

A STUDY OF MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING
TO JOB SATISFACTION FOR NURSES: AN
EXAMINATION OF HERZBERG'S
TWO-FACTOR THEORY

By

VERLEAN VAUGHN SMITH

Bachelor of Science in Education
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1970

Bachelor of Science in Nursing
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1973

Master of Arts
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1983

Thesis
1983D
S662s
Cop. 2



A STUDY OF MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING
TO JOB SATISFACTION FOR NURSES: AN
EXAMINATION OF HERZBERG'S
TWO-FACTOR THEORY

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth W. Blair

Thesis Adviser

Linda M. Vincent

E. J. ...

Phil B. ...

Norman N. ...

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following individuals who assisted me with this research study:

First, I wish to sincerely thank the chairman of my doctoral committee, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, for his patience, direction, motivation, and endurance throughout the entire study. Without his kind, but very efficient guidance, this study would not have been possible. Secondly, I would like to sincerely thank Dr. Patrick Forsyth for his assistance, especially with the research design and statistical analysis. Thirdly, I extend my sincere thanks to Drs. Moses Frye and Lloyd Wiggins for their counsel and support.

A special thanks is extended to Dr. Jan Harris, State Board of Nurses in Oklahoma City, for her assistance in supplying names and addresses of the respondents for this study.

I am especially grateful to my husband, Charley; two sons, Greg and Gary; daughter-in-law, Joy; mother and stepfather; and other relatives and friends for their love, understanding, and sacrifice.

Lastly, and most importantly, I thank God for answering my prayers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose	7
Justification of the Study	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Literature Supporting Herzberg et al.'s Theory of Job Satisfaction	11
Literature Not Supporting Herzberg et al.'s Theory	16
Literature Relating to Job Satisfaction for Nurses	17
Rationale	19
III. METHODOLOGY	22
Introduction	22
Sample Selection	22
Instrumentation	23
Reliability Estimates for Instrument	24
Data Collection	24
Treatment of the Data	24
Summary	28
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	29
Introduction	29
Demographic Information	29
Sex	33
Marital Status	33
Level of Education	34
Age	34
Years Worked as a Nurse	34
Number of Dependents	34
Income Status	34
Present Nursing Position	35
Current Area of Practice	35
Analysis of the Hypotheses	36
Data Related to Hypothesis One	36

Chapter	Page
Data Related to Hypothesis Two	37
Data Related to Hypothesis Three	37
Data Related to Hypothesis Four.	41
Supplementary Data	41
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	44
Summary.	44
Conclusions.	46
Recommendations for Further Study.	48
Recommendations for Nursing Administrators	49
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
APPENDIXES	56
APPENDIX A - THE INSTRUMENT	57
APPENDIX B - CORRESPONDENCE	62
APPENDIX C - FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLES.	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. RN'S and LPN'S Questionnaire Returns	25
II. Comparison of Means of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction for the 13 Factors for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	26
III. Comparison of Job Factor Importance Scores for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	27
IV. RN's Demographic Data.	30
V. LPN's Demographic Data	32
VI. Comparison of the Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75).	35
VII. Means and Standard Deviations for Motivators for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	38
VIII. Means and Standard Deviation for Hygienes for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	39
IX. Comparison of Means for Motivators by Low Level Satisfaction and High Level Satisfaction for Entire Sample of Nurses (N=366)	40
X. Comparison of Means for Hygienes by Low Level Satisfaction and High Level Satisfaction for Entire Sample of Nurses (N=366).	42
XI. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	46
XII. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Age for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75).	65
XIII. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Sex for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75).	65
XIV. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Marital Status for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	66

Table	Page
XV. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Level of Education for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	67
XVI. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Years Worked as a Nurse for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	68
XVII. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Number of Dependents for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	69
XVIII. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Income Status for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	69
XIX. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Present Position for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	70
XX. Frequency Distribution of Three Levels of Job Satisfaction by Area of Practice for RN's (N=291) and LPN's (N=75)	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Keeping qualified nurses on staff is a common goal for many nurse administrators. Yet, the revolving door phenomenon in which the nurse leaves the agency, sometimes before the orientation is completed, and another new nurse enters the institution, is not uncommon. Why is there such a turnover of nurses, and what factors may be employed to help retain nurses in an agency? (Watson, 1979, p. 29).

Nursing administrators are asking, "What factors actually contribute to nurses' job satisfaction?" This growing concern over the retention of nurses has generated much interest in the study of job satisfaction among nurses. For example, Hallas (1980) reported that one of every three registered nurses drop out of nursing. Storlie (1979), Watson (1979), Donovan (1980), and Araujo (1980) reported concern over nurses' showing signs of burnout, boredom, and dissatisfaction with various aspects of their jobs. Despite these and the many studies conducted, researchers and theorists still offer conflicting theories and evidence regarding this abstract concept. Researchers cite several reasons for these conflicting theories and findings. First, because satisfaction is such an abstract concept, it is difficult to define. Second, due to a variety of instruments utilized in the study of job satisfaction, it is difficult to compare studies.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher is using the definition of job satisfaction that was formulated by Hoppock (as

cited in Armstrong, 1969, p. 2): ". . . any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job.'"

Job satisfaction, as an area of study, did not gain important status until the early 1930's, when the human relations approach to management (1930-1950) began to emerge. Prior to that time, classical organizational thought prevailed (1900-1930) (Kozal, 1979). It held that employees were motivated solely by economics and stressed the need to give the employees step-by-step directions for performing tasks. There was little opportunity for employee independence or creativity. Sociological variables were completely ignored.

Follett (1940), in a series of papers, identified some of the problems with administration. She suggested that the fundamental problem in organizations was in maintaining harmonious relationships. Despite all her efforts in the field of human relations, the change did not occur until Mayo's (as cited in Henderson, 1974) studies, which were conducted at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company in Chicago, Illinois. These studies began in 1927 and focused on the importance of informal groups. More specifically, Mayo studied relationships between the physical conditions of the plant and the productivity of employees. He utilized a control group and an experimental group and manipulated the physical variables, such as light, heat, and humidity. Production improved under each of the conditions and remained high even after returning to the original physical conditions. With these unexpected findings, the researchers began to think that attitudes may play an important role in productivity.

Another important individual who exerted great influence on the human relations movement was Barnard (1938), a contemporary of Mayo. In his book, Barnard placed emphasis on informal organization, as well as on human motivation. He stressed communication between all members of the group and viewed the executive function to be that of providing communication among individuals and formulating organizational goals.

Equally important to the human relations movement was McGregor (1960). His theory is referred to as "Theory X" and "Theory Y."

Theory X is based on the following three assumptions:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all (pp. 33-34).

McGregor's Theory Y is more flattering to man and is based on the following six assumptions:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept, but to seek responsibility.

5. The capacity to exercise a relative degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized (pp. 47-48).

McGregor's theory stresses the fact that individuals will exercise self-direction in achieving objectives if they commit themselves to those objectives.

McGregor's (1960) Theory Y was a great contribution to the human relations movement. It assumes that all individuals are striving for self-actualization, and if given autonomy in setting their goals, they will be highly motivated. Theory Y stresses self-control and self-direction.

One of the more contemporary theories of job satisfaction was developed by Herzberg, Mauser, and Snyderman (1959). Their "Two-Factor Theory," or "Motivation and Hygiene Theory," purports to differentiate between the intrinsic aspects of the job and the extrinsic aspects. They referred to the intrinsic factors as content or motivators and they included: advancement, achievement, recognition, work itself, and responsibility. Herzberg et al. defined these six motivators as follows:

1. Recognition referred to some act of recognition of the person. The source could be almost anyone: a supervisor, another individual in management, management as an impersonal force, a client, a peer, a professional colleague, or the general public. Some act of notice, praise, or blame was involved.

2. Achievement included the following: successful completion of a job, solutions to problems, vindication, and seeing the results of one's work. This definition also includes its opposite--failure and the absence of achievement.

3. Possibility of growth referred to situations involving objective evidences that the possibilities for one's growth were increased or decreased.

4. Advancement included situations where there were actual changes in the person's status or position in the company.

5. Responsibility referred to sequences of events in which the person derived satisfaction from being given responsibility for his own work or for the work of others or from being given new responsibility. This definition also included situations where there was a loss of satisfaction stemming from a lack of responsibility.

6. Work itself referred to events related to the actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it.

Herzberg et al. (1959) referred to the extrinsic factors as "hygienes," and they include the following:

1. Salary included all sequences of events in which compensation played a role. This definition also included the unfulfilled expectation of salary increases.

