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Abstract

Determinants and consequences of job satisfaction continue to be a topic of reasonable interest within the field of psychology, both among researchers and practitioners. Employees who experience job satisfaction have a tendency to show job loyalty as well as organizational citizenship behaviors, which are altruist behaviors that go beyond formal requirements of one’s job. The aim of this study was to assess whether employees who experienced job satisfaction would show job loyalty and practice organizational citizenship behaviors as well as to examine whether employees in the public sector would differ from employees in the private sector on these variables. The participants of the study were 49 employees from three different companies in Iceland, two in the public sector and one in the private sector. Job satisfaction was measured with the Gallup Workplace Audit, job loyalty was measured with Meyer and Allen’s Model of Organizational Commitment and organizational citizenship behavior was measured with Degroot and Brownlee’s Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale. Two out of three hypotheses were supported. Employees who scored high on job satisfaction also scored high on job loyalty but not organizational citizenship behavior and there was a significant difference between the public and private sector, with the private sector scoring higher on all three variables.

Keywords: job satisfaction, job loyalty, organizational citizenship behavior

Útdráttur


Efnisorð: starfsánægja, starfstrýggð, þegnhegðun
Job satisfaction continues to be a topic of reasonable interest within the field of psychology (Locke, 1969), both among researchers and practitioners (Judge, 1994). Theories vary in which components are involved in the definition of job satisfaction. Some are as simple as that job satisfaction refers to the amount of which people like or dislike their job (Spector, 1997) while others define job satisfaction as the comparison of one’s experience of the job and their expectations of the job (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). The most commonly used definition of job satisfaction, however, is that of Locke, who defined it as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Locke, 1969, p. 1300). He further described job satisfaction as the perceived relation between what employees want from their job and what they feel they receive. Nevertheless, researchers and practitioners seem to agree on that job satisfaction involves both work satisfaction and environmental satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Spector, 1997). Work satisfaction refers to the extent to which individuals are satisfied with what they do for work and environmental satisfaction refers to ambient factors such as hours, physical space and supervisors.

Research in the field of job satisfaction has been considered to be of great importance and has been driven by utilitarian reasons, such as lower absenteeism and turnover, increased productivity and organizational commitment, along with humanitarian reasons, such as the maximization of employees’ well-being (Spector, 1997).

Job satisfaction studies differ in terms of measurements. There are several ways to measure job satisfaction, such as interviewing employees and conducting focus groups or employee surveys (Saari & Judge, 2004). The most precise measure out of these methods is a well-designed employee attitude survey. These surveys can be either a single-item scale where individuals rate their overall satisfaction (global satisfaction) or as a multi-item scale where they rate factors such as satisfaction with the job environment, co-workers, promotion
opportunities and salary (facet satisfaction) (Duffy & Richard, 2006; Rice, Gentile, & McFarlin, 1991).

Studies have shown that environmental variables such as workload, supervisory relationships, promotional opportunities, and departmental spirit are significantly and positively correlated to overall job satisfaction (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2002). On the contrary, demographic variables such as gender, marital status and age have been shown to be poor predictors of job satisfaction. It has also been indicated that personality traits such as extraversion and conscientiousness are likely to generalize to job satisfaction (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002).

Job satisfaction can have many positive consequences (Landy & Conte, 2016). Individuals who experience job satisfaction have a tendency to show organizational citizenship behaviors, which are altruist behaviors that go beyond formal requirements of one’s job (Organ, 1988; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Schnake, 1991) while individuals who are dissatisfied with their job tend to engage in unfavorable behaviors such as burnout, withdrawal and workplace aggression (Spector, 1997). Employees who experience job satisfaction are also likely to emit organizational behaviors such as loyalty (Mak & Sockel, 2001; Martensen & Gronholdt, 2001; Matzler & Renzl, 2006), and organizational commitment (Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1993; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Pandey & Khare, 2012).

