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Job satisfaction among correctional officers can have a great impact on how successful operations in prisons are. Previous studies have shown that some factors have more impact on job satisfaction than others. The aim of present study was to examine job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland and find factors that affected the job satisfaction. Correctional officers working in all five prisons in Iceland were invited to participate, 63 of 93 officers participated, a response rate of 67.7%. A questionnaire was sent to all prisons by mail, it consisted of the DASS stress scale and questions about background, job satisfaction, and job loyalty.

Participants reported, on average, that they were rather satisfied with their job. However, job satisfaction among correctional officers seems to be lower than among employees in many other professions in Iceland. A path analysis based on two-step multiple linear regression with two dependent variables, one at a time, indicated that one of the two dependent variables, job satisfaction, was significantly related to conditions in the working environment, employees trust towards the executive board of the organization, and employees stress level. The other dependent variable, job loyalty, was significantly related to four factors, including the job satisfaction.
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Foreword

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the BSc Psychology degree, Reykjavík University, this thesis is presented in the style of an article for submission to a peer-reviewed journal.
Job Satisfaction among Correctional Officers in Iceland

Through the years many scientific investigators have studied and defined job satisfaction (Locke, 1969). One of them, Edwin A. Locke, stated that job satisfaction is when an employee experiences his or her work as an achievement or finds it easy to achieve job values that lead to a comfortable emotional state within the person. In contrast, he defined job dissatisfaction as opposed to that. He believed that the difference between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is between what employees want from their job and what their job actually entails.

Aziri (2011) studied job satisfaction and its correlation with job loyalty. His finding showed that job loyalty is positively correlated with job satisfaction. A higher level of job satisfaction was connected with higher level of job loyalty. The findings supported that when an employee is loyal to their work, they feel connected to the workplace and are satisfied with their work, therefore, they are not looking for another job to replace it. If job loyalty is low, and therefore job satisfaction as well, it can lead to unwanted consequences like illnesses, burnout, and resignation.

Job Satisfaction and Correctional Officers

Correctional officers often face difficult circumstances in their workplace (Byrd, Cochran, Silverman, & Blount, 2000; Cheeseman, Kim, Lambert, & Hogan, 2011). Their work can be challenging and it has been shown that some factors can have more impact on job satisfaction than others, but job satisfaction among correctional officers has been studied somewhat around the world (Cheeseman et al., 2011; Cullen, Link, Cullen, & Wolfe, 1990; Härenstam, Palm, & Theorell, 1988). Stress in the workplace, the working environment, gender, role conflict and danger related to the work are some of the factors that are believed to affect job satisfaction.
and have been studied in relation to how high job satisfaction has been among correctional officers (Cheeseman et al., 2011; Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985).

Low job satisfaction can lead to less effort from employees in their job, less cooperation, burnout and for correctional officers to resign (Byrd et al., 2000). Correctional officers in Sweden, who reported higher level of job satisfaction, were less away from work due to sickness and reported fewer symptoms of ill health than those who experienced lower level of job satisfaction (Härenstam et al., 1988). It is clear that prison organizations should put strong emphasis on keeping job satisfaction high among their employees to keep operations in prisons successful (Byrd et al., 2000; Cheeseman et al., 2011).

A study done on job satisfaction among employees in various professions showed that correctional officers experienced the lowest mean score of all the professions (Cullen, Latessa, Kopache, Lombardo, & Burton, 1993). These professions were, for example, wardens at prisons, which experienced the highest level of job satisfaction, farmers, craft workers, sales employees, and service workers.

Byrd et al. (2000) did a study on job satisfaction among correctional officers, the results showed that years of employment can have a negative effect on job satisfaction. The results indicated that the longer the employee had worked as a correctional officer the lower the job satisfaction was, compared to those who had worked for shorter period of time. The employees who had worked, as correctional officers, for the longest duration were not only least satisfied with their job but also experienced a high level of job related stress.