2. Interpersonal relations included incidents in which there was actual verbalization about the characteristics of the interaction between the person speaking and another individual. This definition covered three major categories: those involving superiors, those involving subordinates, and those involving peers.

3. Supervision-technical referred to statements about the supervisor's willingness or unwillingness to delegate responsibility, or his willingness or unwillingness to teach.

4. Company policy and administration involved sequences of events in which some overall company policy was a factor. This category covered two kinds: adequacy or inadequacy of company organization and management and harmfulness or the beneficial effects of the company's policies.

5. Working conditions involved the physical conditions of work, the amount of work, or the facilities available for doing the work. Environmental characteristics such as adequacy or inadequacy of ventilation, lighting, tools, and space were included in this category.

6. Factors in personal life included situations in which some aspect of the job affected the individual's personal life (company demanded that a man move to a new location in which his family was unhappy).

7. Job security included such considerations as tenure and company stability or instability, which reflected in some objective way on a person's job security.

8. Status involved incidents in which the respondents actually mentioned some sign or appurtenance of status as a factor in his feelings about the job. Such incidents as a person who spoke of having a secretary in his new position, of being allowed to drive a car, or of being unable to use a company eating facility were included in this category.

The Herzberg Theory is a cognitive approach to motivation and, like Maslow's (1954) theory, is based upon a hierarchy of needs, which

assumes that individuals decide what to do on the basis of their goals and their needs.

Statement of the Problem

Nursing administrators need to know what factors motivate registered nurses and licensed practical nurses so that appropriate programs can be initiated to meet their needs.

Purpose

The objectives of this study were: (1) to identify the motivator and hygiene factors that contribute to registered nurses' and licensed practical nurses' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, (2) to determine if nurses are satisfied or dissatisfied with their nursing positions, and (3) to investigate the applicability of the Herzberg et al. theory using a questionnaire survey technique in place of Herzberg's et al.'s (1959) critical incident technique.

Justification of the Study

Although satisfaction is an abstract phenomenon, researchers agree that the study of job satisfaction is needed. Job dissatisfaction can result in high turnover and absenteeism. More specifically, Watson (1979), Donovan (1980), and White (1980) report that job dissatisfaction among nurses is a major problem. They state that nurses are reporting burnout and boredom, and are leaving the nursing profession and seeking other occupations. Thompson (as cited in Armstrong, 1969) states that people's jobs are related to their self-concepts. The satisfaction they enjoy at work greatly determine their satisfaction

in other non-job related areas. Herzberg (1966) discussed how individuals' mental health depends upon their needs being satisfied. Vaughn (1976) agrees with Herzberg that understanding the factors that contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is important, because of the effect it has on an individual's mental health.

Limitations of the Study

The utilization of a questionnaire in lieu of the critical-incident method utilized by Herzberg et al. (1959) may not yield the expected results. Due to the economic recession and the resultant cutback in nurses, the respondents may be reluctant to answer questions honestly; however, this researcher reassured the respondents that the results would be kept in the strictest confidence. Since the study involved only registered nurses and licensed practical nurses in Tulsa County, the findings cannot and should not be generalized to other populations.

Definition of Terms

The terms used frequently in this study are defined as:

Two-Factor Theory - Refers to Herzberg et al.'s (1959) motivator-hygiene theory, and is sometimes referred to as intrinsic and extrinsic factors, or content and context factors.

Motivator Factors - According to Herzberg et al.'s (1959) motivator-hygiene theory of motivation, these are factors associated with the content of an individual's job. (See pages 5 and 6 for definitions of the six motivators.)

Hygiene Factors - According to Herzberg et al.'s (1959) motivator-hygiene theory of motivation, these factors are associated with the context of an individual's job. (See pages 6 and 7 for definitions of the eight hygienes.)

Ambients - Factors which, according to Hoy and Miskel (1978), contribute to an employee's satisfaction and dissatisfaction with equal frequency; for example, salary, status, and risk opportunity.

Motivation - Refers to internal psychological mechanisms such as drives or needs, that start and maintain an individual's activity toward achievement of his/her goals.

Demographic - Refers to vital statistics, and includes age, sex, and educational status.

RN - Abbreviation for registered nurse.

LPN - Abbreviation for licensed practical nurse.

Licensed Practical Nurse - Refers to nurses who completed one year in an approved licensed practical nurse program and passed the state board examination for LPN's.

Registered Nurse - Includes those nurses who received either an associate, diploma, baccalaureate, master's, or doctorate status, and successfully passed the state board examination for RN's.

Diploma RN - Refers to RN's who completed an approved program through a hospital and passed the state board examination for RN's.

Associate RN - Refers to RN's who completed an associate degree in health from a junior college and passed the state board examination for RN's.

Baccalaureate RN - Refers to RN's who completed requirements for a baccalaureate degree and passed the state board examination for RN's.

Master's RN - Refers to RN's who completed requirements for a master's degree and passed the state board examination for RN's.

Doctorate RN - Refers to RN's who completed requirements for a doctorate degree and passed the state board examination for RN's.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of literature supporting Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman's (1959) Theory of Job Satisfaction, research not supporting Herzberg et al.'s Theory of Job Satisfaction, and literature relating to job satisfaction among nurses. The rationale and four hypotheses are also presented.

Literature Supporting Herzberg et al.'s Theory of Job Satisfaction

Herzberg et al. (1959) hypothesized that certain factors were associated with job satisfaction and other factors were associated with job dissatisfaction. To test their hypothesis, they surveyed 203 engineers and accountants. A critical-incident technique and semi-structured interviews were utilized to collect data. Subjects were asked to recall and describe a situation in their jobs where they were extremely happy and another situation in their jobs where they were extremely unhappy. The interviews were content analyzed, and frequencies for content categories were tabulated. From the results, it appeared that determinants of job satisfaction, referred to as motivators, were different from determinants of job dissatisfaction, referred to as "hygienes." The results were summarized by Herzberg et al. as follows:

. . . the three factors of work itself, responsibility, and advancement stand out strongly as the major factors involved in producing high job attitudes. Their role in producing poor job attitudes is by contrast extremely small. Contrariwise, company policy and administration, supervision (both technical and interpersonal relationships), and working conditions represent the major job dissatisfiers with little potency to affect job attitudes in a positive direction. . . . Poor working conditions, bad company policies and administration, and bad supervision will lead to job dissatisfaction. Good company policies, good administration, good supervision, and good working conditions will not lead to positive job attitudes. In opposition to this, as far as our data has gone, recognition, achievement, interesting work, responsibility, and advancement all lead to positive job attitudes. Their absence will much less frequently lead to job dissatisfaction (pp. 81-82).

The first research to replicate the initial Herzberg et al. (1959) study was conducted by Schwartz, Jenusaitis, and Stark (1963). They sought to examine the results previously obtained. They wanted to determine if the same results could be obtained when utilizing supervisors in nonprofessional occupations. They utilized 111 male supervisors from 21 utility companies. All of the individuals who took part in the study were in the lower half of the managerial hierarchy. The authors changed the methodology for their study. They utilized a questionnaire that was developed from the original Herzberg et al. interview. The results of this study verified the results of the original study. The motivator factors related to job satisfaction, and the hygiene factors related to job dissatisfaction. One intriguing difference did surface in this study. Interpersonal relations with superiors and peers showed a significant reversal from Herzberg et al.'s findings. In Herzberg et al.'s study with accountants and engineers, interpersonal relations with superiors and peers were significant in the low sequence of events, whereas in this study,

Schwartz et al. found that interpersonal relations with superiors and peers were significant in the high sequences. They thought this might have been due to the utility supervisors' having come up "through the ranks" and consequently, having a common identity with their subordinates. They also mentioned that it could have been due to the superiors, as well as the subordinates, being public service conscious and taking pride in their work.

Herzberg (1965) duplicated the original study in Finland. He utilized 139 lower-level supervisors and administered a translated version of the questionnaire developed by Schwartz et al. (1963). The results confirmed the original findings. The possibility of growth was the only motivator of the six that did not appear more frequently in the satisfied category versus the dissatisfied category. As in the initial study, the hygiene factors appeared with greater frequency in the dissatisfied category than in the satisfied category.