One of the key determining factors of loyalty is job satisfaction (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006). Loyalty is defined as the extent to which employees are faithful to an organization, but does not mean that they are emotionally attached to it (Niehoff, Moremann, Blakely, & Fuller, 2001). Loyal employees demonstrate pride in and support for an organization, and are willing to defend it against criticism. Loyalty also includes emphasizing positive aspects of an organization and avoidance in complaining about it (Niehoff et al., 2001). Employee loyalty has been an interest of employers for a long time because of its link to behaviors
within organizations such as turnover, attendance and organizational citizenship (Shalk & Freese, 1997). Hirschman (1970) presented an aspect of loyalty with an “exit, voice and loyalty model” of responses to job dissatisfaction. Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers and Mainous (1988) later added neglect to Hirschman’s model, and concluded that employees experiencing a decrease in satisfaction with their jobs would choose one of four strategies: exit (quitting the job or actively searching for a new job), voice (actively trying to improve the workplace by discussing the problem with everyone involved), loyalty (waiting patiently and with optimism, hoping the problem will solve itself) and neglect (decrease in effort and involvement in the workplace). Rusbult et al. revealed that the higher job satisfaction employees experienced prior to the problem, the likelier they would be to respond with either voice or loyalty.

In spite of many applications of the model, there is remarkably little evidence that supports Hirschman’s hypotheses about exit, voice, and loyalty (Dowding, John, Mergoupis, & Vugt, 2000). It has been suggested that the model is more complicated than it appeared at first, and that exit, voice and loyalty need to be analyzed separately in order to demonstrate empirical hypotheses about the relation between the variables.

Matzler and Renzl (2006) measured employee loyalty with a five item scale they adapted from Homburg and Stock (2000). The scale had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .84$) and included statements such as I would not change immediately to another company if I got a job offer, I speak positively about my company when talking to friends and relatives and I can recommend the products and services of my company to others. Their research concluded that job satisfaction influences employee loyalty. In order to enhance job satisfaction and employee loyalty, businesses must monitor job satisfaction methodologically by using standardized surveys that measure many facets of job satisfaction (Matzler, Fuchs &
Schubert, 2004). By including questions on trust (i.e. trust in peers and trust in management) in such surveys, the predictive power of those measures increases (Matzler & Renzl, 2006).

A study of 200 employees working in manufacturing and service industry was conducted to assess the impact of job satisfaction on employee loyalty, using regression analysis (Pandey & Khare, 2012). The results indicated that job satisfaction had a significant impact on employee loyalty in the manufacturing industry ($Beta = .567$, $p < .05$). Similar results were found in the service industry where job satisfaction also had a significant impact on loyalty ($Beta = .731$, $p < .05$).

Another potential consequence of job satisfaction is organizational citizenship behavior, which has been described as individual behavior that goes beyond what is expected (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983), an employee emits at his own initiative and is beneficiary for the organization (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Organizational citizenship behavior has been divided into two categories; altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism refers to helpful behaviors toward individuals or groups of an organization (Organ & Ryan, 1995) such as helping a fellow associate with a work-related problem (Organ, 1988) whereas generalized compliance refers to behaviors that are helpful to the organization as a whole, such as endorsing company rules and doing things that are “right and proper” (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Smith et al., 1983). The behavior can not be enforced upon employees by organizations (Podsakoff et al., 2000) and is not part of the job description, rather a personal choice by an employee (Organ, 1988). An Icelandic research on 3083 employees by Kristbergsdóttir, Hafsteinsson, and Einarsson (2008) revealed that employees working in the private sector were more likely to emit organizational citizenship behavior than employees in the public sector.

The purpose of this study was to assess the determinants of job satisfaction, whether job satisfaction resulted in job loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior as well as
assessing the difference between the public and the private sector on organizational citizenship behavior. The first hypothesis is that job satisfaction results in organizational citizenship behavior. The second hypothesis is that job satisfaction results in job loyalty. The third hypothesis is that employees in the private sector will score higher on organizational citizenship behavior than employees in the public sector.

