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Abstract

The present study is a two-step approach using qualitative and quantitative data to analyse the relationship between governmental work conditions and employees’ job satisfaction with regard to its impact on service quality. The goal of the study is to develop a model of factors determining the service quality within an e-government employment. Based on previous research studies it is assumed that employees’ satisfaction is a direct driver for good service quality. It is not clear yet whether this also applies to the quality of e-government services. Previous literatures have rather focused on the private offline sector from an external perspective. Therefore, this study draws its attention on the public sector from an internal perspective.

Twenty-five interviews within a non-profit housing association in North England were conducted with the result of seven factors affecting their job satisfaction. Based on the findings a model was developed and tested by means of a questionnaire. The regression analysis shows that Interpersonal Relationships, Working Morale, Communication Culture, Employer and Leadership Characteristics, and the Quality of Information Technology are related to Service Quality.
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1 Introduction

21st century organisations are facing constant change of the environment (Snipes, Oswald, LaTour, & Armenakis, 2005) and society, which leads directly to constant change of their customers. Thus, it is of great interest to improve an organisation’s service quality by investigating the antecedents of customers’ satisfaction (Snipes, et al., 2005).

There has been a wide range of service quality research focusing on the customer’s perception of service quality (Ding, Hu, Verma, & Wardell, 2009; Hartline & Jones, 1996; A. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988; Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry, 1990). In other words from the external, the customer’s perspective there is a lot known of what is needed to receive good service quality. But there is relatively little known of what is needed to deliver good service quality from the internal, the employee’s perspective.

As Gilbert and Parhizgari say “to ensure long term service quality, organisations need to have quality focused internal structures and processes in place to support those on the front line who make or break the organisation's reputation with their customers” (2000, p. 46). These internal structures and processes include the organisations’ employees and both belong to the term internal marketing. Internal marketing was introduced by Berry (1981) stating that employees shall be treated as customers. The employer is responsible for good internal service quality which is among other things about identifying and satisfying an employee’s needs (Back, Lee, & Abbott, 2010) so that the customers’ perception of service quality is increased based on the employees’ satisfaction (Kang, James, & Alexandris, 2002).

According to Schneider and Bowen (as cited in Back, et al., 2010) the delivery of superior service is given when employees have the necessary resources, the internal quality, “which heavily affects employees’ job satisfaction level” (2010, p. 112). To summarize, several studies (Gilbert & Parhizgari, 2000; Hartline & Ferrell, 1996; Schmitt & Allscheid, 1995) have shown that job satisfaction positively influences service quality.
Most of these studies focus on business and hospitality (Wright, 2001) which is known as the private sector. Thus, the present study focuses on the public sector, in particular on governmental service delivery as the government sector constantly undergoes a change due to information technology (IT) innovations (S. Kim, 2005). These innovations have an impact on how the government communicates with the citizens and also on the government’s abilities to deliver service. The government’s use of IT tools is known as electronic government (e-government). According to the Council for Excellence in Government (as cited in S. Kim, 2005) e-government has a great capability to improve public service delivery. E-government can be compared to e-business which is according to Lai (2006)

“an enterprise with the capability of exchanging values (goods, services, money, and knowledge) digitally via a computer network (…) [using] distributed information technology (IT), knowledge management, and trust mechanisms to transform key business processes and relationships with customers, suppliers, employees, business partners, regulatory parties, and communities” (p. 926).

The possibilities that e-business brings along quickly changes the way customers are being contacted (Lai, 2006). Hence, one can also say that e-government and the development in IT constantly change the way the government communicates and deals with its citizens. More important is the aspect that the service delivery through IT is associated with the employees’ job performance (Lai, 2006). Several research studies have shown that job performance is influenced by job satisfaction (Way, Sturman, & Raab, 2010). Therefore, research on employees’ job satisfaction is of great importance.

Although there has been studies investigating determinants of government employees’ job satisfaction (Ellickson, 2002; Gordon, 2011; S. Kim, 2005; Ting, 1997; Wright, 2001), there appears to be a lack of research concerning e-government employees’ job satisfaction.

Besides technical developments, the success of e-government is due to financial resources and human resource management (S. Kim, 2005). Furthermore, Kim (2005)
emphasized the importance of IT employee recruitment and retention in order to be successful in e-government. Employees who do their jobs well and do their duties in delivering good customers’ service are the result of an employer’s knowledge of how to motivate his employees to do so. An answer to the question of how to motivate employees “would enable a service organisation to formulate a system that links human resource management policies to desired service employee performance, so that customer perceptions of service quality are enhanced” (Bienstock, DeMoranville, & Smith, 2003, p. 358).

Therefore, and due to the limited knowledge of job satisfaction determinants in the electronic public sector, the present study aims to develop a model and according to that an appropriate questionnaire which would be a useful tool for managers in the e-government sector to evaluate their employees’ satisfaction and thus to detect areas with room for improvement and difficulties to overcome within the organisation.

The first part of the present study gives the conceptual framework based on literature, reviewing what is known about internal service quality with a specific focus on the concept of job satisfaction in relation to the public sector. The second part deals with applied research methods including a description of the conducted interviews and the resulting questionnaire. The data analysis and results follow in part three. Finally the study concludes with a discussion part and some practical implications.

### 2 Conceptual Framework

#### 2.1 Internal Service Quality

The definition found in literature for internal service quality is “the quality of workplace benefits, human resource management, and the climate for employee well-being provided by the employer” (Bienstock, et al., 2003, p. 359), or in other words, the employees’ perception of how well they are served by the members of the organisation (Ehrhart, Witt, Schneider, & Perry, 2011). Gronross (1983) found that employees who are treated well by
their managers also treat their customers well (as cited in H. J. Kim, Pimtong, & Kim, 2009). Kang et al. (2002) state that employees, in particular customer-contact employees, who feel valuable for the organisation treat their customer similarly.

These results show that the employees’ perception of how well they are served by the organisation, which can be defined as internal service quality, influences the customers’ perception of service quality. This is confirmed by the findings of Bienstock et al. (2003). Thus one can say that that a high level of internal service quality influences employees satisfaction and hence leads to high level of customer satisfaction (Schlesinger and Heskett, 1991; Schneider and Brown, 1993 as cited in Bienstock, et al., 2003).