Lindsay (1965) tested the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory on two groups of workers (professional and nonprofessional) to determine if the relationship of motivators and hygienes to satisfaction was different for the two classifications of workers. He found that 75 percent of the variance in job satisfaction could be accounted for by motivators and hygienes, and the motivators were much stronger determinants of job satisfaction than were the hygienes. Furthermore, he found that workers with strong feelings of achievement on a job would be satisfied even though conditions surrounding the job were perceived as being inadequate. On the other hand, workers who did not feel as if they were accomplishing much on the job would be dissatisfied even though conditions surrounding the job were good.

Armstrong (1969) was interested in determining the relationships between job satisfaction for the two kinds of job factors (motivators and hygienes) and overall job satisfaction for an upper level occupational group and a lower level group. He found that engineers were only moderately satisfied with their jobs, but significantly more satisfied than the assemblers. Motivator factors were listed as satisfiers in both occupations. Demographic data did not exert any major influence on the findings, regardless of the occupation.

Passalacqua (1970) sought to determine whether job satisfaction could be increased by providing teachers with feedback based on observations of their classroom behavior. Forty-six teachers participated in the project. The participants served as the experimental group and the remaining faculty members were identified as the control group. The results of the study reported no significant differences between the experimental and control group responses on either the pretest or the posttest. However, the results did show that motivators were repeatedly selected as "likes."

A study by Haun (1975) supported the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory. She examined women in administrative positions in higher education to determine what factors contributed to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Haun found that achievement, content of the work, interpersonal relations, the possibility of growth, and job control were the primary satisfiers. University policy and administration, interpersonal relations, and content of the work were the primary dissatisfiers.

Schmidt (1976) tested Herzberg et al.'s (1959) Motivational-Hygiene Theory with public school administrators. His subjects were

randomly drawn from 132 high schools in a Chicago, Illinois, suburban area. Schmidt's findings supported Herzberg et al.'s theory. Administrators were highly motivated by achievement, recognition, and advancement, but were not greatly motivated by salary, good interpersonal relationships, and administration and supervision.

Thomas (1977) examined the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory in a study utilizing community college administrators. She found that motivators contributed more to job satisfaction than did hygienes. Moreover, hygienes contributed more to job dissatisfaction than did motivators. The most prevalent factor mentioned by the administrators was achievement, which comprised 73.0 percent of the total.

Groseth (1978) tested the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory among personnel administrators in the Florida area. The critical incident technique was used to collect data. His findings strongly supported Herzberg et al.'s theory; 68.3 percent of the events were classified as motivators. Of the motivators, recognition, achievement, and the work itself comprised over 90 percent of the cases. For the hygienes, 81.3 percent of the items related to dissatisfying events. Of the hygiene factors, company policy and administration, working conditions and interpersonal relationships accounted for 72.3 percent of the dissatisfying events.

Kozal (1979) was interested in Hoy and Miskel's (1978) Reformulated (Herzberg et al.) Theory. This theory was developed in 1978, and is similar to the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory, except that it has three components instead of two: motivators, hygienes, and ambients. Kozal's study utilized 25 administrators in the Florida State University system. He classified the critical incidents into one of

Hoy and Miskel's five motivators, six hygienes, or five ambients. The findings did not support Hoy and Miskel's theory. However, data were found to support the Motivator-Hygiene Theory. Motivators were found to be associated with job satisfaction more than hygienes or ambients. Moreover, achievement was the most frequently occurring motivator followed by responsibility and recognition. Work itself was the only motivator found not to be associated more frequently with job satisfaction. Hygienes were found to be associated more frequently with dissatisfaction than motivators or ambients.

Literature Not Supporting the Herzberg et al. Theory

Most of the criticism relating to the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory appears to be attributable to the instruments utilized to obtain the data. Herzberg et al. (1959) utilized a semistructured interview method to collect his data. The interview consisted of two questions: it asked the individuals to recall and describe an event that made them feel satisfied and an event that made them feel dissatisfied.

Ewen (1964) reported several deficiencies in the method utilized in Herzberg et al.'s study. They were: ". . . the narrow range of jobs investigated, the use of only one measure of job attitudes, the absence of any validity and reliability data, and the absence of any measure of overall job satisfaction" (p. 161). Ewen also conducted a study to examine the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory. He surveyed 1,020 full-time life insurance agents and found that manager interest in agents and work itself acted like satisfiers, and salary and recognition caused both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Ewen suggested

that more research utilizing different occupational groups and a different research design is needed before the Herzberg et al. results can be generalized beyond the findings of this study.

Dunnett and Kirchner (1965) criticized the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory because no validity nor reliability data were presented. Armstrong (1969) criticized the Herzberg et al. theory as follows:

- 1) relatively few occupational levels were samples; 2) in no one study were both a high and a low-level occupation examined; 3) only a relatively small number of the sixteen specific job factors were typically examined; 4) only infrequently was the overlap between the two types of factors cited; 5) the form of the relationships between the job factors and overall job satisfaction was either not examined or the data were not reported; and 6) the possible influence of demographic variables on the results was seldom analyzed (p. 16).

Literature Relating to Job Satisfaction for Nurses

During the last decade, research regarding job satisfaction among nurses began to surface. These findings have alerted nursing administrators to some of the problems associated with nurses' job satisfaction. Some researchers are concerned with motivational factors affecting student nurses. For example, Womack (1976) conducted a study among adult female students enrolled in three vocational technical schools in Oklahoma. She sought to identify motivator and hygiene factors and to determine the effects these factors had upon the students. She utilized an instrument adapted from the Job Attitudes Patterned Interview, which was designed by Herzberg et al. (1959). Womack's findings supported the Herzberg et al. theory. The results indicated that achievement, recognition, and work itself were

significantly related to the students' satisfaction. Dissatisfaction stemmed from events related to working conditions, supervision, and school policy.

Cowden (1978) noted that in one study on need satisfaction and job performance among professional and paraprofessional hospital personnel, nurses articulated a strong desire for "self-actualization" and "personal growth."

Schwartz and Vaden (1978) conducted a study among foodservice personnel to see if living in a city or in a rural community made a difference in female employees' attitudes toward their work. Significant differences were noted between individuals working in urban and rural settings. The rural sample agreed more with the statement that, "You should do your best, even if you dislike your work." Another important difference was noted under the item of "Drive and Ambition." Those employed in rural hospitals expressed a stronger conviction that hard work was important to success. In addition to the demographic differences, the results showed that all workers agreed that an individual should receive recognition for work.

Watson (1979), in her study among 76 registered nurses, attempted to identify the reasons why nurses leave their positions. She reports that the most frequently given reason for nurses leaving their last position was lack of formal educational opportunities. The next four most frequently given reasons for leaving were: lack of administrative support, lack of opportunity for advancement, and moving from the locale. Only nine nurses indicated that salary was inadequate.

Donovan (1980), in her study of nurses, found that in surveying 1,051 nurses, only 10.8 percent said they were really satisfied at

all. However, an interesting finding surfaced from the results of her study. She found that 90.3 percent of the nurses rated achievement as very important to them. The next most sought-after goals listed by the nurses were: helping, stimulation, education, and fellowship. She states that self-realization and fulfillment are clearly nurses' highest priorities.

White (1980) stated that baccalaureate degree nurses change jobs in hospitals at three times the rate of associate degree nurses.

Rationale

The rationale for the four hypotheses of this study was deduced from Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory. Herzberg et al. (1959), in referring to job content factors, which include recognition, responsibility, achievement, advancement, and possibility of growth, state:

Theoretically, given an individual operating from a neutral point, with neither positive nor negative attitudes towards his job, the satisfaction of the factors, which we may call the 'satisfiers,' would increase his job satisfaction beyond the neutral point. The absence of satisfaction to these factors would merely drop him back to this neutral level but would not turn him into a dissatisfied employee (p. 111).

Referring to the context factors, which Herzberg et al. (1959) associates with dissatisfaction, and which include salary, job security, status, supervision-technical, interpersonal relations with supervisors, peers, and subordinates, company policy and administration, and working conditions, he maintains:

When these factors deteriorate to a level below that which the employee considers acceptable, then job dissatisfaction ensues. However, the reverse does not hold true. When the job context can be characterized as

optimal, we will not get dissatisfaction, but neither will we get much in the way of positive attitudes (p. 113).

Herzberg et al.'s (1959) Two-Factor Theory assumes the following: first, the content and context factors represent two separate attitudinal dimensions. Second, they view job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as being two separate continua. The opposite of job satisfaction is no satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. Third, the content factors relate to satisfiers, and the context factors relate to dissatisfiers. This assumption is based upon the theory that man has two sets of needs; namely: (1) avoidance of pain, and (2) need for self-actualization. Fourth, Herzberg's Theory contends that the effects of the two factors pertaining to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction will hold true for all occupations regardless of level.