Method

Participants

Participants were 49 employees from three different workplaces in Iceland, recruited by convenience. A total of 153 employees were asked to participate in this study, 23 from a company in the private sector and 130 from two companies in the public sector. Out of 130 employees in the public sector, 31 completed the survey (21.1%) and 18 out of 23 (78.3%) in the private sector. The total response rate of all participants was 32%. Seventeen participants were male (34.7%) and 31 female (65.3%). One participant did not reveal the gender. Six participants (12.2%) were in the age range of 30 years old or younger, 30 participants (61.2%) were between 31 and 50 years old and 10 participants (20.4%) were 50 years or older. Participants who had supervisory responsibilities were a minority (24.5%).

Measures

The questionnaire consisted of 34 questions and statements and measured overall job satisfaction, determinants of job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and job loyalty (see Appendix). A part from the demographic questions, all questions were in the form of statements and answer scales were on a 5-point ordinal scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree).

Overall job satisfaction was measured with a single-item measure: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your job? since single-item measuring of job satisfaction has a long history, traced back to 1955 with the Face Scale (Kunin, 1955) and single-item measures of overall job satisfaction have shown moderate reliability (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997).
Determinants of job satisfaction were measured with 12 statements from Gallup Workplace Audit or Q12 (GWA; The Gallup Organization, 1992–1999) in Icelandic translation from Capacent. There are years of extensive research behind the criteria for the selection of these 12 statements (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). The Gallup Workplace Audit includes statements such as I know what is expected of me at work, I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right, I have a best friend at work, and In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.

Organizational citizenship behavior was measured with nine statements from the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale from Degroot and Brownlee (2006) translated into Icelandic by Kristbergsdóttir et al. (2008) and was used with Kristbergsdóttir’s permission. The questionnaire included statements such as I often make suggestions that would help the department improve, I applaud my co-workers for their achievements and successes, and I display a great deal of initiative in this department. Kristbergsdóttir et al. (2008) used these nine statements and based the selection of these statements on earlier research.

Job loyalty was measured with seven statements of which six were from Meyer and Allen’s (1991) 18 item questionnaire in the translation of Kristbergsdóttir et al. (2008). Kristbergsdóttir et al. used these six out of 18 statements and based the choice of using these statements on factor analysis. The questionnaire was used with permission and included statements such as I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization, I do not feel like "part of the family" at this organization and This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. One statement was added from the General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work (QPS Nordic) (2000) which was I recommend this workplace to my friends. This statement was added since research has shown that recommendations of one’s workplace are a good indicator of job loyalty (Matzler & Renzl, 2006).
**Demographic information** was collected with a total of five questions about gender, age, whether the participant had a full time job or a part time job, period of employment and supervisory responsibilities.

**Procedure**

The collection of data took place from March 13 to March 23 2018. The supervisor or HR manager of each organization was sent a link with the questionnaire which they then sent to their employees via email. A total of 153 participants were asked to complete the questionnaire. Before answering the questionnaire the goal of the study was explained to the participants and it was emphasised that responses could not be traced back to the individual. Participants were asked to contact the researcher should they have any questions.

**Data Analysis**

This study used a cross sectional design to assess the determinants of job satisfaction, whether job satisfaction resulted in job loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as well as assessing the difference between the public and the private sector on job satisfaction, OCB and job loyalty. The independent variables were determinants of job satisfaction and the dependent variables were overall job satisfaction, OCB and job loyalty.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on job loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior in order to assess its components. It revealed that the seven statements used to assess job loyalty had one component. All statements had loadings ranging from .704 to .822 and the component explained 59.7% of the variance in the variables. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .812 which is very good according to Field (2014). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$) which suggests that the correlation between the variables were good enough for factor analysis. The component had acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .732$).
The factor analysis of the nine statements used to assess organizational citizenship behavior revealed that the statements had two components, which is in accordance with previous research (Organ & Ryan, 1995). After an orthogonal varimax rotation the first component explained 33.2% in the variance of the variables and contained statements that describe helpful behaviors toward individuals or groups within the organization, such as offering help to coworkers, which is known as altruism. The statements had loadings ranging from .594 to .766. The second component explained 25.7% in the variance of the variables and was made of three statements that describe behavior that is helpful to the the broader organization, such as defending it against criticism, which is known as generalized compliance. The statements had loadings of .864, .826, and .762. Keyser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .744 which is good according to Field (2014). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant \((p > .001)\) and the internal consistency for the first component was acceptable \((\alpha = .788)\) and high for the second component: \((\alpha = .805)\).