**Job Satisfaction and Stress**

Stress is a term used for physical responses or for situations that evoke those responses (Carlson, 2014). Stress responses are physiological reactions to threatening
situations. Stress is not always a bad thing, sometimes it can be helpful. If it does not last too long it can help people to be more at alarm and more focused (Carlson, 2014; Sapolsky, 2000). However, when the threat is constantly around, the physiological reaction is often or always present which can lead to ill health (Sapolsky, 2000).

Stress can be evoked by many situations or actions in people’s workplace as DeFrank and Ivancevich (1998) reported in their study. They specify that heavy workload, conflict in roles, supervisors who employees find difficult to work with, not receiving recognition, unclear job description and fear can cause work-related stress.

Research on correctional officers in Florida in the US showed that job related stress had a significant impact on job satisfaction (Byrd et al., 2000). The more stress that employees experienced the lower was their job satisfaction. Cullen et al. (1985) studied stress and job dissatisfaction among correctional officers. The study showed that role problems, danger related to the work, working in maximum security prison, more interactions with other correctional officers, longer correctional experience and to be a woman rather than a man in correctional officers job were all related to more work-related stress. Cullen et al. (1985) explained that a role problem refers to when employees experience unclear and conflicting expectations in their work.

Meta-analysis based on studies from 9 countries showed that correctional officers experienced relatively high level of work-related stress (Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Many factors affected their stress level but the most notable were safety risks, work overload, role conflict, and low support from coworkers and supervisors.

Blau, Light, and Chamlin (1986) did a study on correctional officers in ten prisons in New York. The results showed that women reported higher level of stress related to work than men in same positions and that high level of stress had strong negative effect on job satisfaction.
Job Satisfaction and Working Environment

Vaughn and Smith reported that the working environment in prisons can be challenging (as cited in Byrd et al., 2000). It often lacks stability, certainty and safety, which can affect job satisfaction.

Blau et al. (1986) did a research on job satisfaction among correctional officers in New York State in the US working in prisons with a minimum, medium, and maximum security. It was expected that job satisfaction would be lowest among correctional officers working in the large maximum security prisons. The results, however, did not show a significant difference in job satisfaction between correctional officers working in these different stages of security prisons.

Job Satisfaction, Working Hours, Family Life and Gender

Around the world a large proportion of correctional officers work long hours and in shifts (Dignam, Barrera, & West, 1986; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Many research have shown that correctional officers experience a conflict between their home life and their work. Prisons do not close in the evenings, at night or on holidays, therefore, time spent away from family can be at all hours of the day and on each day of the year (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2002). Previous research has shown that working on rotating and night shifts have a significant negative effect on job satisfaction (Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001; Scandura & Lankau, 1997; Yoon, Kook, Lee, Shin, & Kim, 1999). These research have shown that, for example, changes in sleep pattern, sleep problems and lack of time spent with family are problems that people on rotating and night shifts experience.

Women were not allowed to work as correctional officers in prisons for men in the US until the late 1970s (Britton, 1997). Since then number of women working as correctional officers have increased enormously, although men are still a majority.
Studies on job satisfaction among correctional officers have shown that women experience less job satisfaction than men in same positions (Britton, 1997; Lambert, Hogan, Camp, & Ventura, 2006).

**Present study**

The aim of present study was to evaluate job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland and to find factors that affected the job satisfaction. No previous research on job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland was found but previous research from other countries indicate that some of the factors that affect job satisfaction are conditions in the working environment, work related stress, and gender. The aim was also to evaluate job loyalty and to examine whether job satisfaction would correlate with job loyalty. Present study is the first one done on job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland and on factors that can affect the job satisfaction. Job loyalty has also not been researched among correctional officers in Iceland or the relations between job satisfaction and job loyalty in that working field.

Based on previous studies four hypotheses are proposed. The first is that there is not a difference in job satisfaction between correctional officers who work in maximum security and those who work in prisons with minimum security. The second hypothesis is that the longer that a person has worked as a correctional officer the lower the job satisfaction is. The third is that job satisfaction among women is lower than amongst the men. Forth and the last hypothesis is that scoring lower on a stress scale is related to higher level of job satisfaction.