Herzberg et al.'s (1959) theory is compatible with Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs Theory, which contends that the greater the potential for self-actualization within the job, the greater the degree of satisfaction for the individual.

Therefore, the general rationale for this study is that the factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are determined by the potential for self-actualization inherent in the nursing position at the different occupational levels. In addition, the greater the potential for self-actualization within the job, the greater the emphasis will be upon intrinsic factors as contributing to job satisfaction, and the emphasis on job context factors as related to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction will increase as the

potential for self-actualization decreases down through the lower occupational levels.

The specific rationale for hypotheses one and two is based on Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs Theory, which states that as a person's lower level needs become satisfied, his/her energy will be directed toward the next higher level need. Moreover, Maslow stated that man's ultimate goal is to attain self-actualization, or to become everything that he/she is capable of becoming. RN's, due to their education and training, are awarded nursing positions that allow them to satisfy their lower level needs (which would be equivalent to hygienes) and to proceed up the hierarchy toward self-actualization (which would be equivalent to motivators). LPN's do not have the opportunities to enable them to satisfy their lower level needs.

Hypotheses one and two are:

- H₁: RN's will value motivator factors significantly more than LPN's.
- H₂: LPN's will value hygiene factors significantly more than RN's.

The specific rationale for hypotheses three and four is based upon Herzberg et al.'s (1959) assertion that motivators will increase an individual's job satisfaction more than hygienes. These hypotheses are:

- H₃: Satisfied nurses will value motivator factors significantly more than dissatisfied nurses.
- H₄: Dissatisfied nurses will value hygiene factors significantly more than satisfied nurses.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was to test the applicability of Herzberg et al.'s (1959) Two-Factor Theory and to determine whether job content factors or job context factors contributed more to job satisfaction when two groups of nurses were examined. A questionnaire, adapted from Herzberg (1966) and Rosenfeld and Zdep (1971), was utilized to collect the data. The questionnaire contained three major categories: (1) the Job Factor Importance Questionnaire, (2) the Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and (3) the Demographic Data. Each nurse was asked to rate 13 items according to the degree of importance. A Likert-type scale from one to five was utilized. This researcher sought to determine if a questionnaire designed from the Herzberg critical incident technique would yield the same results as the interview.

Sample Selection

After interviews with executives of the State Board of Nurses in Oklahoma City, it was determined that computer lists of all LPN's and RN's in Tulsa County would be available for the study and that board officials were willing to provide the researcher with this information. In Tulsa County there are 2,421 RN's and 874 LPN's. The data

were collected by surveying 20 percent of each group. The nurses were randomly selected from the computer lists, utilizing a table of random numbers.

Instrumentation

A two page, Likert-type questionnaire was utilized to collect the data. The questionnaire was adapted from Herzberg (1966) and Rosenfeld and Zdep (1971). The first page contained two categories: (1) the Job Factor Importance Questionnaire, and (2) the Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. The Job Factor Importance Questionnaire consisted of 13 items, 5 of which were classified as motivators or content factors and 8 of which were classified as hygienes or context factors. They were as follows: opportunity for advancement, recognition for good work, opportunity to use skills, opportunity to develop new skills and abilities, and enjoyment of work. These factors were classified as job content or motivators, and the following items were classified as job context or hygienes: hospital policies, employee benefits, salary, good working conditons, relations with co-workers, relations with management, job security, and flexibility in scheduling. The five choices of response for this category ranged from "very unimportant" to "very important." The Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire listed five choices of response, ranging from "I dislike it very much," to "I like it extremely well." The second page of the questionnaire covered the demographic data. A cover letter, personally addressed to each nurse, accompanied the two page questionnaire (Appendix A).

Reliability Estimates for Instrument

Cronbach Alpha coefficients were computed to obtain reliability estimates for both the motivator items and the hygiene items. A coefficient of .58 for the motivators indicated low internal consistency. However, the internal consistency estimate for the hygienes of .70 was in the acceptable range.

Data Collection

The process for collecting the data, as previously stated, consisted of mailing a two page questionnaire, with cover letter, to 484 RN's and 175 LPN's. The nurses were instructed not to identify themselves and to return only the questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which was provided. The researcher emphasized the fact that all information contained in the questionnaire would be kept confidential.

From the 481 RN's surveyed, the return was 291 questionnaires, or 60 percent. The return from the LPN's was 75, or 43 percent (Table I). Several of the nurses expressed interest in the study and asked that the results be shared with them.

Treatment of the Data

Each of the completed questionnaires was scored according to three major sections: (1) the Job Factor Importance Questionnaire, (2) the Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and (3) the Demographic Data. Mean scores were computed for the 13 items on the Job Factor Importance Questionnaire for each group of nurses. Mean scores were also computed for the total of the first five items (referred to

as motivators) and the last eight items (referred to as hygienes) for each group of nurses. In addition, mean scores were computed for the overall job satisfaction for each group of nurses, as well as means for the low level of job satisfaction and the high level of job satisfaction for the entire sample of nurses (Table II). Before interpreting the t-tests, F-tests were calculated to determine if the variances were homogeneous. If they were not homogeneous, a separate variance estimate of "t" was used in place of the standard pooled variance estimate. A T-value was then obtained on each of the items to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of nurses (Table III). In addition, a one-way analysis of variance was computed for each of the items to determine if the demographic variables exerted any significant influence on the results.

TABLE I
RN'S AND LPN'S QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

	RN's	LPN's
Number Sent	484	175
Number Returned	291	75
Percentage of Return	60	43

TABLE II
 COMPARISON OF MEANS OF THREE LEVELS OF JOB
 SATISFACTION FOR THE 13 FACTORS FOR
 RN's (N=291) AND LPN's (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
Advancement	3.9	4.3	3.3	3.8	3.8	4.1
Recognition	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Use of Skills	4.6	4.4	4.3	5.0	4.6	4.6
Develop New Skills	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5
Enjoyment of Work	4.6	4.8	4.6	5.0	4.7	4.7
Hospital Policies	3.9	4.1	3.5	3.8	3.9	4.0
Employee Benefits	4.4	4.6	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.2
Salary	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.6
Working Conditions	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
Relations With Co-workers	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.6
Management	4.2	4.3	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.3
Job Security	4.2	4.6	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.5
Flexible Scheduling	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.5	3.9	3.8

TABLE III
 COMPARISON OF JOB FACTOR IMPORTANCE SCORES
 FOR RN's (N=291) AND LPN's (N=75)

	RN's		LPN's		T Value	Prob
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>Motivators</u>						
Advancement	3.8	1.04	4.1	0.86	2.72	0.007*
Recognition	4.6	0.70	4.4	0.74	-1.39	0.166
Use Skills	4.6	0.60	4.6	0.54	0.26	0.795
Develop New Skills	4.4	0.66	4.6	0.64	1.71	0.088
<u>Enjoyment of Work</u>	<u>4.7</u>	0.52	<u>4.7</u>	0.61	0.37	0.710
Total Motivator Score	21.8	2.48	22.3	2.54	1.58	0.770
<u>Hygienes</u>						
Hospital Policies	3.9	0.81	4.0	0.60	1.48	0.141
Employee Benefits	4.0	0.94	4.3	0.89	1.91	0.057
Salary	4.4	0.65	4.6	0.60	2.34	0.020*
Working Conditions	4.5	0.64	4.6	0.63	1.97	0.049*
Relations w/Co-workers	4.4	0.73	4.6	0.64	2.12	0.035*
Relations w/Management	4.2	0.75	4.3	0.59	1.19	0.236
Job Security	4.3	0.79	4.5	0.67	2.74	0.006*
<u>Flexible Scheduling</u>	<u>4.0</u>	1.12	<u>3.9</u>	1.00	-0.77	0.445
Total Hygiene Score	33.1	4.04	34.49	3.45	2.80	0.005*

*Significant at .05 level.

Summary

The process utilized in the present study consisted of selection of population, which consisted of 20 percent of the LPN's and 20 percent of the RN's in Tulsa County. Selection of the population was obtained from a computer list provided by the State Board of Nurses in Oklahoma City. The nurses were randomly selected. A questionnaire was mailed to the nurses and the results were analyzed. Frequency distributions, F-Values, and T-Values were computed to test the four hypotheses and to test additional information regarding the demographic data.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of data and describes the possible influence of demographic variables on the results. The stated hypotheses are as follows:

- H : RN's will value motivator factors significantly more than licensed practical nurses.
- H : LPN's will value hygiene factors significantly more than RN's.
- H : Satisfied nurses will value motivator factors significantly more than dissatisfied nurses.
- H : Dissatisfied nurses will value hygiene factors significantly more than satisfied nurses.