In order to assess the comparison between the public and the private sector, responses from the two companies from the public sector were added together and the means were calculated. Pearson’s correlation analysis was conducted for OCB, job loyalty, job satisfaction and the 12 determinants of job satisfaction.

Finally, a regression analysis was carried out in order to assess to what extent the determinants of job satisfaction impacted job satisfaction and job loyalty. The regression analysis model used was path analysis, a two step regression with two different dependent variables, which in this case were job loyalty and job satisfaction.

**Results**

**Job Satisfaction, Job Loyalty and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Means of job satisfaction, job loyalty, and OCB between men and women are displayed in Figure 1. The difference was almost none on job satisfaction between men and


women as well as on job loyalty and OCB. An independent samples t-test showed that the
difference between genders on job satisfaction was not significant, \( t(46) = 0.300, p = .766 \), as
well as on OCB, \( t(46) = 0.430, p = .669 \), and job loyalty \( t(46) = 0.146, p = .884 \).

![Bar chart showing means of job satisfaction, OCB, and job loyalty by gender.](chart)

*Figure 1.* Means of job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and job loyalty by
gender.

Means of the public and the private sector on job satisfaction, OCB, and job loyalty
are displayed in Figure 2. The largest difference was on job satisfaction where the difference
was 1.1 and an independent samples t-test revealed that it was significant, \( t(45) = 4.107, p < .001 \). Employees in the private sector scored higher than employees in the public sector on
OCB and the difference was significant, \( t(47) = 2.913, p < .05 \). Employees in the private
sector also scored higher on job loyalty than employees in the public sector and the difference
was significant, \( t(47) = 3.956, p < .001 \).
Correlational Analysis

Pearson’s correlational analysis was conducted for OCB, job loyalty, job satisfaction and the 12 determinants of job satisfaction from the Gallup Workplace Audit (Q12) and is displayed in Table 1. The correlation between job loyalty and OCB was .47 and even higher for job satisfaction and OCB ($r = .52$) and job satisfaction and job loyalty ($r = .70$). The highest correlation between OCB and the Q12 statements was on I have a best friend at work ($r = .69$) and the lowest was This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow ($r = .15$). The highest correlation between job loyalty and the Q12 was on I have a best friend at work ($r = .69$) but the correlation was also high for At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day, In the last seven days I have received recognition or praise for doing good work and There is someone at work who encourages my development, all having a correlation of .6 or higher. The highest correlation between job satisfaction and the Q12 was on the statement At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day ($r = .66$). The statement I have a best friend at work was also high with a correlation of .64 as well as There is someone at work who encourages my development ($r = .61$).
### Correlational analysis for job satisfaction, OCB, job loyalty and determinants of job satisfaction (Q12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Job loyalty</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job loyalty</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: I know what is expected of me at work</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: At work, I have the opportunity to do what I need to do my work right</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6: There is someone at work who encourages my development</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: At work, my opinions seem to count</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: The mission/purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: My associates are committed to doing quality work</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: I have a best friend at work</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11: In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12: This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < .01, *p < .05.
Regression Analysis

A regression analysis was conducted in order to assess to what extent determinants of job satisfaction impacted job satisfaction, OCB and job loyalty. The idea was to keep OCB in the model but it was deleted since there was no significant impact. Path analysis showed that having opportunities to do what one does best at work, support from a supervisor or a colleague and having a best friend at work all had high and direct effects on job satisfaction as well as an indirect effect on job loyalty through job satisfaction. These three variables statistically explained 59% of the variance in job satisfaction, and, along with praise and recognition, job satisfaction statistically explained 65% of the variance in job loyalty. The model also showed that receiving recognition or praise for doing good work did not contribute to job satisfaction but had a direct effect on job loyalty. All Betas ranged from .25 to .38, which shows strong relation in all cases.

