



# How satisfied are public health workers? A national perspective on workforce morale

Keeneland, 2015
Lexington, Kentucky

Elizabeth Harper, DrPH *ASTHO* 

Brian Castrucci, MA

De Beaumont Foundation

Katie Sellers, DrPH, CPH *ASTHO* 

Kiran Bharthapudi, PhD *ASTHO* 

Rivka Liss-Levinson, PhD *ASTHO* 

JP Leider, PhD

De Beaumont Foundation

#### Overview

- Describe job satisfaction of state health agency employees
- Examine correlates of job satisfaction





## Background

- Public health is challenged to recruit and retain a robust workforce
  - Since 2008, 91% of all state health agencies have experienced job losses due to attrition (ASTHO)
- Difficult to attract new graduates to the field
  - 21% of state health agency (SHA) employees are planning to leave their current position next year (Sellers et al)
- Negative consequences of workforce turnover
  - Time and resources to recruit, onboard, train, relocate
  - Institutional knowledge





# Background

- Why do some employees leave their positions and others stay?
  - Job satisfaction
    - Workers that are satisfied with their jobs:
    - Stay at their organizations longer, have less absenteeism
    - Are more productive and engaged
  - What determines job satisfaction?
    - Organizational factors
    - Work relationships (supervisor)
    - Autonomy
    - Salary
    - Demographic characteristics
    - Workplace learning/training





### Purpose

- Characterize the current level of job satisfaction among a nationally representative sample of state health agency (SHA) employees
- Identify factors that are correlated with high and low levels of satisfaction
- Prioritize factors to assist practitioners in identifying high impact areas





#### Methods

- Workplace environment
  - United States Office of Personnel Management Annual Survey / Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey
  - 20 items, measured on a Likert scale (strongly agree strongly disagree)
    - "my supervisor/team leader treats me with respect"
- Job satisfaction
  - Bowling Green State University Job in General Scale
    - >27 satisfied, <22 dissatisfied, 22-27 neutral</li>
- Agency/job characteristics
  - Agency size, tenure, supervisory status, salary
- Demographic characteristics
  - Age, race, gender





#### Methods

- Factor analysis of workplace environment items (20)
  - 3 groups
    - Supervisory support
    - Organizational support
    - Worker engagement
- Compared differences in JIG Score
  - Level of agreement with supervisory/organizational support items
  - Demographics
  - Job/organizational characteristics
- Multivariate linear regression
  - JIG score: dependent variable
  - Supervisory/Organizational support: primary independent variable





#### Mean JIG Score Comparisons by Demographic, Job, and Organizational Characteristics

	Mean	CI (95%)			Mean	CI (95%)	
SUPERVISORY STATUS*				SALARY*			
Non-supervisor	36.4	35.9	36.9				
Team leader	36.6	35.6	37.6	\$35,000.01 - \$55,000	36.7	36.1	37.2
Supervisor	38.5	37.9	39.2	\$55,000.01 - \$75,000	37.4	36.8	38.0
Manager	38.2	37.3	39.1	\$75,000.01 - \$95,000	37.4	36.5	38.3
Executive	41.7	40.2	43.2	95,000.01 or higher	40.1	39.3	40.9
ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE*							
Small	38.4	37.5	39.2	REGION*			
Medium	36.8	36.3	37.3	New England & Atlantic	37.4	36.6	38.3
Large	37.0	36.4	37.6	Mid-Atlantic & Great Lakes	37.5	37.1	37.8
				South	36.8	36.0	37.6
AGE*			Mountain/Midwest	38.4	37.4	39.4	
25 or below	40.5	38.9	42.0	West	36.7	35.4	38.0
26 to 30	38.1	36.5	39.7				
31 to 35	37.0	35.8	38.1	TENURE IN AGENCY*			
36 to 40	38.0	37.1	38.8	0-5 years	37.9	37.2	38.7
41 to 45	37.0	35.6	38.4	6-10 years	36.6	35.9	37.2
46 to 50	36.9	35.9	38.0	11-15 years	36.7	35.9	37.5
51 to 55	37.1	36.1	38.1	16-20 years	36.8	35.7	37.9
56 to 60	36.3	35.3	37.4	21 or above	37.1	36.3	37.9
61 to 65	37.7	36.8	38.5				
66 or above	38.1	36.0	40.3	RACE*			
				Non-White	36.5	36.0	37.1
				White	37.5	37.1	37.9