**Method**

**Participants**

Correctional officers working in all five prisons in Iceland, in January 2018,
were invited to participate in present study, a total of 93 correctional officers (see Table 1). In total 63 correctional officers from all prisons participated, 17 women, 42 men and four participants who did not reveal their gender. Therefore, the response rate was 67.7%. Most participants had worked as a correctional officer for more than 15 years, 17 participants in total. The fewest participants had worked as a correctional officer for less than one year, in total of 8 participants. A total of 53 participants worked as correctional officers full time, 6 participants worked part time and 4 participants did not give an answer about their job percentage. Most participants worked on 12 hours rotating shifts, a combination of night and day shifts. Participants neither got payment nor gained any benefits for their participation. The study was notified to the Privacy and Data Protection Authority in Iceland (case nr. S8528).

Table 1

*Number of participants in each prison, number of prison officers working in each prison and response rate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Prison officers working in each prison</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litla Hraun</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hólmsheiði</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kviabryggja</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akureyri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

**Questionnaire.** Participants answered a questionnaire, which consisted of background questions about themselves, a stress scale, and other questions about, for example, job satisfaction, job loyalty, and the working environment (see Appendix). The questionnaire had 41 questions and statements in total. On the last page, participants were given a chance to write down comments on what they felt was needed to improve their workplace.

**Background questions.** Seven questions were about the participants’ background, most of them related to work. These were about gender, length of employment, education in correctional school, job percentage, job position, working hours, and work overtime.

**Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS).** DASS, which was developed by Lovibond and Lovibond (1995), is a self-report measure with 42 items, measuring depression, anxiety and stress, 14 questions each, with 4-point ordinal scale from 0 (did not apply to me at all) to 3 (applied to me very much or most of the time). The score range is from 0 to 126. In present study only the stress questions were used, with scores ranging from 0 to 42, a higher score represents a higher level of stress. An Icelandic translation of the DASS stress scale was used in present study (Tyrfingsson, n.d.). The internal reliability of the DASS stress scale is high, $\alpha = .93$ (Brown, Chorpita, Korotitsch, & Barlow, 1997). The internal reliability of the DASS stress scale in present study was very good, $\alpha = .89$.

**Job satisfaction and job loyalty questions.** Twenty questions were about, for example, job satisfaction, job loyalty, the working environment, trust towards the executive board of the organization, the information flow at the workplace, and support from coworkers and supervisors.
Procedure

The questionnaire was printed on A4 paper and folded into A5 size, in a booklet style. Each questionnaire was put in an envelope with a peel back strip to seal it. The total number of employees in each prison in Iceland was obtained with the help from the director of the prison at Hólmsheiði. The questionnaire was sent to each prison via mail in January 2018. A supervisor in each prison received the questionnaire and found a suitable place for them within the prisons staff area, where the participant answered the questionnaire. Each participant got one envelope with the questionnaire. On the front page of the questionnaire was information concerning the study and the questionnaire itself. Participants were also encouraged to contact the researcher if they had any questions about the questionnaire or the study. On the last page were instructions about putting the questionnaire back in the envelope, closing it by peeling back the strip and putting the envelope in a certain place which the supervisor had selected. The supervisor kept track of the envelopes and sent it back to the researcher, via mail. Most of the answers came back to the researcher in the first few weeks in February 2018, but the last answers came back in the middle of April 2018. The researcher began to enter the data into SPSS when the first answers came back, in February 2018. When all the answers were back, in April 2018, the researcher finished entering the data and started analyzing.

Statistical Analysis

SPSS version 22 was used for data analysis. Relations between three questions from the questionnaire, which were about job loyalty, were examined using factor analysis. These three questions were, whether the employee would recommend the workplace for friends and family members, whether the employee thought he would still be working at the workplace after three years, and whether the employee had
thought about resigning. Exploratory factor analysis revealed evidence for one factor relating to job loyalty. That one factor explained 64.1% of the total variance of the three variables. All variables loaded highly on this factor, from .637 to .888. The scale had acceptable reliability, \( \alpha = .704 \).