Figure 3. Path analysis for determinants of job satisfaction (Q12), job satisfaction and job loyalty.
Discussion

The aim of this study was to assess possible determinants of job satisfaction, whether job satisfaction resulted in job loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior as well as assessing the difference between the public and the private sector in organizational citizenship behavior.

The first hypothesis was that job satisfaction would result in organizational citizenship behavior. The hypothesis was not supported since organizational citizenship behavior did not fit the path analysis model. This is contradictory to previous research, which has shown that employees who experience job satisfaction are likelier to emit organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1988; Organ & Ryan, 1995). A possible reason for this may have been due to the fact that participants in the study were only 49 and the size of the model was coherent with the small sample size. It would have been interesting to see if having more participants had changed this factor of the path analysis model. Another explanation may be that western societies are largely based on individualist culture which values the individual more than the group in many different contexts, including the workplace (Hofstede, 2001). Individualists are more preoccupied with themselves than their community or coworkers. This could result in less organizational citizenship behaviors since they are behaviors directed at helping others.

The second hypothesis was that job satisfaction would result in job loyalty. It was supported since path analysis showed that job satisfaction contributed greatly and directly to job loyalty ($\beta = .37$) and job satisfaction, along with receiving praise and recognition for doing good work, explained statistically 65% in the variance of job loyalty, which is rather high. These results are consistent with previous research (Mak & Sockel, 2001; Martensen & Gronholdt, 2001; Matzler & Renzl, 2006; Pandey & Khare, 2012) and underlines that employees who experience job satisfaction are likelier to be loyal to their organization.

The third hypothesis was that employees in the private sector would score higher on organizational citizenship behavior than employees in the public sector. This hypothesis was
supported since employees in the private sector did score significantly higher on organizational citizenship behavior than employees in the public sector, which is line with Icelandic research (Kristbergsdóttir et al., 2008). In their study they offer a possible explanation for this which is that there is less job security in the private sector than in the public sector, which results in employees in the private sector trying to do something “extra” for their employer in order to retain their position within the company. Employees in the private sector also scored significantly higher on job loyalty and job satisfaction than those in the public sector, which was interesting to see since Kristbergsdóttir et al. showed that there was no difference between the private and public sector on job satisfaction.

Although not part of the hypotheses, descriptive statistics showed that there was no difference between genders on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and job loyalty. Previous research has shown that demographic variables such as gender, age and marital status are in fact poor predictors of job satisfaction (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2002) as well as of organizational citizenship behavior (Smith et al., 1983).

The path analysis model also showed that having the opportunity to do what you do best every day at work, having your supervisor or a colleague care about you and having a best friend at work are variables that contribute greatly and directly to job satisfaction, as well as contributing indirectly to job loyalty through job satisfaction. All Betas ranged from .25 to .38 which indicates a strong impact. This is to some extent coherent with previous research that has shown that supervisory support is an important determinant for job satisfaction (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2002) as well as doing what you do best everyday which refers to the characteristics of the job itself (Smith et al., 1969; Spector, 1997). Receiving praise or recognition for doing good work impacted job loyalty directly with a Beta of .30 but did not impact job satisfaction. The fact that this variable did not have an effect on job satisfaction is surprising because research continuously shows that in order to be satisfied in one's job, feedback is important (O'Reilly &
Anderson, 1980; Teas, 1981). However, this study revealed a high correlation ($r = .70$) between job satisfaction and job loyalty, and path analysis showed that job satisfaction affected job loyalty directly. This could perhaps explain these surprising results since job loyalty and job satisfaction are fairly associated phenomena.

The Q12 questionnaire is based on extensive research which is why it would have been interesting to keep more statements from Q12 in the model. This was not possible due to the small sample size, since one of the assumptions for regression is that for each predictor in the model, at least 10 answers are needed (Field, 2014). Thus, in order to have considered all determinants, many more participants would have been needed. The choice of variables in the model was based on significance of correlation, that is, predictors with change who had a significant correlation with change in the dependent variables, were the ones kept in the model.

