, to settle (reduce, minimize, impose, or endure) the internal and external demands of his interaction with the environment, which are considered challenging, or forcing to go beyond his/her capabilities. [20]

The choice and adoption of coping strategies are influenced by both gender - women tend to seek more "social support" - and the educational level - primary school graduates use "wishful thinking" and seek "divine help" more often. [22] Coping

strategies are related with mental health and satisfaction, <sup>[23]</sup> and associated with higher levels of optimism, satisfaction with one's life and lower levels of subjective stress. <sup>[24]</sup>

In Greece, the basic forms of job relocation – turnover of civil servants, as stipulated in the articles of the civil servants' Code, are the detachment, the removal the transference and the realignment. On the other hand, suspension is defined as the condition during which an employee is temporarily removed from his post for various reasons.

In the present study, turnover is used as the general term to cover the involuntary internal realignment of the staff — as described below. In a wider sense, turnover includes both suspension, as an initial step, and the realignment, because within health sector, these two administrative measures were implemented consequently, but having a strong interdependence. The whole procedure was based on a point system which was used to decide which posts would be abolished and which members of staff would be suspended.

In September 2013, suspension was implemented by the central administration board, in combination with turnover, due to the demand for abolition of 25.000 posts and the transference of the staff to a different post in other organizations with a shortage of staff. notable An Act (4172/2013) and a Ministerial Decision regulated the overall procedure; imposed the abolition of posts, sectors and specialties in ministries. independent decentralized administrations, Regional and Local Authorities and Legal Entities; and defined the criteria and the selection procedure by which the superfluous staff to be suspended. At the same time, the time span of suspension was reduced from 12 to 8 months. The selection of the employees which were suspended after their posts were abolished was conducted after reappraisal of and awarding points to their qualifications, taking into special consideration the employee's working and administrative experience. The relevant data was collected

from employees' personal records within their organizations and evaluated by the Supreme Council for Civil Personnel Selection (ASEP). Particular attention was given to the way the employee had been hired by the civil service - those who had entered the service through the ASEP were awarded extra points. Initially, 4.200 employees (school guards, educators of technical high schools, drivers and anticipatred to technicians) were suspended. A further 3.500 municipal policemen followed suit. Those exempted from suspension were employees with at least 67% disability, those with more than three dependent children, employees whose spouses or children had at least 67% disability, those exercising parental care by court order and those with a spouse who had already been suspended.

Although health services employees had initially been exempted from this process, they were eventually included. It is worth noting that the process of suspension within health sector was not implemented in the same way as for the rest of the civil services: within hospitals only departments in the administrative sector merged, before a new administration infrastructure had been set up. Posts were arbitrarily abolished – the only criterion being the number of employees who had to be relocated.

As a whole, suspension was not implemented in the same way, regarding pay, time span, abolition of posts, inclusion and exemption criteria and, finally, its association with turnover. The only constant was that the suspension was involuntary.

It is obvious that the implementation of such a legally flexible administration tool will eventually have multiple effects on the employees. At the same time, studies concerning turnover focus primarily on voluntary turnover, which is more common than involuntary. Furthermore, there are no studies available investigating the effects of an involuntary turnover on the employees of both public and private organizations. The only study pertaining to the reduction in the number of public services employees

showed that this measure has been implemented without proper planning, as its only purpose was attaining the predesignated Gross Domestic Product levels, tax revenue, and dismissal numbers. [25]

The current study on suspension, as a type of involuntary turnover and its effects on both health and administrative staff from two Health Regions in Greece fills the gap in the relevant literature and aims to contribute towards effective human resources management.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study took place from December 2014 to May 2015 among the health and administrative staff, in 18 hospitals of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Health Regions, one year after the implementation of suspension/turnover.

# Sample

sample comprised 275 The individuals, a number resulting through the RAOSOFT software for sample calculation, after taking into consideration the amount of tolerated error (5%), the confidence interval (95%) and the total population (n=960) of the two Health Regions. During the sampling, the health and administrative staff ratio within the population under study, as well as its allocation per hospital and region were also taken into consideration and reflected in the sample. The participants were randomly selected for stratified sampling per hospital and field in the two Health Regions, proportionately. Only one hospital ("Agios Savvas" Oncology hospital) was exempted, due to the fact that only administrative staff was suspended.