2.1.1 Service Profit Chain

Furthermore, this is in line with the service profit chain which was firstly introduced by Heskett, Sasser, Jones, Loveman, and Schlesinger (1994). The service profit chain claims that internal service quality drives employees’ satisfaction and thus increases customers’ satisfaction. “According to the service profit chain, internal customers (employees) should be satisfied first in order to ensure better service performance and hence increase external customers’ satisfaction level” (Paulin, Ferguson, & Bergeron, 2006, p. 908). Vilares and Coelho (2003, p. 1704) summarized the basic links of the service profit chain:

- employee variables like employee satisfaction, commitment and loyalty influence customer perception of the value of the product and service, which in turn influences customer satisfaction;

- customer satisfaction influences customer loyalty; and

- corporate financial results are directly influenced by customer loyalty.

One can conclude that in order to increase the organisation’s service quality good internal service quality has to be established first. Internal service quality is the basis for that an employee can deliver individually good external service to their customers. An investigation of internal service quality is of great importance as employees can serve “as an
early warning system (...) [and because of their] intensive exposure to the service delivery system, they often see the system breaking down before customers do” (Lai, 2006, p. 927).

2.1.2 Bagozzi’s Attitude Theory

But what exactly is good internal service quality and how can it be modeled and measured? There should be managerial guidelines on how to improve an organisations’ internal service quality. But before that, one needs a tool to determine the current state of art or better to say how to measure it. According to Heskett et al. it is “internal quality measured by the feelings that employees have toward their jobs, colleagues, and companies (...) [and] contributes most to employee satisfaction” (1994, p. 168) which in turn contributes to customers’ satisfaction. This idea is based on Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory (appraisal \( \rightarrow \) emotional response \( \rightarrow \) behavior) which “proposes that the cognitive evaluation of events, outcomes, and situation precedes affective reactions and responses, which in turn play a determining role in individual behaviors” (H. J. Kim, et al., 2009, p. 371).

Employees evaluate the organisations’ internal service and thus develop feelings toward it. These feelings built their attitude and emotional response towards their job which is described as job satisfaction. That consequently influences the employees’ behaviour and performance e.g. toward the customers, the external service (H. J. Kim, et al., 2009). Johnson, Ryan, and Schmit (1994) investigated employees’ attitude toward workload/stress, training/development, job/company satisfaction, and work group/teamwork, and found that these factors are significantly related to customer satisfaction (as cited in Schmitt & Allscheid, 1995).

In sum, the service profit chain and Bagozzi’s attitude theory assume employees’ satisfaction as the main driver to external service quality. Hence, a further investigation of the term job satisfaction is needed.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

In the organisational behavior literature job satisfaction is one of the most investigated area because it may have the biggest impact on the organisation’s service quality, its
effectiveness and ultimately on the customers’ satisfaction (Snipes, et al., 2005). According to the literature “job satisfaction is defined as the employee’s reaction to what he or she receives from the job” (Gordon, 2011, p. 191) that is “a positive emotional state, (…) resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience” (H. J. Kim, et al., 2009, p. 374) which further can also be defined as the employee’s perception of the environment (Ellickson, 2002).

Hartline and Ferrell (1996) stated that in order to increase customers’ perception of service quality the employees’ job satisfaction has to be increased as it is closely related to customer satisfaction (Heskett, et al., 1994). Reasons for that are given by Schmitt and Allscheid (1995) in saying that satisfied employees rather believe in their ability of delivering good service which is in line with Schneider’s (1980) findings that job satisfaction is the most important cause for employees to deliver good customer service (as cited in H. J. Kim, et al., 2009).

Consequently, external service quality can be increased once the question of what exactly makes employees satisfied has been investigated and answered. What are the antecedents of job satisfaction and what does the organisation have to do to have satisfied employees?

According to Snipes (2005), job satisfaction includes several aspects such as satisfaction with the supervisor, satisfaction with the work as such, satisfaction with the pay, advancement opportunities, and the satisfaction with coworkers, and customers. Further, it can be distinguished between intrinsic (e.g., liking of work, sense of pride, opportunities for personal growth) and extrinsic factors (e.g., financial rewards, pay satisfaction, benefits) (H. J. Kim, et al., 2009). Other literature states that antecedents of job satisfaction are organisation’s reward system (Bowen, Gilliland, & Folger, 1999; Brown & Peterson, 1993; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981 as cited in H. J. Kim, et al., 2009), good working environment, high job security, high wages, fringe benefits, and an opportunity for savings (Panmunin, 1993 as cited in H. J. Kim, et al., 2009). Further, the study of Back et al. (2010) showed that training,
perceived benefit, self efficacy, and climate influence job satisfaction. Kim et al. (2009) found that reward, training, and empowerment increase job satisfaction.

Especially the factor training has received a lot of attention. Training enhances the employees skills and abilities to serve and satisfy the customers (H. J. Kim, et al., 2009) as well as their capabilities to handle customers’ complaints. Thus, it has a significant impact on the organisations’ success (Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982 as cited in H. J. Kim, et al., 2009).

Another factor that has received a lot of attention is empowerment. “Empowerment refers to a situation in which the manager gives employees the discretion to make day-to-day decisions about job-related activities” (Hartline & Ferrell, 1996, p. 56). Several studies have shown that empowered employees feel more secure about their job and their performance (Bowen & Lawler, 1995) and are more satisfied (Back, et al., 2010; Rafiq & Ahmed, 1998). Thus, they provide better service to the customers (Hartline & Ferrell, 1996) and which may lead to higher customer satisfaction (Back, et al., 2010).

Furthermore, Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, & Brymer (as cited in H. J. Kim, et al., 2009) pointed out that especially in service organisations organisational support is an important driver for employees’ job satisfaction because customer-contact employees are more likely to feel dissatisfied when they do not feel the organisational support. This is in line with other research studies as Gilbert and Parhizgari state that “internal organisational support leads to satisfied and loyal employees who provide better quality service to their external organisation customers” (2000, p. 47). Contrary to this, the study of Kim et al. (2009) shows no support of this assumption was found. But their results may be based on culture differences as they studied Thai hotel workers, employees and managers with high power distance (H. J. Kim, et al., 2009).

