

Author's response to reviews

Title: Identifying nurses' rewards: a qualitative categorization study in Belgium.

Authors:

Sara De Gieter (Sara.De.Gieter@vub.ac.be)

Rein De Cooman (Rein.De.Cooman@vub.ac.be)

Roland Pepermans Prof. Dr. (Roland.Pepermans@vub.ac.be)

Ralf Caers (Ralf.Caers@vub.ac.be)

Cindy Du Bois (Cindy.Du.Bois@vub.ac.be)

Marc Jegers Prof. Dr. (Marc.Jegers@vub.ac.be)

Version: 2 **Date:** 11 May 2006

Author's response to reviews: see over

Brussels, May 11, 2006

Concerning : Revision of manuscript

Dear Dr. Clevenstine,

We would like to submit the revision of our manuscript "Identifying nurses' rewards: a qualitative categorization study in Belgium" (MS: 1631324155876846).

We were interested in the remarks of both reviewers (Dr. Peggy De Prins & Prof. Alex Vanderstraeten) and tried to incorporate them in our manuscript as follows:

1) The specificity of our reward types (Reviewer 1):

We are aware of the fact that a lot of reward types identified in our study also apply to non-nurses and especially to nurses working outside a hospital context (e.g., homes for the elderly, revalidation homes). We concentrated on nurses working in a hospital, since they constitute one of the largest non-profit groups in Belgium. To make it more clear to the readers that our results are not really unique for nurses, but can also be generalized to other professions, we included two remarks on this subject: p. 4, p. 13.

2) Scheme on the relationship between reward categories and performance (Reviewer 2):

We prefer not to include a figure illustrating this relationship, since different authors have different opinions on this relationship and our study did not really examine this link. After our next quantitative study (April 2006-July 2006), we will be able to give a detailed model including the relationships between different reward types, the satisfaction with these reward types and the in-role and extra-role performance of nurses.

3) Number of hospitals (Reviewer 2):

We included the exact amount of hospitals involved in our study: p. 7.

4) Introduction of intrinsic/extrinsic rewards (Herzberg) (Reviewer 2):

We preferred not to use this reward categorization in our study, since a lot of people have difficulties in categorizing rewards as being intrinsic or extrinsic. However, this dichotomy is indeed well-known and often used by other researchers. Therefore we included a definition of both reward types: p. 5.

5) Number of respondents (Reviewer 2):

20 respondents is indeed a small sample size, but not unusual in qualitative studies using interviews. At first, we wanted to interview 30 nurses from different hospitals. After 15 interviews, we noticed that we had achieved the information saturation point. To minimize the risk of overlooking some rewards, we conducted 5 more interviews nonetheless. After interviewing 20 nurses, we were quite sure that we had captured the most important, if not all, possible rewards. We have included an additional remark concerning the number of respondents: p. 14.

Kind regards,

Sara De Gieter

Vrije Universiteit Brussel -Pleinlaan 2 - 1050 Brussel, Belgium

Sara.De.Gieter@vub.ac.be