# **Questionnaires:**

The following data collection tools were used in the study: a questionnaire for the participants' demographic characteristics, their post, job relations before and after suspension, their concerns and problems during the period of suspension and their views concerning the suspension itself. The Perceived Stress Scale of the ten questions (PSS-10) [26] was

used in order to assess the subjective stress during the previous month. Job satisfaction was measured with the Greek version of the Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI). Finally, in order to document the strategies used in the management of stress in challenging life situations, the adjusted to the Greek language "Ways of coping with stressful situations" [28,29] scale was used. Permission was requested and granted for the use of all questionnaires. The internal reliability of the tools used in the study as checked with the use of Chronbach's  $\alpha$ , was satisfactory, except one dimension of the Ways of Coping scale (Table 1).

Table 1: Reliability coefficient of study questionnaires

Questionnaire	Cronbach's α
Subjective stress (PSS)	0.87
Job satisfaction (ESI)	
Working condition	0,76
Salary	0,70
Promotion	0,70
Supervisor	0,83
Work as a whole	0,74
Organization as a whole	0,74
Coping strategies for stressful situations	
Positive approach	0,62
Solution to the problem	0,64
Pursuit of social support	0,73
Pursuit for Divine help	0,72
Resignation	0,60
Denial	0,60
Demanding a solution	0,30

#### Procedure

After receiving approval to conduct the study by the Bioethics and Research Ethics committee of the National School of Public Health and the Training Departments of the two Health Regions, a pilot study was conducted on 30 employees from the hospitals under study, who had already been suspended.

The distribution and collection of the questionnaires was conducted as follows: First, the granted permission from the two Health Regions to conduct the study was filed at the Secretariat of every hospital. Then, the suspended employees who had come to the hospital were located in their various sections, in co-operation with the Human Resources Department. The meeting between the researchers and the participants took place in the workplace. The

participants were informed about the purpose of the study and given reassurances as to its confidentiality. Further assurances on the voluntary character of their participation and their right to withdraw at any time were also provided. The questionnaires were filled out on the spot and were handed back to the researchers in a sealed envelope. In some cases, the collection of the envelopes with the completed questionnaires took place later, upon request, due to employees' load of work. Two hundred and forty five (245)

correctly completed questionnaires were collected (89.9% responded).

# Statistical analysis

A Kolmogorov – Smirnov test and the regularity charts were used to control the regular distribution of quantitative variables. Pearson's *r* coefficient was used to investigate the relationship between the quantitative variables following the regular distribution. The bilateral significance level was defined as equal to 0.05. Data analysis was carried out using SPSS 21.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