Thus, one can assume that factors affecting employees’ job satisfaction may vary according to their culture but mainly according to the organisational structure. Governmental
institutions are also known to be hierarchal and bureaucratic. Thus, the factors affecting governmental employees’ satisfaction may be different from those that have been investigated in the private sector.

2.3 The public sector

Governmental institutions are constantly pressurised due to the demand of high productivity with low costs (Wright, 2001). Nevertheless, its employees are often denoted as lazy and slow, hence it is of great importance to find out what motivates employees in the government sector.

Unfortunately, there is little existing research on job satisfaction in the public sector compared to the amount of existing research in the private sector. This may be due to the assumption that the determinants of job satisfaction are the same in both sectors (Ting, 1997). In the literature there is a big debate whether one should differentiate between the public and the private sector work environment. Wright (2001) has summarized several studies in their agreement of the fact that there is a difference (Fottler 1981; Meyer 1982; Osborae and Gaebler 1992; Perry and Porter 1982; Perry and Rainey 1988; Rainey, Backoff, and Levine 1976; Whorton and Worthley 1981). Thus, the following section summarizes factors found in the literature concerning job satisfaction determinants in the public sector which are partly different to the private sector.

An early study by Ting (1997) on the determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees showed that their job satisfaction is mainly determined by job, organisational, and by individual characteristics. Especially the job characteristics pay satisfaction, promotional opportunity, task clarity, skills utilization, and task significance as well as the organisational characteristics organisational commitment and relationship with supervisors and co-workers have all a significant effect on the employees’ job satisfaction.
Wright’s (2001) literature review showed that employees working in the public sectors put less value on job security and financial rewards but more value on “helping others” than employees working in the private sector (Wright, 2001, p. 566).

Ellickson (2002) studied factors affecting employees’ job satisfaction at the municipal government. His results showed that environmental factors such as promotional opportunities, pay and benefits satisfaction, performance appraisal satisfaction, equipment and resources, training, workload, supervisory relationships, and departmental esprit de corps\(^1\) are positively related to job satisfaction. In particular the factors availability of promotional opportunities, satisfaction with pay, and satisfaction with benefits were the most important predictors. The only two factors that were not related to job satisfaction were the amount of physical workspace and the perception of safety, which confirms Wright’s (2001) findings.

Gordon (2011) replicated Ellickson’s (2002) findings by testing the model of job satisfaction for municipal employees which has been developed by Ellickson and Logsdon in 2001 (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001). His study also emphasized on satisfaction with equipment and resources, satisfaction with supervisory relationships, and esprit de corps as determinants for job satisfaction in the government sector.

These findings of equipment and resources as determinants of job satisfaction confirms Ting’s (1997) study who already has emphasized on the importance of the employees’ skills and abilities, as those were the most important determinants of job satisfaction in his study. This leads to the assumption that in an environment where employees work with electronic systems, the ability to handle these systems as well as the functionality of the system may be an important driver for employees’ job satisfaction. But very little is known about job satisfaction in an e-government environment.

\(^1\) "Work group esprit de corps refers specifically to the extent to which members take pride in their work group. Work group esprit de corps also has been discussed as a vital component of an organisation’s psychological climate, which in turn, is thought to influence employee job satisfaction" (Ellickson, 2002, p. 346).
Kim (2005) put the focus on turnover intentions of government IT employees. She has found that work exhaustion, emphasis on participatory management, and opportunities for advancement are factors affecting the turnover intentions from government IT employees. Nevertheless, determinants of job satisfaction of employees working in the area of e-government were not investigated.

Particularly in service organisations is the internal service quality, namely job satisfaction, a crucial factor, as according to Ehrhart et al. (2011), the “external service delivery is dependent on the corporate information and tools at the disposal of the front-line workers who directly interact with customers” (Ehrhart, et al., 2011, p. 428). This statement underlines the importance of reliable and well-functioning working tools for employees. For example, when an employee cannot provide the requested service to a customer because e.g. the information system is currently not working due to electronic problems, then it is not a fault of or a lack of the employee’s service quality but one of the information system.

As a conclusion, the present literature review provides support for the assumption that internal service quality influences the degree of employees’ job satisfaction which is positively related to external service quality. At the same time, it emphasizes the lack of this kind of research in the field of public service organisations and in particular in the field of e-government services.

Therefore, an exploration of job satisfaction determinants in an e-government environment and an investigation of how far the quality of an electronic working device influences the employees job satisfaction and hence the external service quality is urgently required. As a result the following research questions have been developed:

- **Research Question 1**: What makes e-government employees satisfied?
- **Research Question 2**: Is job satisfaction better explained by the quality of the used IT system or by environmental factors?
- **Research Question 3**: Is job satisfaction a direct driver for external service quality?
• *Research Question 4:* Does the quality of the used IT system directly influence the external service quality?

### 3 Method A

In order to answer these research questions a two-step approach was used. Qualitative research is suitable to describe something from the internal, the acting human being, perspective (Flick, p. 14). By doing so an answer to research question number one can be found. This study is an inductive approach which means that the researcher moves from the specific to the general. This is also called “bottom-up” approach. “In inductive reasoning, we begin with specific observations and measures, begin to detect patterns and regularities, formulate some tentative hypotheses that we can explore, and finally end up developing some general conclusions or theories” (Trochim, 2006).

Further characteristics of qualitative research are its naturalistic inquiry by examining the real world, its inductive holistic perspective by seeing the whole scenario as a complex system, and its context sensitivity as qualitative research places its findings in context (Dooley, 2009).

By conducting a qualitative study the researcher is able to explore and to better understand an unknown phenomenon or to extent the knowledge in detail of a phenomenon of interest. With qualitative research one can generate new theories or extent existing theories.

Therefore, to investigate a rather unknown topic such as e-government employees’ job satisfaction the present study used first of all a qualitative approach by interviewing employees who work in an e-government area on their feelings and attitude regarding their work conditions. Interviews are very appropriate to gain insight knowledge of e.g.: employees’ perception of something within the organisation (Downs & Arian, 2004), or for “exploratory and theory building studies” and when there is a small number of respondents (Marschan-Piekkari & Welch, 2004, p. 186).
3.1 Sample

The present study aims to explore job satisfaction determinants of e-government employees which is a rather unexplored research field. Therefore, an inductive approach is needed. According to Marschan-Piekkari and Welch (2004), in order to gain specific explanations by using an inductive approach one can conduct a case study. This was done by working in cooperation with Erimus Housing, a non-profit housing association governed by Middlesbrough Council, UK.