Independent samples t-test was used to test differences between groups on job satisfaction, job loyalty, and DASS scores. A path analysis based on two-step multiple linear regression with two dependent variables, one at a time, was used. Multiple linear regression was used to model the relations between the dependent variable, job satisfaction, and the independent variables, conditions in the working environment, employees trust towards the executive board of the organization, and the level of stress scores. Another multiple linear regression was used to model the relations between the dependent variable, job loyalty, and the independent variables, job satisfaction, whether the employee felt that the organization honored their obligations to their family life, whether the employees trusted the executive board of the organization, and how good the employees felt the information flow within the workplace was.

**Results**

As seen in Figure 1 participants reported, on average, that they were relatively satisfied with their job \( (M = 3.70, SD = 1.05) \) on the scale from 1 to 5, higher number indicated higher level of job satisfaction. Correctional officers working in prisons with minimum security reported a higher level of job satisfaction than correctional officers working in maximum security prisons, however, the differences was not significant, \( t(59) = 1.447, p = .153 \). Correctional officers working in the prison at Hólmsheiði reported the lowest level of job satisfaction \( (M = 3.52, SD = 1.08) \), followed by the correctional officers working in the prison Litla Hraun \( (M = 3.64, SD \)
Correctional officers working in the prison located at Akureyri reported slightly higher job satisfaction level ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.83$). These three prisons all have maximum security. The correctional officers working in the prison at Kviabryggja reported the highest level of job satisfaction ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.13$), followed by the correctional officers working in the prison at Sogn ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$). These two prisons have minimum security.

*Figure 1.* Average job satisfaction among correctional officers by level of prison security, years of employment, and gender.

The correctional officers who had worked in the field for less than 10 years reported somewhat higher job satisfaction than those who had worked for longer time (see Figure 1). That was, however, not significant, $t(57) = 0.860$, $p = .393$. Women reported considerably higher level of job satisfaction than men in the same position.
However, the difference was not significant, though it was not far from being significant, \( t(57) = 1.899, p = .063 \).

On average, correctional officers reported moderated job loyalty (\( M = 3.31, SD = 1.00 \)) on scale from 1 to 5, higher value indicated a higher job loyalty (see Figure 2). Correctional officers working in minimum security prisons reported considerably higher level of job loyalty than those working in maximum security prisons. The difference was significant, \( t(57) = 2.170, p = .034 \). The difference on job loyalty between correctional officers who had work in that field for 10 years or less and those who had worked for 10 years or more was not much and insignificant, \( t(57) = 0.679, p = .679 \). Women reported a higher level of job loyalty than men in the same position, which is a significant difference, \( t(42.50) = 2.621, p = .012 \).

![Figure 2](image-url)

*Figure 2.* Average job loyalty among correctional officers by level of prison security, years of employment, and gender.
Correctional officers' scores on the DASS stress scale were from 0 to 28, which is from normal to severe stress level. The average stress level, however, was normal \((M = 9.58, SD = 6.86)\). As seen in Table 2, there was a significant negative correlation between scores on DASS stress scale and job satisfaction, \(p < .01\). Those who scored normal level of stress reported higher level of job satisfaction on average than those who scored mild to severe level of stress, which is a significant difference \(t(57) = 2.05, p = .045\). There was a low correlation between scores on DASS stress scale and job loyalty, \(r = .155, p = .245\). The difference on job loyalty between those who scored normal level of stress and those who scored mild to severe level of stress was not significant, \(t(56) = 0.866, p = .390\).