As stated in previous chapters, the questionnaire was mailed to 484 RN's and 75 LPN's. A return of 291 questionnaires, or 60 percent, from the RN's and 75 questionnaires, or 43 percent, from the LPN's, were used in the study.

Demographic Information

Data regarding the RN's age, sex, marital status, level of education, years worked as a nurse, number of dependents, income status, present position, current area of practice, is presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV
RN'S DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
(N=291)

Variable	Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	13	4.5
	Female	277	95.5
		1	missing
Age	20-29 Years	63	21.6
	30-39 Years	106	36.6
	40-49 Years	55	19.0
	50 Years & Older	66	22.8
		1	missing
Marital Status	Unmarried	90	31.0
	Married	200	69.0
		1	missing
Educational Level	Associate	59	20.3
	Diploma	145	50.0
	Baccalaureate	59	20.3
	Master's	15	5.2
	Doctorate	3	1.0
	Other	9	3.1
		1	missing
Years Worked as a Nurse	1-5 Years	62	21.4
	6-10 Years	81	27.9
	11-15 Years	53	18.3
	16 Years or More	94	32.4
		1	missing
Number of Dependents	0	128	44.0
	1	58	19.9
	2	57	19.6
	3	25	8.6
	4	23	7.9
Income Status	Sole Earner	88	30.3
	Contributing Earner	202	69.7
		1	missing
Present Nursing Position	Staff-Hospital	156	54.2
	Head-Supervisor	37	12.8
	Instructor-Educator	18	6.3

TABLE IV (Continued)

Variable	Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
	Nursing Home	1	0.3
	Private Duty	6	2.1
	Doctor's Office	9	3.1
	Other	61	21.2
		1	missing
Area of Practice	General	23	8.0
	Medical-Surgical	58	20.1
	Operating Room	15	5.2
	ECF	11	3.8
	Emergency Room	7	2.4
	ICU-CCU	26	9.0
	Pediatrics	25	8.7
	Psychiatric	14	4.9
	Other	109	37.8
		3	missing

Data reported the majority of the RN respondents were female (95.5%), in the 30-39 year age category (36.6%), married (69.0%), with no dependents (44.0%), were diploma nurses (50.0%), had worked 16 or more years as a nurse (32.4%), were contributing income earners (69.7%), and were working as staff-hospital nurses (54.2%).

Data regarding the LPN's age, sex, marital status, level of education, years worked as a nurse, number of dependents, income status, present position, and current area of practice is presented in Table V.

Data reported the majority of the LPN respondents were female (88.0%), in the 30-39 year age category (40.0%), married (59.0%), with

no dependents (38.7%), had a high school education (72.0%), had worked 6-10 years as a nurse (35.0%), were contributing income earners (56.0%), and were working as staff-hospital nurses (67.0%) (Table V).

TABLE V
LPN'S DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
(N=75)

Variable	Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	7	9.3
	Female	66	88.0
		2	missing
Age	20-29 Years	14	18.7
	30-39 Years	30	40.0
	40-49 Years	18	24.0
	50 Years & Older	13	17.3
Marital Status	Unmarried	31	41.3
	Married	44	58.7
Educational Level	High School	54	72.0
	Baccalaureate	6	8.0
	Other	15	20.0
Years Worked as a Nurse	1-5 Years	19	25.3
	6-10 Years	26	34.7
	11-15 Years	18	24.0
	16 Years or More	12	16.0
Number of Dependents	0	29	38.7
	1	16	21.3
	2	17	22.7
	3	9	12.0
	4	4	5.3
Income Status	Sole Earner	33	44.0
	Contributing Earner	42	56.0

TABLE V (Continued)

Variable	Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
Present Nursing Position	Staff-Hospital	50	66.7
	Nursing Home	3	4.0
	Private Duty	6	8.0
	Doctor's Office	9	12.0
	Other	7	9.3
Area of Practice	General	8	10.7
	Medical-Surgical	24	32.0
	Operating Room	1	1.3
	ECF	2	2.7
	Emergency Room	1	1.3
	ICU-CCU	7	9.3
	Pediatrics	4	5.3
	Psychiatric	1	1.3
	Other	27	36.0

A comparison of the RN and LPN profiles is as follows:

Sex

Data reported that 277 (95.5 %) of the RN's were female and 13 (4.5 %) were male. Sixty-six (88.0%) of the LPN's were female, and seven (9.3%) were male, with two missing.

Marital Status

Two hundred (69.0%) of the RN's were married and 44 (59.0%) of the LPN's were married.

Level of Education

For the RN's, the highest percentage for the level of education listed was 140 (50.0%) for diploma nurses. Only three (1.0%) had doctorates. Fifty-four (72.0%) of the LPN's listed high school as their highest level of education. Six (8.0%) had baccalaureate degrees.

Age

The ages of the nurses ranged from a low of 23 to a high of 76 years. The age group with the highest percentage was from 30-39 years for both groups, with 36.6 percent for the RN's and 40.0 percent for the LPN's.

Years Worked as a Nurse

The highest percentage, 94 (32.4%), of the RN's reported having worked 16 or more years as a nurse. For the LPN's, 26 (35.0%) had worked for 6-10 years.

Number of Dependents

For the number of dependents for the nurses, 128 (44.0%) of the RN's reported having no dependents, and 29 (38.7%) of the LPN's listed no dependents.

Income Status

Two hundred two of the RN's (69.7%) were contributing income earners, and 42 (56.0%) of the LPN's were contributing income earners.

Present Nursing Position

For the present position of the nurses, the largest percentage reported for both RN's and LPN's was in the category of staff-hospital, with 156 (54.2%) for RN's and 50 (67.0%) for LPN's.

Current Area of Practice

The highest percentage listed for both groups of nurses for the category of current area of practice was under the response "Other," with RN's reporting 109 (37.5%) and LPN's reporting 27 (36.0%).

The category "Other" covered educators, supervisors, administrators, health department, doctor's office, and private duty nursing.

In comparing the overall job satisfaction for both groups, the difference was not significant. However, the results did show that RN's were slightly more satisfied than LPN's (Table VI).

TABLE VI
COMPARISON OF THE OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RN'S (N=291) AND
LPN'S (N=75)

Mean	RN's	SD	Mean	LPN's	SD	T-Value	Prob.
4.4		1.1	4.2		1.2	-1.56	0.119

Analysis of the Hypotheses

The major goal of the study was to determine whether differences existed in the type of factors which contribute to job satisfaction for RN's and LPN's.

The questionnaire utilized to collect data listed three categories: (1) Job Factor Importance Questionnaire, which listed 13 items, five of which were referred to as job content factors or motivators and eight of which were referred to as context factors or hygienes, (2) Overall Job Satisfaction, which listed five different levels of job satisfaction, and (3) Demographic Data.

Mean scores were computed for the three categories. F-Values were calculated to check for homogeneity of variances and T-Values were obtained to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of nurses. In addition, a one-way analysis of variance was computed for each of the items to determine if the demographic variables exerted any influence on the results.

Data Related to Hypothesis One

H_1 : RN's will value motivator factors significantly more than LPN's.

The five items on the questionnaire representing job content (referred to as "motivators") were scored and means were obtained for the RN's and for the LPN's. A higher score indicates a stronger value placed on that set of items. The mean for the RN's was 22.2 percent and for the LPN's, 21.8 percent. In comparing these two means, a T-Value of 1.58 ($p = 0.770$) was obtained, indicating that there was no

significant difference between the two groups of nurses (Table VII). Therefore, hypothesis number one was rejected.

Data Related to Hypothesis Two

H₂: LPN's will value hygiene factors significantly more than RN's.

The eight items on the questionnaire representing job context factors (referred to as "hygienes") were scored and means were obtained for the RN's and the LPN's. The mean score was 34.5 percent for the LPN's and 33.1 percent for the RN's. In comparing the two means, a T-Value of 2.80 ($p = 0.003$) indicated that a significant difference existed between the two groups at the 0.05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number two was accepted (Table VIII).

Data Related to Hypothesis Three

H₃: Satisfied nurses will value motivator factors significantly more than dissatisfied nurses.