Proportion and mean JIG Score of items related to supervisory support							
	Percent	JIGSCORE					
MY SUPERVISOR/TEAM LEADER TREATS ME WITH RESPECT*							
Strongly disagree	3%	17.63					
Disagree	5%	21.94					
Neither agree nor disagree	10%	28.36					
Agree	38%	36.76					
Strongly agree	44%	42.07					
MY SUPERVISOR/TEAM LEADER PROVIDES ME WITH OPPURTUNITIES TO DEMONSTRATE MY LEADERSHIP SKILLS*							
Strongly disagree	5%	18.28					
Disagree	10%	26.3					
Neither agree nor disagree	19%	33.97					
Agree	41%	39.44					
Strongly agree	25%	43.32					
SUPERVISORS/TEAM LEADERS IN MY WORK UNIT SUPPORT EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT*							
Strongly disagree	4%	18.43					
Disagree	8%	24.79					
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	31.79					
Agree	45%	39.2					
Strongly agree	25%	43.74					
SUPERVISORS/TEAM LEADERS WORK WELL WITH EMPLOYEES OF DIFFERENT BACKGROUNDS*							
Strongly disagree	3%	18.53					
Disagree	7%	23.92					
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	32.33					
Agree	48%	39.3					
Strongly agree	23%	43.01					
*Represents significant differences within groups < 0.05							

#### Proportion and mean JIG Score of items related to organizational support

	Percent	JIGSCORE				
MY TRAINING NEEDS ARE ASSESSED						
Strongly disagree	6%	22.67				
Disagree	21%	31.68				
Neither agree nor disagree	28%	37.07				
Agree	35%	40.83				
Strongly agree	10%	44.58				
COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SENIOR LEADERSHIP AND EMPLOYEES IS GOOD IN MY ORGANIZATION*						
Strongly disagree	12%	24.28				
Disagree	22%	32.76				
Neither agree nor disagree	23%	37.63				
Agree	32%	42.13				
Strongly agree	11%	44.82				
CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION ARE REWARDED*						
Strongly disagree	9%	21.73				
Disagree	20%	31.09				
Neither agree nor disagree	32%	37.64				
Agree	29%	42.39				
Strongly agree	10%	45.38				
I RECOMMEND MY ORGANIZATION AS A GOOD PLACE TO WORK*						
Strongly disagree	5%	16.38				
Disagree	9%	21.85				
Neither agree nor disagree	23%	32.01				
Agree	43%	41.25				
Strongly agree	20%	45.40				
*Represents significant differences within groups < 0.05						

Results of multivariate linear regression on the correlates of job satisfaction (JIG score)					
Independent Variables	β	p-value	CI (95%)		
Supervisory Support	4.33	<0.001	3.95	4.71	
Organizational Support	6.66	<0.001	6.14	7.19	
Supervisory Status					
Non-Supervisor (Ref)					
Team leader	0.40	0.36	-0.48	1.29	
Supervisor	0.99	0.002	0.40	1.58	
Manager	1.08	0.01	0.24	1.92	
Executive	1.35	0.04	0.04	2.66	
Race					
Non-White (Ref)					
White	0.69	0.002	0.27	1.10	
Tenure in Agency					
0-5 years (Ref)					
6-10 years	0.61	0.20	-0.33	1.54	
11-15 years	1.04	0.02	0.18	1.90	
16-20 years	1.00	0.03	0.11	1.90	
21 or above	1.12	0.03	0.09	2.15	
Degree Earned					
Associates (Ref)					
Bachelors	0.52	0.20	-0.29	1.32	
Graduate	0.79	0.03	0.10	1.48	
Agency Size					
Small (Ref)					
Medium	-0.91	0.08	-1.91	0.10	
Large	-1.22	0.02	-2.22	-0.22	

#### Discussion

- Overall, SHA employees are satisfied with their jobs
- To increase satisfaction focus on
  - Supervisory support
    - Provide opportunities to demonstrate leadership skills, support employee development, work well with employees of different backgrounds
      - Provide management and diversity training
      - Informal learning experiences and mentorship opportunities
      - Find ways for employees to take the lead on a project
  - Organizational support
    - Meet the training needs of the workforce, reward creativity and innovation
      - Regularly identify and meet training needs
      - Support a culture of continuous learning
      - Examine policies and procedures that restrict creativity and innovation





#### **Limitations and Conclusions**

- Cross sectional study
- Survey bias
- Other factors that influence job satisfaction
  - Individual personalities
  - Marital status
  - Health status
- Providing employees with organizational and supervisory support is likely to improve job satisfaction
  - Assess training needs, meet those needs
  - Build strong relationships among peers and supervisors









# Questions?

eharper@astho.org