There was a strong correlation between the dependent variable, job satisfaction, and the independent variables, conditions in the working environment, employees trust towards the executive board of the organization, and how often employees had thought about resigning (see Table 2). There was also a strong correlation between the dependent variable, job loyalty, on one hand and both job satisfaction and the independent variables on the other, i.e. whether the employee felt that the organization honored their obligations to their family life, whether the employees trusted the executive board of the organization, and how good the employees felt the information flow within the workplace was.

A path analysis based on two-step multiple linear regression with two dependent variables, one at a time, was executed (see Figure 3). Results from the first step a multiple linear regression showed significant relations between the dependent variable, job satisfaction, and the independent variables, conditions in the working environment, stress, and trust towards the executive board of the organization. These three variables explained 54.0% of the variance and significantly predicted the job
Table 2

*Means, standard deviations and correlation between the two depended variables, job satisfaction and job loyalty, and the independent variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job loyalty</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.751***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working environment</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.608***</td>
<td>.539***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trust towards the board</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.612***</td>
<td>.685***</td>
<td>.562***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family obligations</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td>.550***</td>
<td>.440***</td>
<td>.476***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Information flow</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.493***</td>
<td>.292*</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.274*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stress</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>-.386**</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.387**</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.*
satisfaction, $F(3, 55) = 21.500, p < .001$. Employee’s trust towards the executive board of the organization had strongest relations with level of job satisfaction, the more the employees trusted the board the higher the level of job satisfaction was ($\beta = .372, p < .001$). When the employees thought they had everything in the working environment that they needed to do their job as well as possible and their stress level was lower, the level of job satisfaction was higher.

![Path analysis model](image)

*Figure 3. Path analysis model, with standardized coefficients betas, of relations between dependent and independent variables.*

*Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.*

Results from the second step a multiple linear regression showed that the relations between the dependent variable, job loyalty, and the independent variables, job satisfaction, whether the employee felt that the organization honored their
obligations to their family life, whether the employees trusted the executive board of the organization, and how good the employees felt the information flow was within the workplace, were all significant (see Figure 3). These four variables explained 72.7% of the variance and significantly predicted the job loyalty, $F(4, 53) = 35.288, p < .001$. Job satisfaction had strongest relations with job loyalty, the higher the job satisfaction was the higher the job loyalty was ($\beta = .436, p < .001$). If employees felt that the organization honored their obligations to their family life, they trusted the executive board of the organization, and they felt that the information flow within the workplace was good, the job loyalty increased.

**Discussion**

The aim of present study was to examine job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland and to find factors that affected the job satisfaction. The aim was also to evaluate job loyalty and to examine whether job satisfaction would correlate with job loyalty.

The results from present study supported the first hypothesis that there was not a difference in job satisfaction between correctional officers who worked in prisons with maximum security and those who worked in prisons with minimum security. Correctional officers working in prisons with minimum security reported higher level of job satisfaction than officers working in prisons with maximum security, however the difference was not significant. These findings are consistent with previous research that showed that there was not a difference in job satisfaction between correctional officers who worked in different stages of security prisons (Blau et al., 1986). The results from present study did not support the second hypothesis that the longer the person had worked as a correctional officer the lower the job satisfaction was. Correctional officers who had worked for less than 10 years reported higher job
satisfaction than those who had worked for longer time, however the difference was not much and not significant. These findings are inconsistent with previous research, were Byrd et al. (2000) found that those who had worked as correctional officers for the longest duration reported lower job satisfaction than those who had worked for shorter period of time. The results from present study did not support the third hypothesis that job satisfaction among women was lower than amongst the men. The results were the opposite, women reported higher job satisfaction than men, although the difference was not significant but not far from it. These findings are inconsistent with previous research, which have shown that women experience less job satisfaction than men (Britton, 1997; Lambert et al., 2006). The results from present study did support the last hypothesis that scoring lower on a stress scale was related to higher level of job satisfaction. Those who scored normal on the DASS stress scale had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than those who scored higher. These findings are consistent with previous research, were Byrd et al. (2000) found that the more stress that employees experienced the lower was their job satisfaction.