The study has some limitations. Out of the 153 who were sent a link to the questionnaire, only 49 participated which resulted in a response rate of 32%. Due to the small sample size external validity of the study is not high and, therefore, the findings cannot be generalized onto all Icelandic employees. A meta-analysis by Baruch and Holtom (2008) revealed that the response rate for organizational studies was 37.2% on average as well as revealing that researchers who obtain data from supervisors or managers (such as this study did) may experience lower response rate than those who contact employees directly. Another limitation was that the data was gathered with a convenience sample which is another possible threat to the external validity of the study. According to Ferber (1977) sample sizes need to be large enough to provide stability in the results, should a convenience sample be used.

One of the main strengths of the study was the measurements used. As mentioned before, Q12 is a questionnaire that is based on years of extensive research (Harter et al., 2002) and contains widely mentioned determinants of job satisfaction. The organizational citizenship behavior scale (Degroot & Brownlee, 2006) and Meyer and Allen’s three-component
conceptualization of organizational commitment (1991) have shown good psychometric properties in Icelandic research (Kristbergsdóttir et al., 2008). Another strength of the study is the result of the factor analyses. The seven statements used to assess job loyalty had one component that explained almost 60% in the variance of the statements. The nine statements used to measure organizational citizenship behavior had two components which is coherent with previous research that shows that OCB is created of two concepts; altruism and generalized compliance. The first component did indeed consist of statements that refer to altruism, such as helping a fellow coworker, and the latter component consisted of statements that referred to generalized compliance, such as making suggestions to help improve the company. These results of the factor analyses demonstrate that the questionnaire did in fact measure what it was supposed to measure.

The findings of this study indicate that having the chance to do something one knows well at work, having a caring supervisor or a colleague, and having a best friend at work are strong determinants of job satisfaction as well as loyalty to one’s workplace. They also indicate that supervisors should give their employees feedback or praise for doing good work in order to retain their employees by keeping them loyal to the organization. This is important to consider since turnover can be costly for organizations (Waldman, Kelly, Aurora, & Smith, 2004).

Employee loyalty has been an interest of employers for a long time because of its link to behaviors within organizations such as turnover, attendance and organizational citizenship behaviors (Shalk & Freese, 1997). Research in the field of job satisfaction has also been considered to be important and has been fueled by utilitarian reasons, such as lower absenteeism and turnover, increased productivity and organizational commitment, along with humanitarian reasons, such as the maximization of employees’ well-being (Spector, 1997). Thus, loyalty and job satisfaction are beneficiary for organizations as well as employees themselves and, therefore, studies that assess these phenomena are of great importance.
Job satisfaction and job loyalty are concepts that are thoroughly examined by researchers worldwide. However, to the researcher's best knowledge, organizational citizenship behavior has not been well documented in Icelandic companies and institutions. Analyzing this phenomenon further in different contexts would be an interesting field for future research. Although employee surveys are the most common tool in organizational research (Saari & Judge, 2004) an intriguing approach would be to do behavioral research on organizational citizenship behavior, such as observing employees at work and assessing their behavior.
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Appendix

Starfsánægjukönnun á vegum Háskólans í Reykjavík

Ágæti viðtakandi,

Þessi spurningalisti er hluti af rannsókn við Háskólann í Reykjavík og er ætlað að kanna starfsánægju, starfstryggð og þegningar (v. organizational citizenship behavior). Spurningarmar eru 34 talsins og tekur u.p.b. 3-5 minútur að svara.

Vinsamlegast svaraðu eftir bestu getu.

Fullum trúnaði er heitið og ekki verður hægt að rekja svör til einstakla þátttakenda.

Ef einhverjar spurningar vakna skeltu ekki híka við að hafa samband við Margréti Rúnarsdóttur (margrettunars@ru.is).

Með fyrirfram þökki tyrir þátttökuna.