The five items on the questionnaire representing job content factors (referred to as "motivators") were scored for both RN's and LPN's according to three levels of job satisfaction: low, neutral, and high. Means were then computed for the entire sample of nurses for the low level and the high level. The mean for the low level of job satisfaction was 22.0 percent, and for the high level was 21.9 percent. In comparing the two means, a T-Value of .39 ($p = 0.09$) was obtained, indicating that there was no significant difference between satisfied nurses and dissatisfied nurses in the value they placed on content factors. Therefore, hypothesis number three was rejected (Table IX).

TABLE VII
 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR MOTIVATORS
 FOR RN'S (N=291) AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	F-Value	Prob.	T-Value	Prob.
RN's	21.8	2.5	1.05	0.770	1.58	0.115
LPN's	22.3	2.5				

TABLE VIII
 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR HYGIENES
 FOR RN's (N=291) AND LPN's (N=75)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	F-Value	Prob.	T-Value	Prob.
RN's	33.1	4.0				
			1.37	0.10	2.80*	0.005
LPN's	34.5	3.4				

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE IX
 COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR MOTIVATORS BY LOW LEVEL
 SATISFACTION AND HIGH LEVEL SATISFACTION
 FOR ENTIRE SAMPLE OF NURSES
 (N=366)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	F-Value	Prob.	T-Value	Prob.
Low Level of Job Satisfaction	22.0	2.1	1.47	0.092	0.39	0.696
High Level of Job Satisfaction	21.9	2.6				

Data Related to Hypothesis Four

H₄: Dissatisfied nurses will value hygiene factors significantly more than satisfied nurses.

The eight items on the questionnaire representing job context factors (referred to as "hygienes") were scored for both RN's and LPN's according to three levels of job satisfaction: low, neutral, and high. Means were then computed for the entire sample of nurses for the low level and the high level. The mean for the low level of job satisfaction was 34.4 percent and 33.2 percent for the high level. In comparing the two means, a T-Value of 2.54 ($p = 0.013$) was obtained, indicating that there was a significant difference between satisfied nurses and dissatisfied nurses in the value they placed on context factors (hygienes) (Table X). Therefore, hypotheses number four was accepted.

Supplementary Data

The demographic data was analyzed to determine if these variables exerted any influence on the nurses' responses to the 13 items and to the level of job satisfaction. T-Values were computed on the demographic variables.

The T-Value for sex indicated that a significant difference existed between the two groups of nurses for the item "recognition." A mean score of 3.8 percent for the males and 4.6 percent for the females indicated that the females valued recognition significantly more than did the males.

Another significant difference was noted for the item "hospital policies." The mean score of 3.5 percent for the males and 4.0

TABLE X
 COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR HYGIENES BY LOW LEVEL
 SATISFACTION AND HIGH LEVEL SATISFACTION
 FOR ENTIRE SAMPLE OF NURSES
 (N=366)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	F-Value	Prob.	T-Value	Prob.
Low Level of Job Satisfaction	34.4	3.0	1.87	0.0007	2.54*	0.013
High Level of Job Satisfaction	33.2	4.0				

*Significant at .05 level.

percent for the females produced a T-Value which was significant. This indicated that females valued hospital policies significantly more than did the males.

For the variable marital status, no significant difference was reported for any one of the 13 items. However, in totaling the five items, referred to as "motivators," a mean score of 22.3 percent for the unmarried and 21.7 percent for the married indicated a significant difference. The T-Value was significant at the 0.05 level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to determine whether job content (referred to as intrinsic factors or motivators) or job context factors (referred to as extrinsic or hygienes) contributed more to job satisfaction for RN's and LPN's. Another goal of the study was to examine the Herzberg Theory of Job Satisfaction. Moreover, this researcher wanted to know if the questionnaire would yield the same results as the interview method utilized by Herzberg (1959).

A two page, Likert-type questionnaire, adapted from Herzberg (1959) and Rosenfeld and Zdep (1971) was utilized to collect the data. The questionnaire was mailed to 484 RN's and 175 LPN's. A return of 291 questionnaires, or 60 percent, from the RN's and 75 questionnaires, or 43 percent, from the LPN's were used in the study.

The data were analyzed and frequency distributions, as well as t-tests, were computed to determine the differences between the RN's' and LPN's' mean scores for motivators and hygienes. Mean scores were also computed for each of the 13 items on the Job Factor Importance Questionnaire, and were compared with the demographic variables. Under the section, "Overall Job Satisfaction," the five items were grouped according to low, neutral, and high, with low comprising the

first two statements, neutral the third, and high the fourth and fifth statements.

The analysis of this data was presented in Chapter IV. The level of significance was set at the 0.05 level.

The first hypothesis was rejected. No significant difference was found between the two groups of nurses for the value placed on the motivator factors.

The second hypothesis was accepted. A T-value of 2.80 indicated that a significant difference existed between the two groups in the value they placed on hygienes.

The third hypothesis was rejected, because no significant difference was found between satisfied nurses and dissatisfied nurses in the value they placed on motivator factors.

The fourth hypothesis was accepted. A T-Value of 2.54 indicated that dissatisfied nurses valued hygiene factors significantly more than satisfied nurses.

The demographic data was presented in Chapter IV. Some significant differences did exist. The T-Value for sex indicated that females valued the factor "recognition" significantly more than did males.

A T-Value indicated that females viewed hospital policies as being more important than did males.

For the variable marital status, no significance was reported for the individual items; however, when obtaining a total score of the first five items, referred to as content factors (motivators), the T-Value indicated that unmarried nurses valued motivators significantly more than the married nurses.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the results of this study of motivating factors which contributed to RN's' and LPN's' job satisfaction:

1. Contrary to previous research, the results of this study indicated that both RN's and LPN's were very satisfied with their jobs. For RN's, 240 (82%) stated that they were satisfied, and 57 (76%) of the LPN's reported being satisfied (Table XI). This came as a surprise to the researcher, because all literature indicated that nurses were experiencing boredom, burnout, and were leaving the nursing profession. This reverse in the nurses' attitudes may have been due to the abrupt shift in the economy. This writer has noted that nurses who have not worked for several years are returning to nursing positions. They may have felt insecure and said they were satisfied even though they were not.

TABLE XI
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS OF
JOB SATISFACTION FOR RN'S (N=291)
AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low (%)	Neutral (%)	High (%)
RN's	13.7 (40)	3.8 (11)	82.5 (240)
LPN's	18.7 (14)	5.3 (4)	76.0 (57)

2. There was no significant difference between RN's and LPN's in the value they placed on motivator factors. This finding is compatible with Herzberg's theory. However, this researcher expected that RN's would value motivator factors significantly more than LPN's, because RN's have had more opportunities in which to satisfy their hygiene needs and, therefore, they should be striving for the higher level needs, such as motivator factors. This researcher can only conjecture that this reversal from Herzberg et al.'s (1959) findings might have been due to a low Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .58 for the motivator items on the questionnaire.

3. LPN's valued hygiene factors significantly more than did RN's. This was as the researcher expected. This finding is compatible with Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory. LPN's opportunities are limited and their salaries are less than RN's. Therefore, they have not satisfied their lower needs and would place a higher value on the hygiene factors.

4. In this study there was no significant difference between satisfied nurses and dissatisfied nurses in the value they placed on motivator factors. This writer expected satisfied nurses to value motivator items significantly more than dissatisfied nurses. According to the Herzberg theory, satisfied nurses should value the motivator factors significantly more than the dissatisfied nurses. One reason for this reversal from Herzberg et al.'s (1959) findings could have been due to a low coefficient of .58 for the motivator items of the questionnaire.

5. The results from this study indicated that dissatisfied RN's and LPN's valued hygiene factors significantly more than satisfied nurses. This finding is substantiated by Herzberg's theory.

6. In listing the factor means in rank order, the findings indicated that RN's valued: (1) enjoyment of work, (2) opportunities to use their skills, and (3) recognition more than the other factors. The LPN's valued: (1) enjoyment of work, (2) opportunities to use their skills, (3) relations with co-workers, and (4) salary and working conditions as the most important factors. The results indicated both groups of nurses considered work itself to be the most important factor. Moreover, among the top three items for both groups was opportunities to use their skills. However, the findings suggest LPN's place more value on relations with the co-workers than do RN's; RN's place more value on recognition. The factor most frequently reported by RN's that contributed to job dissatisfaction was recognition and LPN's reported working conditions.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based upon the results of this study, the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. This study should be replicated using another instrument. This researcher would suggest utilizing a questionnaire used by Schwartz et al. (1963), which was patterned after the Herzberg et al. (1959) interview method, or the critical incident interview utilized by Herzberg et al., because both methods yielded results that supported the Herzberg theory.