## **RESULTS**

Table 2: Consequences and evaluation of suspension-The reception hospital

Worry during the suspension         5         26.6           Duration of suspension         65         26.6           Fear of dismissal         98         40.3           Concern over the adjustment for the new post         18         7.4           Hospital of relocation         19         7.8           Fear for not being able to cover financial obligations         42         17.2           Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period         100         40.8           To much         45         18.4           Above average         58         23.7           Too little         34         13.9           Not at all         8         3.3           Yes         179         73.4           No         65         26.6           Problems risen due to the suspension process         179         73.4           Psychological problems         83         50           Financial problems         83         50           Financial problems         8         4.8           Social problems         8         4.8           Was the evaluation procedure fair?         2           Yes         124         51.2           No         118		N	%
Fear of dismissal         98         40,3           Concern over the adjustment for the new post         18         7,4           Hospital of relocation         19         7,8           Fear for not being able to cover financial obligations         42         17,2           Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period         42         17,2           Far too much         45         18,4           Above average         58         23,7           Too little         34         13,9           Not at all         8         3,3           Yes         179         73,4           No         65         26,6           Problems risen due to the suspension process         5           Psychological problems         83         50           Financial problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems         8         4,8           Social problems         8         4,8           Was the evaluation procedure fair?         11           Yes         124         51,2           No         18         4,8           What was wrong with the procedure         11			
Concern over the adjustment for the new post   18   7,4     Hospital of relocation   19   7,8     Fear for not being able to cover financial obligations   42   17,2     Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period     Far too much   100   40,8     Too much   45   18,4     Above average   58   23,7     Too little   34   13,9     Not at all   8   3,3     Yes   179   73,4     No   65   26,6     Problems risen due to the suspension process     Psychological problems   83   50     Financial problems   84   4,8     Social problems   8   4,8     Social problems   8   4,8     Social problems   8   4,8     Social problems   8   4,8     Was the evaluation procedure fair?     Yes   124   51,2     No   118   48,8     What was wrong with the procedure     Unfair awarding of points   49   46,2     Rusted and disorganized process   25   23,6     Inadequate appraisal   32   30,2     Degree of adjustment to new post   10,4     Too little   41   16,9     Above average   106   43,8     Too much   49   20,2     Far too much   49   20,2     Far too much   49   20,2     Far too much   57   25,2     Good of-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital     With no interest   13   5,8     With no interest   13   5,8     With no interest   14   1,6     Too little   41   1,6     Too little   41   1,6     Too little   41   1,6     Too little   41   1,6     Too little   57   25,2     Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital     Not at all   4   1,6     Too little   40   12,3	Duration of suspension	65	26,6
Hospital of relocation   19   7,8     Fear for not being able to cover financial obligations   42   17,2     Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period     Far too much   45   18,4     Above average   58   23,7     Too little   34   13,9     Not at all   8   3,3     Yes   179   73,4     No   65   26,6     Problems risen due to the suspension process     Psychological problems   83   50     Financial problems   45   27,1     Health problems   30   18,1     Was the evaluation procedure fair?     Yes   124   51,2     No   118   48,8     What was wrong with the procedure     Unfair awarding of points   49   46,2     Rusted and disorganized process   25   23,6     Inadequate appraisal   3   30,2     Degree of adjustment to new post   49   40,4     Too little   41   16,9     Above average   106   43,8     Too much   49   20,2     Far too much   57   25,2     Good enough   31   13,7     Good /Formal deal   69   30,5     With no interest   13   5,8     With hostility   56   22,9     Too little   41   16,9     Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital     Not at all   4   1,6     Too little   41   1,6     To	Fear of dismissal	98	40,3
Fear for not being able to cover financial obligations   Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period   Far too much   100   40,8   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,4   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,5   18,4   18,5	Concern over the adjustment for the new post	18	7,4
Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period   Far too much   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100   40,8   100			7,8
Far too much         40,8           Too much         45         18,4           Above average         58         23,7           Too little         34         13,9           Not at all         8         3,3           Yes         179         73,4           No         65         26,6           Problems risen due to the suspension process         8           Psychological problems         83         50           Financial problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems	Fear for not being able to cover financial obligations	42	17,2
Too much	Employees' personal life affected during the suspension period		
Above average	Far too much	100	40,8
Not at all   34   13,9     Not at all   8   3,3     Yes   179   73,4     No   65   26,6     Problems risen due to the suspension process     Psychological problems   83   50     Financial problems   45   27,1     Health problems   8   4,8     Social problems   30   18,1     Was the evaluation procedure fair?     Yes   124   51,2     No   118   48,8     What was wrong with the procedure     Unfair awarding of points   49   46,2     Rusted and disorganized process   25   23,6     Inadequate appraisal   32   30,2     Degree of adjustment to new post   10,4     Too little   41   16,9     Above average   106   43,8     Too much   49   20,2     Far too much   45   18,6     Preference of current or previous post   157   66,8     Reception at the hospital of relocation   Very good /friendly deal   57   25,2     Good enough   31   13,7     Good /Formal deal   69   30,5     With no interest   13   5,8     With hostility   56   22,9     Too little   40   12,3     Not at all   4   1,6     Too little   40   12,3     Not at all   4   1,6     Too little   40   12,3	Too much	45	18,4
Not at all         8         3,3           Yes         179         73,4           No         65         26,6           Problems risen due to the suspension process	Above average	58	23,7
Yes         179         73,4           No         65         26,6           Problems risen due to the suspension process	Too little	34	13,9
No         65         26,6           Problems risen due to the suspension process         83         50           Psychological problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems         30         18,1           Was the evaluation procedure fair?         124         51,2           No         118         48,8           What was wrong with the procedure         118         48,8           Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post	Not at all	8	3,3