1. Hversu ánægð(ur) eða óánægð(ur) ertu í starfí þinu?

- Mjög ánægð(ur)
- Frekar ánægð(ur)
- Í meðallagi
- Frekar óánægð(ur)
- Mjög óánægð(ur)

2. Ég veit til hvers er ætlast af méð í starfí mínú.

- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála
3. Ég hef þau tæki og gögn sem nauðsynleg eru til að sinna starfi minu vel.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

4. Í vinnunni hef ég tækifæri til þess að gera það sem ég kann best á hverjum degi.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

5. Ég hef fengið hrós eða viðurkenningu fyrir vel unnin störf á síðustu vikum.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

6. Yfirman ni mínun eða vinnufélaga er umhugað um mig sem einstakling.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála
7. Einhver í vinnunni hvetur mig til þess að þróast í starfi.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

8. Álit mitt skiptir máli í vinnunni.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

10. Vinnufélagar minir leggja sig alla fram við að skila vel unnu verki.
    - Mjög sammála
    - Frekar sammála
    - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
    - Frekar ósammála
    - Mjög ósammála
11. Ég á góðan vin eða vinkonu í vinnunni.
- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála

12. Á síðastliðnum sex mánuðum hefur verið rætt við mið um frammistöðu mina í starfi.
- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála

13. Ég hafði tækifæri til þess að bæta við mig þekkingu og þróast í starfi á síðastliðnum 12 mánuðum.
- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála

14. Mér finnst ég ekki tilfinningalega tengd(ur) stofnuninni.
- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála
15. Ég upplifir mig ekki sem „einn úr fjölskyldunni“ hjá stofnuninni.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

17. Ég finn ekki hjá mér neina skyldu til að halda áfram hjá stofnuninni.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

18. Stofnunin á tryggð mín skilið.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála
19. Ég myndi ekki hætta störfum hjá stofnuninni á þessari stundu, því mér finnst ég hafa skyldum að gegna gagnvart starfsfólki hennar.

- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála

20. Ég hæli stofnuninni við vini mína.

- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála
21. Íg fylgist vel með breytingum innan stofnunarinnar.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

22. Íg legg mitt af mórkum með því að sækja atburði á vegum stofnunarinnar, jafnvel þó þess sé ekki krafist.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

23. Íg ver stofnunina þegar aðrir gagnrýna hana.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála

24. Íg er mjög hjálpleg(ur) við samstarfsfólk mitt.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ósammála
   - Frekar ósammála
   - Mjög ósammála
25. Ég hvet vinnufélaga mina áfram þegar á möti blæs.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ösammála
   - Frekar ösammála
   - Mjög ösammála

26. Ég er dugleg(ur) að hrósa og samgleðjast samstarfsfólki minu þegar það nær góðum árangri.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ösammála
   - Frekar ösammála
   - Mjög ösammála

27. Ég legg oft fram tillögar sem stuðla að því að bæta stofnunina.
   - Mjög sammála
   - Frekar sammála
   - Hvorki sammála né ösammála
   - Frekar ösammála
   - Mjög ösammála
28. Ég legg aukalega af mörkum til að ljúka verkefnum innan tímamarka.

- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála

29. Ég er dugleg(ur) að taka frumkvæði.

- Mjög sammála
- Frekar sammála
- Hvorki sammála né ósammála
- Frekar ósammála
- Mjög ósammála
30. Hvert er kyn þitt?
   ○ Karl
   ○ Kona
   ○ Annað

31. Hver er aldur þinn?
   ○ 30 ára eða yngri
   ○ 31 árs - 50 ára
   ○ 51 árs eða eldri

32. Berð þú stjórnumarlega ábyrgð?
   ○ Já
   ○ Nei

33. Ert þú í fullu starfi eða hlutastarfi?
   ○ Fullu starfi
   ○ Hlutastarfi

34. Hve lengi hefur þú starfað hjá stofnuninni?
   ○ í minna en 1 ár
   ○ 1 - 5 ár
   ○ 6 - 9 ár
   ○ 10 ár eða meira