As the present study focuses, beside others, on job satisfaction in the context of information technology, the interviews were conducted with employees working with the electronic choice based lettings scheme (CBL) called COMPASS. The CBL is used by the Tees Valley sub region and thus five partner organisations work with it: Erimus Housing, Coast & Country, Housing Hartlepool, Tristar Homes, and Darlington Borough Council. Twenty-five semi structured interviews were held, five in each of the partner organisation.

Nineteen interviews were conducted with employees and six with managers. The first interview, with a manager, served as pilot interview in order to ensure the right terminology. The interview questions used in the pilot interview turned out to be adequate and thus were one-to-one adopted for the following interviews. The interviews were semi structured and six themes were covered. These themes derived from the literature and have been covered in form from pre-formulated questions. The formulated questions were summarized on an interview summary sheet which can be found in the Appendix A. The chronological order of the questions was flexible depending on the respondents answer. After a short introduction including the interview purpose and the assurance that all the data is kept confidentially the respondents were asked if the interview can be taped (see Appendix A). Thus, all twenty-five interviews were recorded where the shortest took fourteen minutes and the longest forty-five minutes.
For each interview one interview summary sheet was used like a checklist in order to prevent any category from being forgotten during the interview. The interview themes which were derived from a literature study are further described in the following section.

3.2 Interview Themes

The problem of investigating internal service quality is that one cannot only rely on employees’ job satisfaction as there are many different reasons for employees why they feel satisfied (Way, et al., 2010) and their satisfaction depends on other factors such as environmental factors like the workplace conditions. The research of Paulin et al. (2006) showed that when workplace conditions are supportive, equitable, and motivating they create satisfied employees.

Thus, one does not only have to investigate what makes them satisfied, but also what makes the workplace conditions motivating and comfortable. Snipes et al. (2005) stated that employees feel more satisfied when their job itself is fulfilling or enjoyable. Therefore, the participants of the interviews were asked whether they felt comfortable and what are the reasons for it. This question was indirectly linked to one of the main interview themes: climate.

3.2.1 Climate

One definition of job satisfaction describes it as employees’ perception of what they receive from the job, the work environment (Gordon, 2011). Consequently, to find out what makes employees satisfied one should ask about their perception of their work environment. The work environment is the same as the workplace’s conditions, which can also be called climate (Dietz, 2004 as cited in Paulin, et al., 2006). Climate creates job satisfaction as well as “behaviors that facilitate the creation of customer satisfaction, perceived service quality and loyalty” (Dietz, 2004 as cited in Paulin, et al., 2006). This is supported by the study of Schmitt and Allscheid (1995) who say that an organisation’s service quality can be improved by implementing a service climate. This positive climate is needed for the employees’ well-being to facilitate good service quality (Schmitt & Allscheid, 1995). This is in line with
Schneider, White, and Paul (1998) whose study showed that a “climate for service is the determinant of customer perceptions of service quality” (Schneider, et al., 1998, p. 161).

Additionally, Way et al. (2010) stated several studies (de Jong, de Ruyter, and Lemmink (2004) and Schneider, Ehrhart, Mayer, Saltz, and Niles-Jolly (2005) as cited in Way, et al., 2010) that have investigated and supported the assumption that a good working climate leads to better employee performance. Their own research study has confirmed this assumption by showing that more than 80% of the individual job satisfaction can be explained by a good perception of service climate. Thus, the aim of the interviews was to find out how e-government employees describe and perceive their working climate and hence to detect what creates a good working climate.

3.2.2 Needs

In this context the participants were asked what they need to perform their job properly, as according to the definition of internal marketing, the goal is to satisfy employees’ needs so that they can satisfy customers’ needs (Kang, et al., 2002). Ellickson’s study (2002) showed that “the more a person’s work environment fulfills his or her needs, values, or personal characteristics, the greater the degree of job satisfaction” (p. 344). By asking about their needs one can detect whether the work environment fulfills the employees’ needs and thus, whether the preconditions to feel satisfied are met by the organisation.

3.2.3 Expectations and sense of achievement

Employees’ needs are also related to the next theme: employees’ expectations, as these are related to their job satisfaction (Vlosky & Aquilar, 2009). This assumption is based on the expectancy theory, developed by Vroom (1964). The theory suggests that employees, who believe that their performance will be positively rewarded, put more effort in their work (Cooper & Locke, 2000). Thus, expectations explain or more specifically predict behaviour and its motives. Lawler and Stuttle’s (1973) developed a model based on the theory saying “that employee motivation is a function of the perceived likelihood of a successful accomplishment and that such accomplishment will result in securing certain outcomes or rewards” (Vlosky & Aquilar, 2009, p.
2). Therefore, the interviews did not only ask about the employees' expectations but also about what made their day successful or alternatively disappointing.

### 3.2.4 Relationships

Furthermore, achievements are one of the three major goals employees seek from their job. Vlosky and Aquilar (2009) refer to Sirota and Mischkind (2006) who say that these three goals are:

1. equity, which involves being respected and treated fairly in areas such as pay, benefits, and job security;
2. achievement, which encompasses being proud of one's job, accomplishments, and employer; and
3. camaraderie, which embraces good, productive relationships with fellow employees (p. 4).

This means that beside the factors *expectation fulfillment* and *sense of achievement* the factor *camaraderie* do play a role in employees’ job satisfaction. According to Vlosky and Aquilar (2009) means *Camaraderie* having good relationships with colleagues, and this relationship is according to Ellickson (2002) positively related to job satisfaction. The better the relationship to colleagues is, the higher an employee’s job satisfaction. Additionally, Heskett et al. (1994) have emphasized on the importance of good relationships between employees within an organisation because this is a critical determinant for good customer contact.

### 3.2.5 Communication

Good customer contact includes good communication. But it is not only important to communicate effectively to customers it is also of great importance that communication between employees is effectively. Without good internal communication good external communication is not possible. As Back et al. (2010) have said “effective communication is a critical part of internal service quality (…) and is the most central process in organisations”
Their study confirmed the research of Mount and Back (1999), Sparks (1994), and Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, and Brymer (2000) (as cited in Back, et al., 2010, p. 114) that the degree of communication satisfaction is positively related to the degree of job satisfaction.