2. The surveys should be conducted in large groups during staff meetings to ensure a good return.

3. In order to ensure the greatest return, the surveys should be conducted during the winter instead of during the summer when many nurses are on vacation.

4. A similar study should be conducted using occupations at more diverse levels, such as nurses' aides, RN's, and nursing administrators to determine if Herzberg's theory is supported regardless of the occupation.

Recommendations for Nursing Administrators

The findings of this study indicated RN's valued work itself as the most important factor which contributed to job satisfaction, followed by ability to use their skills and recognition. LPN's valued work itself as the most important factor, followed by relations with co-workers and opportunity to use their skills.

Based upon this information, nursing administrators must recognize the importance of considering the nurses' needs and not just the needs of the organization. In order to accomplish this goal, Herzberg (1966) suggests separating the employee relations into two separate divisions. One division should be responsible for the employees' hygiene needs, such as salary, policies, and other fringe benefits; the other division should be responsible for the employee's motivator needs, such as opportunity to use their skills, opportunity to learn new skills, etc.

According to Herzberg (1966), the division concerned with the motivators should be responsible for re-education of workers and

management toward motivator orientation, job enlargement, and remedial actions.

Many large medical facilities are already practicing certain aspects of the motivator division, but the following recommendations are made by this researcher:

1. The first priority for nursing administrations should be to set the entry level for nurses at the Baccalaureate degree. This must be initiated in order for the nursing profession to achieve the professional status it so rightly deserves. At the present time, in many instances, LPN's are allowed to perform the same duties as the RN's. This researcher does not believe this results in quality patient care. Baccalaureate nurses have demonstrated their deep desire for nursing by going to school for four years to prepare themselves for the nursing profession. Therefore, in order for them to remain motivated in the nursing profession, they must be given recognition and continued opportunities for growth. This researcher suggests the following recommendations in order to achieve this goal:

- a. A program should be developed through a university to ensure growth for all nurses (LPN, associate, diploma, master's, and doctorate). Each level nurse should continue to take prescribed courses, properly sequenced, which would lead to a higher degree. At the present time, there are continuing education short courses available to nurses at all levels through the various hospitals, but this researcher does not agree with this method of transmitting knowledge. This method is too fragmented and is not structured in a sequential manner.

By implementing the plan outlined above, eventually all nurses would acquire a Baccalaureate degree.

- b. The program should be designed to incorporate theory and practice. Each level nurse could be assigned mentors from the level above. This method would allow the nurses to acquire in-depth knowledge and would greatly facilitate the quality of nursing care for all patients.

2. A record should be maintained on all nurses listing their goals and aspirations. Exercise should be taken to ensure that their needs are met.

3. All nurses should be allowed to rotate through different units if they so desire. This would provide opportunities for nurses to use their skills and their knowledge and, in many instances, this would prevent burnout and boredom.

4. Short breaks and other opportunities should be provided for LPN's to meet their need for relationships with co-workers.

5. Opportunities should be provided for creativity in all nurses.

6. Flexible schedules should be an option for all nurses.

7. A remedial program should be developed to assist nurses who are performing below hospital expectations.

In conclusion, the researcher found this study to have been an interesting one, with some surprising findings. Prior to this study, the data indicated that nurses were very dissatisfied with their nursing positions. However, the data collected for this study did not substantiate previous data. The findings from this study indicated that both RN's and LPN's were very satisfied with their jobs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Araujo, M. Creative Nursing Administration Sets Climate for Retention. Hospitals, May, 1980, 54, 72-76.
- Armstrong, T. B. Occupational Level as an Indicator of Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers: A Test of the Herzberg Theory. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1969.)
- Barnard, C. L. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Burke, R. J. Are Herzberg's Motivators and Hygienes Understandable? Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 317-321.
- Cowden, P. Dissatisfaction and the Changing Meaning and Purpose of the Nurse's Work. Nursing Forum, 1978, 17, 202-209.
- Donovan, L. What Nurses Want (and What They're Getting). RN, 1980, 22-30.
- Dunnett, M. D. and Kirchner, W. K. Psychology Applied to Industry. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Ewen, R. B. Some Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A Study of the Generality of Herzberg's Theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 161-163.
- Follett, M. P. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett, Metcalf, H. C. and Urwick, L., eds. New York: Harper Bros., 1940.
- Graen, G. B., Dawis, R. V., and Weiss, D. J. Need Type and Job Satisfaction Among Industrial Scientists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 52, 286-289.
- Groseth, R. S. An Investigation of the Motivator-Hygiene Theory of Job Satisfaction Among Selected Student Affairs Administrators. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida Press, 1978.)
- Hallas, G. G. Why Nurses Are Giving It Up. RN, 1980, 17-21.
- Haun, H. A Study of Work Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Among Selected Women Leaders in Higher Education. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1975.)

- Henderson, G. Human Relations: From Theory to Practice. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1974.
- Herzberg, F. The Managerial Choice: To Be Efficient and to Be Human. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1976.
- Herzberg, F. The Motivation to Work Among Finish Supervisors. Personnel Psychology (Winter), 1965, 393-402.
- Herzberg, F. One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? Harvard Business Review, 1967, 46(3), 82-91.
- Herzberg, F. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing, 1966.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- Hoy, W. K. and Miskel, C. G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Hulin, C. L. and Smith, P. A. An Empirical Investigation of Two Implications of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 396-402.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- King, N. Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 74(1), 18-31.
- Kozal, A. P. An Application of the Reformulated Herzberg Theory of Job Satisfaction to Selected Administrative Affairs Staff in The Florida State University System. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1979.)
- Lindsay, C. A. Job Satisfaction: An Examination and Test of a Modification of the Herzberg Theory. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1965.)
- Lindsay, C. A., Marks, E., and Gorlow, L. The Herzberg Theory: A Critique and Reformulation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 330-339.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper Bros., 1954.
- McGregor, D. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- McGregor, D. Leadership and Motivation. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

- Myers, S. Who Are Your Motivated Workers? Harvard Business Review, 1964, 42, 73-88.
- Passalacqua, B. J. Teacher Job Satisfaction Based on the Herzberg Theory. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.)
- Popham, J. W. and Sirotnik, K. A. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Rosenfeld, M. and Zdep, S. M. Intrinsic-Extrinsic Aspects of Work and Their Demographic Correlates. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 359-362.
- Saleh, S. and Otis, J. Sources of Job Satisfaction and Their Effects on Attitudes Toward Retirement. Journal of Industrial Psychology, 1963, 1, 101-106.
- Schmidt, G. L. Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1976, 12, 68-86.
- Schwartz, M. M., Jenusaitis, E., and Stark, H. Motivational Factors Among Supervisors in the Utility Industry. Personnel Psychology, 1963, 16, 45-53.
- Sergiovanni, T. Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction. Journal of Educational Administration, May, 1967, V, 66-81.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., and Hulin, C. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.
- Storlie, F. J. Burnout: The Elaboration of a Concept. American Journal of Nursing, Dec., 1979, 79, 2108-2111.
- Swartz, R. S. and Vaden, A. G. Behavioral Science Research in Hospital Foodservice. Research, 1978, 73, 120-126.
- Thomas, S. C. An Application of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction to Selected Community College Administrative Roles. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1977.)
- Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Vaughn, W. J. Predictors, Correlates, and Consequences of Job Satisfaction in a University Library. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, North Texas State University, 1976.)
- Vroom, V. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Wanous, J. P. A Causal-Correlational Analysis of the Job Satisfaction and Performance Relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 139-144.

- Watson, L. A. Keeping Qualified Nurses. Supervisor Nurse, 1979, 10, 31-34.
- Werniment, P. F. and Dunette, M. D. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors in Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 41-50.
- White, C. H. Where Have All the Nurses Gone and Why? Nursing, 1980, 68-71.
- Wolf, M. G. Need Gratification Theory: A Theoretical Reformulation of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Job Motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 87-94.
- Womack, J. G. A Study of Motivator and Hygiene Factors of Adult Women Students in Nursing Programs at Area Vocational-Technical Schools. (Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1976.)

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

THE INSTRUMENT

RN and LPN Questionnaire

Directions: Listed below are 13 aspects of your overall nursing environment. Please indicated the degree of importance that each item holds for you in determining your satisfaction with your job. Please read each item carefully and circle the appropriate number on a scale ranging from 1 - Very Unimportant, to 5 - Very Important.