Maskina, a market research company in Iceland, has done employee satisfaction surveys on thousands of employees in many companies and institutions in Iceland (Þorlákur Karlsson, personal communication, April 10, 2018). Currently, the mean job satisfaction for those employees is 4.05, on the scale from 1 to 5, higher number indicates higher level of job satisfaction. Results from present study on average job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland was 3.70, that shows that compared to the average job satisfaction from Maskina, correctional officers report much lower job satisfaction than employees from many other professions in Iceland. Previous study on job satisfaction showed similar finding, correctional officers reported the lowest job satisfaction among many employees from various
professions (Cullen et al., 1993). Higher job satisfaction among correctional officers can affect many aspects, not only for the officers themselves but also for the operations in the prisons (Byrd et al., 2000; Cheeseman et al., 2011). Therefore, it should be an emphasis to keep job satisfaction higher in the profession.

Previous studies indicate that some factors had more impact on job satisfaction among correctional officers than others (Byrd et al., 2000; Cheeseman et al., 2011; Härenstam et al., 1988). Results from a multiple linear regression in the present study supports the finding from previous studies, some of the factors were the same, for example, stress and conditions in the working environment. Employees' trust towards the executive board of the organization was also a factor that had an effect on job satisfaction in the present study, however, that factor was not mentioned in previous studies. Whether employee trust towards an executive board of an organizations is a factor that only affects job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland or if it has not been studied among correctional officers in other countries is not known.

On the last page of the questionnaire participants were given a chance to write down what they felt was needed to improve their workplace. A certain pattern was among correctional officers who worked in each prison, they often mentioned the same things that could improve their workplace. But, what many correctional officers in one prison mentioned were not the same things as from the officers in the other prisons. For example, many correctional officers who worked in the prison at Hólmsheiði mentioned that the workload was heavy and that more employees were needed. Many correctional officers who worked in the prison Litla Hraun mentioned that there was a need for better working environment for the employees, especially for improvements on the staff area. Some of the correctional officers who worked in the prison at Sogn mentioned that they wanted flexible working hours. But correctional
officers who work at the prisons at Kviabryggja and Akureyri mentioned that professional help for the inmates was needed, referring to support from psychologists and social workers. All these things that the correctional officers mentioned could affect the job satisfaction. Some common factors may affect the job satisfaction for correctional officers working in all prisons, but some factors may differ depending on which prison the officer works in. Based on these results it would be useful in the future to do another study to find both common and separate factors affecting job satisfaction among officers working in each prison.

Previous study showed relations between job satisfaction and job loyalty (Aziri, 2011). Job satisfaction affected the job loyalty, and the other way around. Results from present study supported those findings, a strong correlation was between job satisfaction and job loyalty. Results from a multiple linear regression also indicated that the higher the job satisfaction was the higher was the job loyalty. Job satisfaction was not the only variable that affected the job loyalty in present study, but had the strongest effect of all the variables. The other variables were whether the employee felt that the organization honored their obligations to their family life, whether the employees trusted the executive board of the organization, and how good the employees felt the information flow was within the workplace.

A great deal of the findings in present study are, in consistent with previous studies but some not, as has been stated. Previous studies on correctional officers found that women reported lower job satisfaction than men (Britton, 1997; Lambert et al., 2006). In present study the results were opposite, the women reported higher level of job satisfaction than men, the difference was not significant but not far from it. The reason behind the inconsistency between the present and previous study is not known, but further research are needed on job satisfaction between women and men in this
field. As stated in previous research many correctional officers experience a conflict between their home life and their work (Dignam et al., 1986; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). In present study results indicated that whether the employee felt that the organization honored their obligations to their family life had relations to job loyalty. The more that the employee felt that the organization honored their obligations to their family life the higher the job loyalty was.

Strengths in present study were several. First, the study was the first in Iceland to examine directly job satisfaction and job loyalty among correctional officers, or at least the first that is known of. Next, all working correctional officers, from all prisons in Iceland, were reached and two-thirds of all correctional officers participated. Last, the research was cost-efficient. By using a questionnaire and sending it to each location the cost was minimum.