Therefore, Back et al. (2010) recommended that organisations should reduce hierarchical communication in order to improve internal communication processes. The present study deals with a government institution which has usually been a hierarchical bureaucracy and known as the “Webarian Model” of organisations with the focus “on internal and managerial concerns and emphasizes departmentalization, specialization, standardization, and routinization of the production process” (Ho, 2002, p. 435).

Hence, it is assumed that communication plays a vital role in determining factors affecting e-government employees’ job satisfaction. Ellickson’s (2002) study showed that trustworthy work environments and good internal relationships can be developed by eliminating discomfort and distrust through better communication.

Consequently, employees’ job satisfaction and their ability to provide good service quality increases. Therefore, the present study focused the interviews also on what constitutes to good communication and climate within an e-government environment and on what employees need to perform their jobs properly and to feel comfortable.

### 3.2.6 Choice Based Lettings Scheme

Finally, due to the study’s purpose of investigating an e-government work environment one of the most interesting aspects was the question concerning their opinion about the information technology, the choice based lettings scheme (CBL) they work with. Therefore, the employees were asked in how far the CBL has changed their working routine and if any improvements were needed.
4 Data Analysis and Results A

4.1 Grounded Theory

A frequently used approach in qualitative research is the grounded theory. This approach has been developed by Glaser and Strauss in the 1960s and is aimed at developing a theory about phenomena of interest (Trochim, 2006). At the beginning of the research all possible data are collected for example by interviewing people. Out of this data pool the data that fitted with previous theories or those that were different from previous findings are picked out and further analysed (Flick, 2004). This further analysis is called coding. With the process of coding core theoretical concepts can be identified (Trochim, 2006). The reason for using the grounded theory is to develop a theory based on the examined data (Zhu & Lin, 2010, p. 1011).

4.2 Interview Analysis

As the aim of the study was to investigate what makes e-government employees satisfied and whether these findings are in line with previous research or whether there are unknown aspects of e-government, which haven’t been detected yet, the grounded theory approach was used. Further, the present study was guided by Herzberg’s theory on employees’ motivation to work, named two-factor theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Herzberg interviewed employees in order to develop a new theory by simply asking what makes them satisfied and what makes them dissatisfied. Out of this pool of interview data he discovered two dimensions of employees’ job satisfaction.

According to his approach, the present study analysed the interviews by looking for categories which contribute to employees’ job satisfaction. Therefore, for further analysis the

---

2 Employees’ satisfaction depends on two sets of issues: “hygiene” issues (which are dissatisfiers: Company and administrative policies, Supervision, Salary, Interpersonal relations, Working conditions) and motivators (Work itself, Achievement, Recognition, Responsibility, Advancement). The hygiene issues need to be addressed before the motivators can create satisfaction.
interviews needed to be transcribed after having had them conducted. All twenty-five interviews were typed out (see Appendix G).

According to the grounded theory and to Herzberg’s approach, the focus of this study’s analysis was on each interview’s content. Hence, the transcription was aimed to be a content protocol, written in pure literary English without spoken utterance or intonations.

In order to find categories of what makes e-government employees satisfied the interview transcriptions needed to be coded. “Coding is a process for both categorizing qualitative data and for describing the implications and details of these categories” (Trochim, 2006). This was done by using a matrix (see Appendix B) in which all interview questions were chronologically typed as keywords in the first row. The next rows were filled with the respondents’ answers. Every respondent’s answer was also summarized as keywords and put into the columns.

4.3 Interview Results

With the aid of such a matrix an overview of what has been said is given and one can easily read through the answers. The next step was to look in the matrix for keywords that have the same meaning and assign those an umbrella term. These final keywords or better to say umbrella terms were written down on memory cards (Appendix C) which were then sorted according to the context in which they were mentioned. Finally, six categories resulted which are displayed in table 1.

The analysis of the interviews shows that for e-government employees a good working atmosphere, internal relationships, working morale, communication culture, as well as the characteristics of the employer and manager (leadership) play a role in determining their job satisfaction. Further, this analysis has demonstrates what exactly for example a good manager needs to bring along in order to have productive employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Explanation/ items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working atmosphere</td>
<td>time to relax, time to socialize, workload (pressure, stress, being busy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>honesty, empathy, respect, rewarding/appreciation, approachability, trust, loyalty, customer satisfaction/ customer behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working morale</td>
<td>Work as a team, support/ help each other, be professional, fairness (equally split workload), work on their own (do the duty), knowing the job role and the others work, be reliable (be and do things on time), commitment, achievements, meet the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication culture</td>
<td>Pass on information, writing notes, have meetings, face-to-face communication, getting involved, be reachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer characteristics</td>
<td>Reputation, future opportunities, payment, good human resource management (staff shortage), get regular training/ having skills, good technology, job security, get challenging tasks, office environment (e.g. facilities, open office), working policies/ procedures/ structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership characteristics</td>
<td>Explain things, have time, be approachable, reward, give feedback, listen, trust (talk in privacy), support, delegate (be leader, manage team and tasks), control/ monitor, professionalism (know the job, be confident), empathy, resolve problems, guide, approachability, constructive criticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seventh category covered the answers of the interview question regarding the CBL. These were diverse and rather related to specific problems of the CBL that was used (COMPASS) but not to the general use of e-government. Therefore, it was harder to detect categories. Nevertheless, with the aid of a word cloud it was possible to investigate the most important aspects of the usage of CBL.

The word cloud was developed by using the web site Wordle (Wordle, 2009). All given answers concerning the CBL questions were put into the text box from the web site and automatically a word cloud was created. The word cloud can be found in the Appendix D. An
The advantage of using a word cloud is that those words which have been mentioned the most are presented as the biggest.