1 - Very Unimportant 4 - Important
 2 - Unimportant 5 - Very Important
 3 - Uncertain

	VUI	UI	U	I	VI
1. Opportunity for advancement	1	2	3	4	5
2. Recognition for good work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Opportunity to use my skills	1	2	3	4	5
4. Opportunity to develop new skills and abilities	1	2	3	4	5
5. Enjoyment of my work	1	2	3	4	5
6. Hospital policies	1	2	3	4	5
7. Employee benefits	1	2	3	4	5
8. Salary	1	2	3	4	5
9. Good working conditions	1	2	3	4	5
10. Relations with co-workers	1	2	3	4	5
11. Relations with management	1	2	3	4	5
12. Job security	1	2	3	4	5
13. Flexibility in scheduling (4-hour, 10-hour, 12-hour, etc. shifts)	1	2	3	4	5

Directions: Listed below are five statements which describe how satisfied you are with your overall job. Please select the statement that best describes your feelings regarding your job and make a check mark in the space to the left of the question number.

- 1. I dislike it very much.
- 2. I dislike it some.
- 3. I neither like it nor dislike it.
- 4. I like it just a little.
- 5. I like it extremely well.

APPENDIX B
CORRESPONDENCE

July 26, 1982

Dear _____ :

I am a registered nurse at Hillcrest Medical Center and a doctoral student at Oklahoma State University. I am in the final stages of preparation for my dissertation and need your help in supplying the data for my research.

In order not to intrude on your working time, I have elected to send the questionnaires to your home. Will you please complete these questionnaires and return them in the enclosed envelope within ten days?

The purpose of these questionnaires is to find out how you view various aspects of your job, such as the work itself, supervision, salary, etc. In addition, you are asked to answer some questions about yourself. Such information is necessary because of the possible effect these factors may have on the overall results.

Be assured that your answers will be kept confidential. They will not be identified to anyone, nor will they be used to identify individuals. My major concern is to determine how you honestly feel about various aspects of your nursing activities. Please do not put your name on the questionnaires.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your time and effort in making this study possible.

Sincerely,

Verlean Smith

VS/hgf
Enclosures (3)

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLES

TABLE XII
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY AGE FOR RN'S
 (N=291) AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
20-29 Years	20.0 (8)	14.3 (2)	9.1 (1)	25.0 (1)	22.6 (43)	19.3 (11)
30-39 Years	45.0 (18)	50.0 (7)	45.5 (5)	25.0 (1)	34.7 (83)	38.6 (22)
40-49 Years	25.0 (10)	28.6 (4)	9.1 (1)	25.0 (1)	18.4 (44)	22.8 (13)
50 Years and Over	10.0 (4)	7.1 (1)	36.4 (4)	25.0 (1)	24.3 (58)	19.3 (11)

TABLE XIII
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY SEX FOR RN'S
 (N=291) AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
Male	2.5 (1)	7.7 (1)	9.1 (1)	25.0 (1)	4.6 (11)	8.9 (5)
Female	97.5 (39)	92.3 (12)	90.9 (10)	75.0 (3)	95.4 (228)	91.1 (51)

TABLE XIV
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY MARITAL STATUS
 FOR RN'S (N=291) AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
Unmarried (divorced & single)	42.5 (17)	35.7 (5)	18.2 (2)	75.0 (3)	29.7 (71)	40.4 (23)
Married	57.5 (23)	64.3 (9)	81.8 (9)	25.0 (1)	70.3 (168)	59.6 (34)

TABLE XV
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY LEVEL OF
 EDUCATION FOR RN'S (N=291) AND
 LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
High School		71.4 (10)		75.0 (3)		71.9 (41)
Associate	27.5 (11)		18.2 (2)		19.2 (46)	
Diploma	47.5 (19)		63.6 (7)		49.8 (119)	
Baccalaureate	17.5 (7)	14.3 (2)	18.2 (2)	25.0 (1)	20.9 (50)	5.3 (3)
Master's	5.0 (2)				5.4 (13)	
Doctorate					1.3 (3)	
Other	2.5 (1)	14.3 (2)			3.3 (8)	22.8 (13)

TABLE XVI
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY YEARS WORKED
 AS A NURSE FOR RN'S (N=291)
 AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
1-5 Years	30.0 (12)	28.6 (4)	9.1 (1)	50.0 (2)	20.5 (49)	22.8 (13)
6-10 Years	32.5 (13)	21.4 (3)	18.2 (2)	25.0 (1)	27.6 (66)	38.6 (22)
11-15 Years	22.5 (9)	35.7 (5)	36.4 (4)		16.7 (40)	22.8 (13)
16 Years or More	15.0 (6)	14.3 (2)	36.4 (4)	25.0 (1)	35.1 (84)	15.8 (9)

TABLE XVII
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY NUMBER OF
 DEPENDENTS FOR RN'S (N=291)
 AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
None	37.5 (15)	21.0 (3)	45.5 (5)	75.0 (3)	45.0 (108)	40.4 (23)
One	22.5 (9)	21.4 (3)	9.1 (1)	25.0 (1)	20.0 (48)	21.1 (12)
Two	25.0 (10)	35.7 (5)	36.4 (4)		17.9 (43)	21.1 (12)
Three	7.5 (3)	14.3 (2)	9.1 (1)		8.8 (21)	12.3 (7)
Four or More	7.5 (3)	7.1 (1)			8.3 (20)	5.3 (3)

TABLE XVIII
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY INCOME STATUS
 FOR RN'S (N=291) AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
Sole Earner	37.5 (15)	49.9 (6)	18.2 (2)	50.0 (2)	29.7 (71)	43.9 (25)
Contributing Earner	62.5 (25)	57.1 (8)	81.8 (9)	50.0 (2)	70.3 (168)	56.1 (32)

TABLE XIX
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY PRESENT
 POSITION FOR RN'S (N=291)
 AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
Staff/Hospital	67.5 (27)	64.3 (9)	54.5 (6)	75.0 (3)	51.9 (123)	66.7 (38)
Head Nurse/ Supervisor	10.0 (4)		9.1 (1)		13.5 (32)	
Instructor/ Educator	5.0 (2)				6.8 (16)	
Nursing Home					0.4 (1)	5.3 (3)
Private Duty	2.5 (1)	7.1 (1)	9.1 (1)		1.7 (4)	8.8 (5)
Doctor's Office	2.5 (1)	14.3 (2)			2.8 (8)	12.3 (7)
Other	12.5 (5)	14.3 (2)	27.3 (3)	25.0 (1)	22.4 (53)	7.0 (4)

TABLE XX
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THREE LEVELS
 OF JOB SATISFACTION BY AREA OF
 PRACTICE FOR RN'S (N=291)
 AND LPN'S (N=75)

	Low		Neutral		High	
	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's	RN's	LPN's
General	5.0 (2)	14.3 (2)	9.1 (1)		8.4 (20)	10.5 (6)
Medical/Surgical	27.5 (11)	21.4 (3)	36.4 (4)	50.0 (2)	181 (43)	33.3 (19)
Operating Room	7.5 (3)				5.1 (12)	1.8 (1)
ECF	5.0 (2)		18.2 (2)	25.0 (1)	3.0 (7)	1.8 (1)
Emergency Room	5.0 (2)				2.1 (5)	1.8 (1)
ICU/CCU	2.5 (1)		9.1 (1)	25.0 (1)	10.1 (24)	10.5 (6)
Pediatrics	10.0 (4)	14.3 (2)			8.9 (21)	3.5 (2)
Psychiatric	12.5 (5)	7.1 (1)	9.1 (1)		3.4 (8)	
Other	25.0 (10)	42.9 (6)	18.2 (2)		40.9 (97)	36.8 (21)

VITA²

Verlean Vaughn Smith

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO JOB
SATISFACTION FOR NURSES: AN EXAMINATION OF HERZBERG'S
TWO-FACTOR THEORY

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Searcy, Arkansas, December 19, 1931, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Vaughn.

Education: Graduated from West Point High School, West Point,
Arkansas, in May, 1949; received Bachelor of Science in
Education degree from the University of Tulsa in 1970;
received Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree from the
University of Tulsa in 1973; received Master of Arts in
Guidance and Counseling degree from the University of Tulsa
in 1974; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education
degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1983.

Professional Experience: Teacher for the Tulsa Public Schools,
Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1973-78; Nurse for the Tulsa Public
Schools, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1978-80; Teacher for the Tulsa
Public Schools, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1980-Present; Part-Time
Nurse for the Hillcrest Medical Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma,
1973-Present.