Problems risen due to the suspension process           Psychological problems         83         50           Financial problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems         30         18,1           Was the evaluation procedure fair?         124         51,2           Yes         124         51,2           No         118         48,8           What was wrong with the procedure         Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post	Yes	179	73,4
Psychological problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems         30         18,1           Was the evaluation procedure fair?	No	65	26,6
Psychological problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems         30         18,1           Was the evaluation procedure fair?	Problems risen due to the suspension process		
Financial problems         45         27,1           Health problems         8         4,8           Social problems         30         18,1           Was the evaluation procedure fair?		83	50
Social problems         30         18,1           Was the evaluation procedure fair?         124         51,2           No         118         48,8           What was wrong with the procedure		45	27,1
Was the evaluation procedure fair?         124         51,2           No         118         48,8           What was wrong with the procedure	Health problems	8	4,8
Yes         124         51,2           No         118         48,8           What was wrong with the procedure         49         46,2           Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post	Social problems	30	18,1
Yes         124         51,2           No         118         48,8           What was wrong with the procedure         49         46,2           Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post			
What was wrong with the procedure         49         46,2           Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post         10         4           Not at all         1         0,4           Too little         41         16,9           Above average         106         43,8           Too much         49         20,2           Far too much         45         18,6           Preference of current or previous post         78         33,2           Previous post         78         33,2           previous post         78         33,2           Reception at the hospital of relocation         57         25,2           Good enough         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Too little		124	51,2
Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post	No	118	48,8
Unfair awarding of points         49         46,2           Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post	What was wrong with the procedure		
Rusted and disorganized process         25         23,6           Inadequate appraisal         32         30,2           Degree of adjustment to new post            Not at all         1         0,4           Too little         41         16,9           Above average         106         43,8           Too much         45         18,6           Preference of current or previous post         78         33,2           New post         78         33,2           previous post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3		49	46,2
Inadequate appraisal   32   30,2     Degree of adjustment to new post	Rusted and disorganized process	25	23,6
Degree of adjustment to new post         Image: Content of the c		32	
Not at all         1         0,4           Too little         41         16,9           Above average         106         43,8           Too much         49         20,2           Far too much         45         18,6           Preference of current or previous post           New post         78         33,2           previous post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good /friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3			
Above average       106       43,8         Too much       49       20,2         Far too much       45       18,6         Preference of current or previous post         New post       78       33,2         previous post       157       66,8         Reception at the hospital of relocation         Very good / friendly deal       57       25,2         Good enough       31       13,7         Good /Formal deal       69       30,5         With no interest       13       5,8         With hostility       56       22,9         Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital       Not at all       4       1,6         Too little       40       12,3		1	0,4
Too much         49         20,2           Far too much         45         18,6           Preference of current or previous post           New post         78         33,2           previous post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good/friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3	Too little	41	16,9
Far too much         45         18,6           Preference of current or previous post         78         33,2           New post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good /friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3	Above average	106	43,8
Preference of current or previous post           New post         78         33,2           previous post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good /friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3		49	20,2
New post         78         33,2           previous post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good /friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3	Far too much	45	18,6
New post         78         33,2           previous post         157         66,8           Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good /friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3	Preference of current or previous post		Ĺ
Too little   Previous post   157   66,8     Reception at the hospital of relocation   57   25,2   25,2     25,2   25,		78	33,2
Reception at the hospital of relocation           Very good / friendly deal         57         25,2           Good enough         31         13,7           Good / Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3		157	66,8
Very good / friendly deal       57       25,2         Good enough       31       13,7         Good / Formal deal       69       30,5         With no interest       13       5,8         With hostility       56       22,9         Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital       4       1,6         Too little       40       12,3	Reception at the hospital of relocation		
Good enough       31       13,7         Good /Formal deal       69       30,5         With no interest       13       5,8         With hostility       56       22,9         Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital       4       1,6         Too little       40       12,3		57	25,2
Good /Formal deal         69         30,5           With no interest         13         5,8           With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3		31	13,7
With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3		69	
With hostility         56         22,9           Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3	With no interest	13	
Good co-operation with colleagues at relocation hospital         4         1,6           Not at all         4         1,2           Too little         40         12,3	With hostility	56	
Not at all         4         1,6           Too little         40         12,3			
7-		4	1,6
Ab 102 41.9	Too little	40	12,3
Above average   102   41,8	Above average	102	41,8
Too much 52 21,3		52	21,3
Far too much 56 23,0	Far too much	56	23,0