As a result, the word cloud shows that referring to the employees the most important aspects of using an e-government IT system is the reliability of the system as such, employees’ understanding of the system, and the given information, the amount of work and the attendant time of work. Table 2 summarizes the most frequently mentioned aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Aspects of CBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>The system works, does not crash, is reliable, having access to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Skills to work with it, ease of use, not enough instructions given, no consistency in work procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Wrong information given by customers, wrong information entered by colleagues, no accurate note taking, information does not match, amount of information either too much or too less, inconsistency of entered information, information from other departments are not accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Amount of work and cases have increased, double checks are needed, entered information needs to be corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Working with CBL takes time because it is a slow system, it is time consuming due to the amount of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.1 Reliability and Validity

To obtain high quality research the present study’s design and analysis addresses the issues of reliability and validity. Reliability and validity are well known concepts to evaluate a study’s quality whereby reliability is a precondition for validity (Golafshani, 2003).

Reliability is defined as the consistency of your measurement instruments over time and deals with the question whether the study is replicable and whether the results will be the
same with the same measurement instruments under the same conditions (Golafshani, 2003). According to Dooley (2009) it is “the degree to which observed scores are ‘free from errors of measurement’” (p. 76). Therefore, reliability is rather related to quantitative research because qualitative data deals beside others with words and not with numbers. Thus, it cannot be measured.

Nevertheless, it is also important to ensure good quality in qualitative research and consequently, there are other techniques needed to evaluate a qualitative study on its quality. Thus, Lincoln and Guba (1985) have introduced the term dependability for judging the reliability of qualitative research. Dependability means that the process and execution of the research need to be reported in detail so that other researchers can repeat the study (Shenton, 2004). Therefore, the content of the interviews was described in detail in Section 3.2 and the corresponding interview summary sheet can be found in the Appendix A.

To ensure a reliable research study the examination of trustworthiness is vital (Golafshani, 2003). In this context the objectivity of a research study plays an important role. Objectivity is according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) called confirmability and “refers to the degree to which the results could be confirmed or corroborated by others” (Trochim, 2006). Furthermore, Miles and Huberman (1994) defined reliability as the stability of data across researchers over time. Therefore, the analysis of the qualitative data at hand was coded by two independent researchers to ensure reliable results. Referring to Miles and Huberman (1994) this procedure is called check-coding and serves a good reliability check because “definitions become sharper when two researchers code the same data set and discuss their initial difficulties” (p. 64).

The other criterion for judging a research’s quality is the concept validity. To ensure validity one procedure is triangulation because “(...) triangulation strengthens a study by
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3 Due to an overall agreement the results of the second coder Julia Lange are not discussed and can only be found in the Appendix F on page 57
combining methods. This can mean using several kinds of methods or data, including using both quantitative and qualitative approaches” (Patton, 2002, p. 247). Therefore, the present study used a two-step approach by combining qualitative and quantitative data gathering.

5 Method B

With the first, a qualitative approach, a less investigated research field of what makes e-government employees satisfied was investigated. The results show that there are six factors (categories) that in a way affect their overall well-being. Additionally, the interviews show that the quality of IT does influence an e-government employee’s job satisfaction. The second step of the present study is to confirm that there is a relation between those detected factors and e-government employees’ job satisfaction and hence on their service quality and it is the goal to investigate which of these factors have the biggest impact. Therefore, a quantitative approach is needed.

“In quantitative research your aim is to determine the relationship between one thing (an independent variable) and another (a dependent or outcome variable) in a population” (Hopkins, 2000). Therefore, with a quantitative approach the remaining research questions can be answered.

- Research Question 2: Is job satisfaction better explained by the quality of the used IT system or by environmental factors?
- Research Question 3: Is job satisfaction a direct driver for external service quality?
- Research Question 4: Does the quality of the used IT system directly influence the external service quality?

5.1 Proposed Model

The aim of the second method is to confirm the results of what have been found by the first method. Quantitative research is “confirmatory and deductive in nature” (Trochim,
This means that a deductive approach is a “top-down” approach as the researcher starts with a general assumption like a theory and tries to apply it to the specific. Deductive reasoning means to narrow down a theory into a more specific hypothesis which then will be tested and or confirmed (Trochim, 2006).

The goal of quantitative research is to explain what has been observed for example in a particular case by measuring data and as a result a model based can be constructed (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Based on the interview the following proposed model has been developed:

In quantitative research the data consist of numbers and statistics (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and thus the data needs to be transferred into numbers. This can be done by using a questionnaire.
5.2 Questionnaire

With the first method the interviews, the researcher was only able to interview a limited number of employees of the councils. With the aid of a questionnaire all employees working with the CBL can be reached. Questionnaires are a good method for investigating a large sample size at a low cost (Downs & Arian, 2004). It is a fast way of getting information on several topics and compared to interviews it does not take employees away from the job, at least not for a long time (Downs & Arian, 2004).

5.2.1 Independent variables

The independent variables consist of the six categories examined during the interviews: Working Atmosphere, Interpersonal Relationships, Working Morale, Communication Culture, Employer Characteristics, Leadership Characteristics, and Quality of Information Technology (CBL).

The questions of the questionnaire concerning each construct were chosen from those statements which were mentioned the most in the interviews. A complete overview of the constructs and the related questions can be found in the Appendix E.

5.2.1.1 Quality of Information Technology (CBL)

One independent variable gains special focus as it concerns the present study’s uniqueness. The current research investigates the impact of a used IT system on government employees’ job satisfaction in relation to the e-government’s external service quality.

One very common and well known model for measuring service quality is SERVQUAL which has been firstly introduced by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985). According to the SERVQUAL determinants of service quality are: reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness. Further, SERVQUAL helps any organisation to determine a lack of their service quality by examining possible gaps between the perceived
and expected service\textsuperscript{4}. So far, most service quality research has focused on how to meet the customers’ service expectations and whether the delivery matches the customers’ expectations (Kang, et al., 2002).

According to Zeithaml et al. (1990) SERVQUAL can also be adapted in order to measure the service quality which is provided by the organisation for the employees. Furthermore, due to social developments Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra (2005) investigated the field of electronic service delivery and its quality. They emphasized on the lack of adequate service delivery through the Internet and thus, they have adapted the SERVQUAL to the electronic business and have developed the E-S-Qual scale for measuring electronic service delivery.

Still, there is a lack of adequate tools for measuring electronic service delivery in the case of e-government. Therefore, the E-S-Qual scale by Parasuraman et al. (2005) was adapted (based on the interview results) to the present study.