Limitations were also several. First, the sample was small, only 63 participants, therefore, weak power, despite the fact that the response rate was acceptable. The results would have been stronger and more reliable if the sample had been bigger. Next, the questionnaire was self-reported, so there is always a risk that the information is inaccurate or unreliable. Last, although the research was controlled as well as possible the researcher was not on the location when the participants answered the questionnaire. That was because the prisons are located in different places in Iceland, far away from each other, and the correctional officers work on shifts, so they are not all in the prison at the same time. To accommodate for the fact that the researcher was not on the location the questionnaire was sent to each prison, a supervisor in each prison kept track of the questionnaire and send it back to the researcher.

Present study is an important addition to see how job satisfaction is among
correctional officers in Iceland, both in comparison to correctional officers in other countries and employees in other professions. It is also an important addition to see what factors affect the job satisfaction, the knowledge can be used to improve the job satisfaction. It is important in the future to do more research on job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland, to find more factors that affect the job satisfaction and the job loyalty. It would also be useful in the future to do a study on job satisfaction after an intervention, were factors that affects the job satisfaction have been changed. For example by reducing stress factors, improving the working environment, and building the employees trust towards the executive board of the organization.

From these results it can be concluded that job satisfaction among correctional officers could be higher, compared to employees in other professions in Iceland. Many factors have an impact on both job satisfaction and job loyalty among correctional officers in Iceland, by finding these factors improvements can be made to increase both the job satisfaction and job loyalty. It is crucial to put an emphasis on increasing job satisfaction among correctional officers in Iceland, not only for the employees and their health, but also for the prison system so operations can run smoothly.
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Appendix

The questionnaire

1. Á heilune líðið hverna árangör(una) eða óráningör(una) sem þú í stafri þuna?
   - Mýg árangör(una)
   - Fremur árangör(una)
   - Í meðallagi
   - Fremur óráningör(una)
   - Mýg óráningör(una)

2. Myndir þú segja sá í því vunnumhverfi veri allt sem þú þarft til þess að stúna still þessum og best verður á konun?
   - Hef allt sem eg þarf
   - Hef flest sem eg þarf
   - Hef flest um vantar runt
   - Vantar flest sem eg þarf
   - Vantar flest um vantar runt

3. Hefur það oft, standum, sjáðuð eða aldri félgrið því eða vísbúknings-
   fyrir vel innan stafri til að hefur vikum?
   - Mýg oft
   - Nekkot oft
   - Standum
   - Út
   - Aldrei

4. Aldrei, sem myndir þú segja sá þit þit líkt skipari miklu eða lítsi mati í
   vunnum?
   - Mýg miklu
   - Fremur miklu
   - Í meðallagi
   - Fremur lítsi
   - Mýg lítsi/Engin

5. Myndir þú segja að stofnunin virði vel eða illa skyldur þinna gagnað
   stofnunin?
   - Mýg vel
   - Fremur vel
   - Í meðallagi
   - Fremur ólla
   - Mýg ólla

6. Myndir þú segja að þú finn málda eða lítsi hvatningu frá yfirlýsingunum eða
   samfundsfræðingum til að þjónast í stafri?
   - Mýg mikla
   - Fremur mikla
   - Í meðallagi
   - Fremur lítsi
   - Mýg lítsi/Engin

7. Myndir þú segja að þú hefur morg eða traktar virski til að gera stofnunin
   hven í þjónum stafri?
   - Mýg morg
   - Fremur morg
   - Í meðallagi
   - Fremur lítsi
   - Mýg lítsi/Engin

8. Myndir þú segja að þú hefur miklu eða lítsi sjálftreki í stafri?
   - Mýg miklu
   - Fremur miklu
   - Í meðallagi
   - Fremur lítsi
   - Mýg lítsi/Engin