144 nurses (58.8%),89 administrative staff (36.3%), 9 technical services staff (3.7%) and 3 laboratory staff (1.2%) took part in the study. The mean age was 45.3±7.5 years, most were married (n=160, 65.6%), with children (n=175, 72.6%), having completing the tertiary education and holding postgraduate degrees (n=135, 55%) and with an annual salary of up to 1.500 € (n=153, 63.8%). Regarding work before suspension, 78 members of staff (31.8%) had 21-26 years of work experience at their hospital and the majority (n=192, 78.4%) held the lowest rank (simple employee, nurse). Approximately 1 out of 6 claimed to be more than satisfied with their type of work (n= 146, 59.6%) and even more (n=176, 71.8%), were satisfied with their co-operation with colleagues.

The effects of suspension, the critical assessment of the participants for the process and data from the relocation hospital are presented in Table 2.

Employees' greatest concern during suspension was the fear of dismissal (40.3%). Their personal and social lives were affected to a large degree (58.8%), whilst their most serious problems were psychological. For most, (51.2%) the assessment procedure was fair, whilst for the rest, it was unfair mainly due to the points awarded by ASEP (46.2%) and secondly due to the incomplete assessment (30.2%). A significant minority (43.8%) claimed that they had been sufficiently adjusted to their new post. However, the majority of the participants preferred their previous post. One in three participants (30.5%) claimed that they felt well-accepted or with civility at their new hospital they, while approximately the same number (28.7%) were received with indifference or hostility.

Data for subjective stress, job satisfaction and coping strategies are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Subjective stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction

	M±SD	Median	Range
Subjective stress	18.9±6.9	19	0-36
Coping strategies in dealing with stressful situations			
Positive reappraisal	22.4±3.2	23	13-28
Problem solution	12.2±2.3	12	6-16
Seeking social support	12.4±2.6	13	4-16
Wishful thinking	11±2.9	11	4-16
Seeking for Divine help	7.9±2.5	8	3-12
Relinquishment	11.1±2.5	11	4-16
Denial	10.9±2.6	11	4-16
Conforntive solving	10±2.2	10	4-16
Job satisfaction			
Working condition	15.2±4.1	15	5-25
Salary	8.4±3.4	8	4-18
Promotion	7.2±2.5	7	3-14
Director	14.6±3.5	14	4-20
Work as a whole	14.5±3.2	15	5-20
Organization as a whole	9.9±3.4	10	4-20

M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation

As shown in the table 3, moderate levels of subjective stress were documented. Participants claimed to be relatively satisfied with their working conditions, their job as a whole, and their superiors but poorly satisfied with their salary, promotion opportunities, and the organization as a whole. Finally, it seems that participants chose several stress management strategies

to cope with stressful situations: most chose "positive appraisal", "seeking social support", but also, "wishful thinking", "denial", and "relinquishment".

**Tables 4 and 5** present the correlations between items of stress, job satisfaction and coping strategies for the health and administrative staff, respectively.

Table 4: Inter-item correlations among nursing staff

Scales															
		Perceived	stress	Job satisfa	Job satisfaction										
Scale				Working conditions Pearson's p		Salary		Promotion		Director		Work as a whole		Organization as a whole	
		Pearson's r	p			Pearson's p	p	p Pearson's r	p	Pearson's	p	Pearson's	p	Pearson's	p
Coping strategies	Positive reappraisal	-0.13	0.1	0.13	0.1	0.01	0.9	0.23	0.005	0.10	0.2	0.05	0.5	0.06	0.5
_	Problem solving	-0.12	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.10	0.3	0.04	0.7	0.06	0.5	0.03	0.7	0.08	0.3
	Seeking social support	-0.01	0.9	-0.01	0.9	0.03	0.8	0.09	0.3	0.00	0.9	-0.13	0.1	-0.01	0.9
	Wishful thinking	0.33	< 0.001	0.01	0.9	0.00	0.9	0.13	0.1	-0.07	0.4	-0.22	0.007	0.03	0.7
	Seeking for Divine help	0.14	0.09	-0.11	0.2	0.13	0.1	0.21	0.01	-0.12	0.2	0.04	0.6	-0.02	0.8
	Relinquishment	0.23	0.007	-0.02	0.8	0.11	0.2	0.17	0.04	-0.12	0.1	-0.04	0.7	-0.01	0.9
	Denial	0.20	0.02	0.09	0.3	0.11	0.2	0.18	0.03	0.02	0.8	-0.10	0.2	0.16	0.05
	Confrontive solving	0.14	0.1	-0.08	0.3	-0.01	0.9	0.05	0.6	-0.04	0.6	-0.19	0.02	-0.06	0.5
Perceived stress				-0.56	<0.001	0.16	0.05	-0.23	0.005	-0.33	<0.001	-0.48	<0.001	-0.29	<0.001