\subsection*{5.2.2 Dependent variables}

\subsubsection*{5.2.2.1 Job satisfaction}

According to Snipes et al. (2005) job satisfaction is one of the biggest driving factors of an organisation’s service quality and is necessary for delivering superior service to customers (Ehrhart, et al., 2011). Therefore, in order to increase the external service quality one has to increase the internal quality by measuring the employees’ job satisfaction. This was done with three items adopted from Back et al. (2010) as those which have shown to be a reliable scale and which have been used in other studies before. The items were: “I am satisfied with my job”, “I am satisfied with my career path within the organisation”, “I am happy with what I am doing with the current job”.

\textsuperscript{4} For further reading read Parasuraman et al. (1985), Parasuraman et al. (1988), and Zeithaml et al. (1990).
5.2.2.2 Extra role

The success of an organisation is heavily dependent on its front-line employees behaviour as those have direct contact to the customers (Chebat, Babin, & Kollias, 2002). Therefore the construct extra role service behaviour has gained more and more importance in the marketing literature. It was found to be related to job satisfaction (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997, as cited in H. J. Kim, et al., 2009).

The research of Kim et al. (2009) emphasized the early findings of Schmitt and Allscheid (1995) that job satisfaction is related to prosocial behaviour and that when employees are satisfied with their job this positive attitude motivates them to do extra work for customers. This extra role service behaviour is predicted to provide better service quality and hence an advantage for the organisation.

Therefore, it was measured with the following three items adopted from the study of Kim, Pimtong, and Kim (2009): “I voluntarily assist customers even if it means going beyond the job requirements”, “I often go beyond and above the call of duty when serving customers”, “I frequently go out of the way when to help customers”.

A pre-test with one of the managers was conducted. After the pre-test the last item needed to be reworded due to possible comprehension ambiguities and thus was changed into “I try very hard to help customers”.

5.2.2.3 Service Quality

The main outcome to be measured of the present study is the construct service quality. According to the work of Parasuraman et al. (1985) by measuring the organisations’s service quality possible gaps and implication can be detected. Hartline and Ferrell (1996) used an adapted version of SERVQUAL for measuring the perceived service quality. Their items showed high construct reliability (0.97) and thus it was adapted to the present case and reworded to the perspective of employees. For instance Hartline and Ferrell’s item “receiving
prompt service from our employees” was reworded into “our customers receive prompt service from us”. The complete construct items can be found in the Appendix E.

5.3 Sample

Like in the first method the sample of the study consists of employees from the five partner organisations working with CBL: Erimus Housing, Coast & Country, Housing Hartlepool, Tristar Homes, and Darlington Borough Council. Based on the quantitative nature of the second method the research was not restricted to a certain amount of participants. Hence, it was possible to forward the questionnaire to all employees working with CBL.

The questionnaire was administrated with the aid of an Internet portal. Therefore, the link of the web site just needed to be forwarded within the organisation via their internal email system.

Beforehand, the questionnaire was pre-tested by the same manager with whom the pilot interview was held. By doing so the adequateness of the questionnaire for the employees were given. Any possible misunderstandings were prevented by using comprehensive wordings. After the pre-test, the questionnaire needed to be shortened as it would have been too long and would have taken too much of the employees’ time during their work.

Therefore, the original eighty-nine questions were reduced to seventy-one whereas four of the questions covered demographic questions. Those questions which were mentioned the fewest during the interviews were removed.

Further, in order to make sure the participants pay attention to the questionnaire, some of the questions were negatively worded.
6 Data Analysis and Results B

The online questionnaire was sent to all employees working with CBL. Indirectly have all employees of the five partner organisations contact with CBL but directly working with CBL (being a Homechoice Lettings officer) are only twenty-five people. Within two weeks, only fifteen employees completed the questionnaire. Due to this very low response rate it was not possible to gain representative data and results. Therefore the present study rather serves as a pre-test for the developed questionnaire.

6.1 Statistical Analysis

Despite the low response rate, the collected data helped to optimize the developed questionnaire. Thus, in order to test the constructs’ reliability and hence the questionnaire’s adequateness all statistical analyses were done by using the software of SPSS 16.0. This programme offers statistical techniques with which the relation and correlation of given variables can be measured. The reliability of the constructs was measured by using Cronbach’s Alpha. To assess whether there is a relation between the dependent variable (job satisfaction, extra-role customer service behaviour, and service quality) and the independent variables the present study used the indicators $R^2$ (explained variances), $B$ (beta coefficient), $M$ (mean), and $SD$ (standard deviations). Significance is given at p-value $<0.05$ or $<0.01$.

6.2 Descriptive Statistics

Ten employees and five managers have completed the questionnaire. Eleven of them were female and four male. Their average age is 38.5 with an average of seven years of employment. The majority have a certificate or diploma of higher education and only two have a bachelor and one has a master degree.

The items which have been negatively worded beforehand were transformed into positive wording and coding for conducting a consistent analysis.