9. Hverna miklar eða lítsar upplýsingar fornir frá
   yfirlýsingum yfirlýsimun þeim sem hverrug þó standur þig stafri?
   - Mýg miklar
   - Fremur miklar
   - Míðanugs
   - Fremur lítsar
   - Mýg lítsar/Engin

10. Hvernu líktlegt eða skiltlegt er að þú myndir mæla með stofnuninum sem
    góðum varminum við því það þeit og æftum?
    - Mýg líktlegt
    - Fremur líktlegt
    - Í meðallagi
    - Fremur skiltlegt
    - Mýg skiltlegt

11. Hvernari vel eða illa treysta þó yfirlýsim stofnuninum?
    - Mýg vel
    - Fremur vel
    - Í meðallagi
    - Fremur lítsi
    - Mýg lítsi

12. Myndir þú segja að starfandin á vinnustöfnum sem góður eða lýsnum?
    - Mýg góður
    - Fremur góður
    - Í meðallagi
    - Fremur lýsir
    - Mýg lýsir

13. Vexin aflað, oftast, standum, sjálaðust eða aldrei til hvers er afleið af
    því í stafri?
    - Alþraf
    - Ofastað
    - Sjálaðust
    - Aldrei

14. Myndir þú segja að þú hefur morg eða traktar virski til að lúa og þjónast
    í stafri?
    - Mýg morg
    - Fremur morg
    - Í meðallagi
    - Fremur lítsi
    - Mýg lítsi/Engin

15. Hverna miklar eða lítsar lýsir þeim at þeim að því það verður að vanna ýs
    stofnuninum að ná næsta 3 árin?
    - Mýg miklar
    - Fremur miklar
    - Í meðallagi
    - Fremur lítsi
    - Mýg lítsi/Engin

16. Myndir þú segja að kærir eða konur hafið meiri mógaekla á
    stofnunum minn stofnuninum eða hafsi kynna sjálf mikla mógaekla?
    - Kærar minn meiri
    - Kærar minn meiri
    - Konur minn meiri
    - Konur minn meiri
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.</th>
<th>Hefrir þi oft, stundum, sjaldban en að aldei lágriðum um að hætta í niðurverandi stilla?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mjög oft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nekkdo oft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stundum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sjaldan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldrei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18.</th>
<th>Myndir þi segja að þi sést alltaf, oftast, stundum, sjaldbat en að aldei um mikið viðmastaðilega?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Öfraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stundum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sjaldan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldrei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19.</th>
<th>Myndir þi segja að upplýsingamálun inna viðmastaðilega sé alltaf, oftast, stundum, sjaldbat en að aldei í glóðu lagi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Öfraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stundum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sjaldan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldrei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20.</th>
<th>Myndir þi segja að þi sést því því að venja mikilvægt eða því því að þær í viðmastaðilega rúv rúvum að sér um 2 virken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mjög mikilvægt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fremur mikilvægt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I metvelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fremur liðhild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mjög liðhildið</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23.</th>
<th>Hvert er þegar þitt?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kærlyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kvenkyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annæ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36.</th>
<th>Hveru lengi hefur þi starfbíð sem fangsverður?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skránum en 1 ár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 ár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 ár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 ár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langur en 15 ár</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37.</th>
<th>Hefur þi lokin námi í Fangsverðaskólaum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38.</th>
<th>Þarf þi í fulla starfi eða í hlutastafi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulla starf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hlutastaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39.</th>
<th>Oganir þi stýrrum verðaðu?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Í</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40.</th>
<th>Viður þi á næturvökum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Í</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41.</th>
<th>Hvað þann þá að þafnaða mikla yfirlituna í mátnimi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engra yfirlitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 klist. eða mínar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-24 klist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 klist.-48 klist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 klist. eða mér</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vinsamlega setti listana aftur í litla umlagið sem hann kom í eg landsfyrir. Settu svo litla umlagið í stora umlagið sem heldur utan um alla listana. |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Tökk kærlega fyrir þaðrúvum! |