Table 5: Inter-item correlations among administrative staff

Scale	Scale														
		Perceived s	tress	Job satisfaction											
			Working conditions		Salary		Promotion		Director		Work as a whole		Organization whole	n as a	
		Pearson's r	p	Pearson's r	p	Pearson's r	p	Pearson's r	p	Pearson's r	p	Pearson's r	p	Pearson's r	p
Coping	Positive reappraisal	-0.04	0.7	0.17	0.1	0.25	0.02	0.22	0.04	0.15	0.2	0.14	0.2	0.31	0.003
strategies	Problem solving	-0.24	0.03	0.07	0.5	0.11	0.3	-0.01	0.9	0.08	0.5	0.10	0.3	0.05	0.7
	Seeking social support	-0.03	0.8	0.02	0.9	0.14	0.2	0.08	0.5	0.14	0.2	0.02	0.8	0.18	0.1
	Wishful thinking	0.21	0.06	0.08	0.5	0.27	0.01	-0.04	0.7	0.06	0.6	0.02	0.9	0.24	0.02
	Seeking for Divine help	0.17	0.1	0.24	0.03	0.41	<0.001	0.02	0.9	0.01	0.9	0.02	0.9	0.17	0.1
	Relinquishment	0.16	0.1	-0.01	0.9	0.21	0.04	-0.07	0.5	-0.03	0.8	-0.05	0.7	0.01	0.9
	Denial	-0.06	0.6	0.06	0.6	0.13	0.2	-0.03	0.8	0.04	0.7	0.10	0.4	0.13	0.2
	Confrontive solving	-0.12	0.3	-0.01	0.9	0.08	0.5	0.01	0.9	-0.30	0.01	-0.11	0.3	-0.08	0.5
Perceived stress				-0.06	0.6	-0.01	0.9	0.09	0.4	-0.20	0.06	-0.24	0.02	0.07	0.5

Vol.7; Issue: 5; May 2017

288

For the nursing staff, subjective stress is positively correlated with the adoption of wishful thinking, resignation, and denial, and negatively with satisfaction with working conditions, their director, the job as a whole, and the organization as a whole. As for the administrative staff, subjective stress is negatively correlated with confrontive solving of a problem, and with satisfaction from the work as a whole.

#### **DISCUSSION**

A large proportion of the sample in the current study had long previous work experience within the health services sector. Although it is an overburdened sector, it offered to employees, job permanency, safety and security. At the same time most of the participants was of secondary education - meaning that they had received training on the job in order to execute specific tasks, together with colleagues who had permanent posts. Additionally, in Greece turnover within the public sector is uncommon. [29] The above mentioned three conditions probably explain why many of the participants phased psychological and social problems when suspended. Moreover, the current study showed that employees who previously had held liability positions, were subsequently placed in different, lower ranking positions. This probably resulted in the low satisfaction levels and possibly had a negative impact on the degree of loyalty to the organization, as previous research has verified. [30] Based on the above, it is suggested that in a future decision made by the central administration board where turnover is deemed necessary, qualifications and other personal characteristics of the staff members who wish to be relocated (age, previous experience, post, education level) should be assessed fairly. In this way, not only the number of employees to be relocated but also the selection criteria will be discernible.

Participants' greatest concern during suspension was the fear of dismissal. This is reasonable when considering the way suspension was implemented: compulsory holiday from work, abolition of the permanent post, vague duration of suspension and maximum waiting period of 8 months.

Although participants in the current study preferred their previous posts and spotted elements of unfairness in the suspension procedure, they claimed - to a great extent – that they had adjusted fairly well to their new post. This was mainly due to the fact that their new colleagues welcomed them in a proper way, despite that a significant number of employees claimed to have been treated with hostility in the new workplace. The overall working climate, having a good relationship with colleagues, the premises, as well as the motivation for ongoing training seem to have a great impact on job satisfaction and play an important role in the employees' decision to remain loyal to the company. [18] Nevertheless, findings of the present study point out the lack of preparation of the new framework for the implementation of turnover.

Stress levels among suspended employees were reported to be normal, confirming previous studies. [7,8] "Normal" stress is also justified if we take into consideration the fact that the questionnaire was filled out one year after the implementation of suspension, perhaps indicating that the employees had time to adjust to the new reality, easing the immediate psychological effects of the suspension.

Regarding job satisfaction, current documented reduced satisfaction study concerning and promotion pay opportunities, also verified in other studies. More specifically, the nursing staff was not satisfied with most areas of their work (conditions, relationship with the director, work as a whole, and organization as a whole). This was subsequently related with high levels of stress and the extensive use of coping strategies based on emotion, such as wishful thinking, resignation and denial. The lack of satisfaction could be considered as "normal" cumulatively, due to the recession, the suspension, and the challenges one has to face in the nursing profession. [11] It could also be interpreted as lack of confidence towards the organization and the assessment criteria it uses. Finally, satisfaction from the co-operation with the director, verified by previous research, [32] and from the work in the new post indicate the effectiveness of the coping strategies used by the participants in this study – particularly that of "positive reappraisal".

As a notion, suspension carried negative connotation during implementation and thus, had negative effects on the staff: financial (s period with limited payment), professional (change of post), and psychological (fear of dismissal). A more appropriate and integrated plan for turnover by the central administration board would have addressed these issues by avoiding long periods of suspension, preventing poorer pay, and eliminating fear of dismissal. Consequently, it is suggested that suspension should be detached from turnover. Suspension could, however, be maintained as a waiting period during which a permanent decision is taken in cases of charges filed against the employee.

Good planning is necessary for the implementation of involuntary turnover, with direct involvement of all interested parties (the Ministries, the Administrative bodies, organizations, and employees). It should be implemented only when there is a clear target posing, fair and proper assessment, and some form of motivation. In this way, the negative effects on both in the functioning of the organizations, and those staff members to be relocated are predicted and minimized.

The creation of a new and flexible system for internal turnover in the public sector, particularly in the area of health, is imperative. This system should take into account both the needs in human resources as well as the personal career choices of the employees. This system can be supported electronically to ensure transparency, directness and effectiveness.

Finally, it is essential that an evidence based assessment of the effectiveness of turnover implementation should be made in order to determine its acceptance and functionality.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We thank our colleagues who took part in the study - both nursing and administrative staff - for their willingness to complete the questionnaires used. We also thank the training departments in the Regional Health Services Administration for responding to our request readily, and for their interest in the outcome of our study thereafter.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Aijala K. Public Sector- An Employer of Choice? Report on the competitive public employer project. OECD Public Management Service 2001.
- 2. Mbah SE, Ikemefuna CO. Job Satisfaction and Employees' Turnover Intentions in total Nigeria plc. in Lagos State International Journal of Humanities and Social Science 2012;2(14): 275-287.
- 3. Waldman JD, Arora S. Measuring Retention Rather than Turnover: A Different and Complementary HR Calculus. Human Resource Planning 2004;27(3): 6.
- 4. Cullen FT, Link BG, Wolfe NT, Frank J. The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. Justice Q 1985:2:505–533.
- 5. Avey JB, Luthans F, Jensen SM. Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. Human Resource Management. 2009:48(5):677-693.
- 6. Lykouras L., Soldatos K., Zervas G. Liaison psychiatry. Athens: BETA Medical publications MEPE; 2009
- Agagiotou S. Work-related stress of social workers and the relationship with work engagement and emotional intelligence. Thesis. University of Macedonia Economic and Social Sciences; 2011.
- 8. Doupi S, Koulierakis G, Karademas E. Subjective stress, role perceptions and coping strategies among mental health nurses Hellenic J Nurs Science. 2015:8(3):42-53.

- 9. Warr P. Work, well-being and mental health. In Barling J, Kelloway K, Frone M, editors. Handbook of Work Stress. New York: Sage; 2005. pp. 547-573.
- Locke E. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunette MD editor. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand Mc Nal; 1976. pp. 1297-1349.
- 11. Kapela M., Minetou E., Zyga S. Measurement of nurses' job satisfaction. Nursing. April. 2002;41(2):34-42.
- 12. Sarafidis P., Tsiora V., Pantelis A. Incitement of nursing staff in public and private Greek hospitals. Health Review. 2006;102: 21-26
- 13. Sereti O, Koulierakis G. Turnover and job satisfaction of nursing staff in two hospitals. Hellenic J Nurs. 2014: 53(3):289-299.
- 14. Hyun Ju Choi. Moderating effects of work-family conflict between joborganizational – career characteristics and turnover intention among nurses in small and medium sized hospitals. J Korean Acad. Nurs. Adm. 2015 Jun;21(3): 297-307.
- 15. De Gieter S, Hofmans J, Pepermans R. Revisiting the impact of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on nurse turnover intention: An individual differences analysis. International Journal of Nursing Studies 2011:48(12): 1562-1569.
- 16. Mosadeghrad AM, Ferlie E, Rosenderg D. A study of relationship between job stress, quality of working life and turnover intention among hospital employees. Health Serv Manage Res. 2011:24:170-181.
- 17. Emami R, Moradi E, Idrus, D. Investigating the Relationship between Organizational Learning Culture, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention in IT SMEs. IJII 2012:12(1): 8-23
- 18. Jyoti VB, Trupti VD, Siddharth B. A study of impact of work stress on job satisfaction of employees working in Indian banking sector IJBEMR. 2015;1(11): 27-32
- 19. Makris M., Theodorou M., Middleton NH. Job satisfaction in the public general hospitals in Cyprus. Archives of Hellenic Medicine. 2011;28(2): 234-244.

- Folkman S, Lazarus RS, Dunkel-Schetter C, DeLongis A. Dynamics of a stressful encounter Cognitive appraisal, coping and encounter outcomes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1986:50:992-1003
- Dinou M, Moraitou D, Papantoniou G, Kalogiannidou A, Papantoniou A. Psychometric properties of the Greek version of the Coping Orientations to Problems Experienced - COPE Inventory. Scientific Annals-School of Psychology. 2013;10: 163-192.
- 22. Karadimas E. Coping Strategies of Stresful Events Inventory Adjusted to the Greek Language. Psychology 1998;5(3): 260-273.
- 23. Velana M., Barbouni A., Merakou K., Koutis C., Kremastinou T. Research of quality of life in students of programmes of postgraduate studies in Public Health. Archives of Hellenic Medicine. 2012;29(2): 195-201.
- 24. Ntatsis A., Tragouda E., Chania m., Rogdakis A., Gerolymos m., Spiliotis J. Ντάτσης A. The Perspective of Health Professionals for their Work and Working Environment. Nursing. 2007;46(2): 268-281.
- 25. Vogiatsis J. Evolution of Social Security in Greece: Efficiency Criteria in the Case of Compulsory Redundancy. Thesis. Department of business Administration Patra's University; 2013.
- 26. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstei, R. A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 1983;24(3): 385-396.
- 27. Koustelios AD, Bagiatis K. The Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI): development of a scale to measure satisfaction of Greek employees' educational and psychological measurement. 1997;57:469-476.
- 28. Lazarus RS, Folkman S. Stress, Appraised and Coping. New York: Springer; 1984.
- 29. Katsimardos P., Mpouas K. Enhancing turnover as a strategic management option of human resource's [internet] 2014 Institute for Regulatory Policy Research updated: 2015. Available from: http://www.inerp.gr/en/blog/130-

- enisxysi-kinitikotitas-stratigikiepilogi.html.
- 30. De Gieter S, Hofmans J, Pepermans R. Revisiting the impact of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on nurse turnover intention: An individual differences analysis. International Journal of Nursing Studies 2011;48(12): 1562-1569.
- 31. Ioannou P. The effect of job satisfaction in nurses' health and quality of life. Thesis. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens; 2011.
- 32. Saiti A. Main factors of job satisfaction among primary school educators: Factor analysis of the Greek reality. Management in Education. 2007; 21(2): 28-32.

How to cite this article: Depasta A, Pavlou M, Koulierakis G. Stress, job satisfaction and ways of coping among suspended health services staff. Int J Health Sci Res. 2017; 7(5):282-292.

\*\*\*\*\*