Table 3 shows the reliability of constructs, mean scores, and standard deviations.
Table 1
Reliability, Means, and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Atmosphere (α = .646)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have enough time to relax</td>
<td>2,86</td>
<td>0,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have enough time to socialize</td>
<td>2,60</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a balanced workload</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>1,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Relationships (α = .908)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good relationship to the people I work with</td>
<td>4,47</td>
<td>0,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with are honest</td>
<td>4,20</td>
<td>0,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with respect each other</td>
<td>4,07</td>
<td>0,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever I have a concern I can go to the people I work with</td>
<td>4,20</td>
<td>0,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the people I work with</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Morale (α = .859)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a good working morale</td>
<td>3,90</td>
<td>1,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have good team work</td>
<td>3,67</td>
<td>0,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We support and help each other out</td>
<td>4,27</td>
<td>0,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We work professionally</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>0,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can rely on each other</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>0,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone works as hard as I do</td>
<td>4,20</td>
<td>0,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone does what he/ she is supposed to do</td>
<td>3,40</td>
<td>1,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Culture (α = .878)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our communication is good</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>1,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive enough information from the people I work with</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>0,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive the information I need on time</td>
<td>3,46</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have enough face-to-face meetings</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>1,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I need to communicate with are reachable</td>
<td>4,20</td>
<td>0,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer Characteristics (α = .76)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer offers me good future opportunities</td>
<td>3,53</td>
<td>1,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer has good human resource management (e.g.: enough staff)</td>
<td>3,07</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer gives me enough training</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>1,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer gives me enough job security</td>
<td>3,67</td>
<td>1,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer offers me the facilities (e.g.: technology) I need</td>
<td>3,87</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer has standardised and consistent policies</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Characteristics (α = .896)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is approachable</td>
<td>4,08</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager appreciates my work</td>
<td>4,07</td>
<td>0,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager gives enough feedback</td>
<td>3,60</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is trust worthy</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>1,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager gives me enough support</td>
<td>4,27</td>
<td>0,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is able to delegate tasks to the team</td>
<td>3,67</td>
<td>1,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can go to my manager whenever I have a concern</td>
<td>4,20</td>
<td>0,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Information Technology (CBL) (α = .851)</strong></td>
<td>3,47</td>
<td>1,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL makes it easy to find what I need</td>
<td>3,80</td>
<td>1,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL enables me to complete a transaction quickly</td>
<td>3,53</td>
<td>0,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL loads it pages quickly</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>1,20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CBL is well organized 3.60 1.12
I save time by working with CBL 3.66 1.11
I have less work to do with CBL 1.73 0.70
CBL has improved my work 3.40 1.18
I receive the information I need (refers to CBL) 3.73 0.88
The information I need is well organized (refers to CBL) 3.66 0.82
The Information I need is well interlinked (refers to CBL) 3.46 0.92
I have the skills to work with CBL 4.40 0.74
CBL is easy to use 4.06 0.59
CBL is always available 3.33 0.72
CBL launches and runs right away 3.00 1.11
CBL crashes frequently 3.13 0.83
The CBL screen does not freeze after I enter my order information 3.00 1.19

**Overall Job Satisfaction (α = .789)**

I am satisfied with my job 3.87 0.83
I am satisfied with my career path within the organisation 3.73 1.16
I am happy with what I am doing with the current job 3.93 0.96

**Extra Role Customer Service Behaviour (α = .918)**

I voluntarily assist customers even if I’ve to go beyond the job requirements 4.67 0.49
I often go beyond and above the call of duty when serving customers 4.53 0.64
I try very hard to help customers 4.73 0.46

**Service Quality (α = .899)**

Our customers receive prompt service from us 4.20 0.77
We are never too busy to respond to our customers’ requests 4.00 1.07
Our behaviour instills confidence in our customers 4.13 1.13
Our customers feel safe with the transactions they do with us 4.13 0.74
We are always friendly to our customers 4.13 1.06
We do not have the ability to answer our customers’ questions 4.26 0.70
We pay enough attention to our customers 4.40 0.83
We have our customers’ best interests at heart 4.06 0.80
We understand our customers’ specific needs 4.26 1.03

| Table 3 |

All constructs show a reliability more than .70 which is recommended as minimum for basic research (Back, et al., 2010). In order to gain this minimum of reliability two items needed to be removed (“we have a good atmosphere here at work”, and “I am sufficiently involved in what is happening”). Although a higher reliability of the construct *Working Atmosphere* could have been reached by removing the item “we have a balanced workload”, the results of the interviews show that the amount of workload influences the employees’ perception of their working atmosphere. Therefore, the item remains.
The same is true for the construct *Overall Job Satisfaction*. The reliability could have been higher by removing the item “I am satisfied with my career path within the organisation”. Due to the fact that this construct has been adapted from the study of Back, Lee, and Abbott (2010) and has been confirmed as reliable item it stays within the construct.

The descriptive statistics show that the mean score of the constructs *Internal Relationships* (M= 4,47), *Leadership Characteristics* (M= 4,07), *Extra Role Customer Service Behaviour* (M= 4,64), and *Service Quality* (M= 4,17) are very high. This indicates that within the present case the internal relationships are very good. The employees perceive their leadership’s characteristics as positive and their own customer service as well as the service quality as good.

Regarding the CBL one can say that the system as such is easy to use and well organized, but some technical issues could be improved. Most interesting is the low score of the item “I have less work to do with CBL” (M= 1, 73). This is in line with the interview results saying that contrary to the literature the implementation of information technology has not reduced the amount of work. This could also explain the rather low scores concerning the *Working Atmosphere*. These results show that employees of the present e-government institution do not have a balanced workload and thus do not have enough time to relax or socialize which has an impact on their perception of the working atmosphere.

### 6.3 Correlations

Table 2 shows the correlation matrix of all constructs. Significant correlation (at the level p < 0.01) can be found between *Working Morale* and *Interpersonal Relationships*. *Interpersonal Relationships* is further correlated with *Communication Culture*. Additionally, *Communication Culture* is correlated with *Leadership Characteristics*, *Overall Job Satisfaction*, and *Service Quality*. *Communication Culture* and *Service Quality* are the constructs that correlate the most as *Service Quality* also correlates with *Employer*
Characteristics, Extra Role Customer Service Behaviour, and Quality of Information Technology.

The only construct that correlates with none of the other construct is Working Atmosphere. This indicates that even if the employees have too much work or perceives the atmosphere not as very positive, it does not affect the employee’s attitude towards their job as such and hence it does not affect the service quality.

Overall Job Satisfaction only correlates with Interpersonal Relationships, Communication Culture, and Leadership Characteristics. This leads to the assumption that these three constructs might be the most powerful predictors of an e-government employee’s job satisfaction.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Working Atmosphere</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Working Morale</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communication Culture</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Employer Characteristics</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Extra Role Customer Service Behaviour</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Service Quality</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Quality of Information Technology (CBL)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Significant at p < 0.05  
Note. **Significant at p < 0.01

6.4 Regression Analysis

The regression analysis helps to find out whether there is a relation between the different dependent and independent variables and to identify which variable is the most predictive one in our proposed model. The results of the regression analysis can be found in figure 2.
The regression analysis shows that Interpersonal Relationships, Communication Culture, Leadership Characteristics and the Quality of Information Technology have an influence on the employees’ job satisfaction. Surprisingly, the employees’ job satisfaction does neither predict Extra Role Customer Behaviour nor Service Quality. Nevertheless, Extra Role Customer Behaviour has a significant effect on Service Quality as well as the Quality of Information Technology. Based on this finding a further regression analysis between the dependent variable Service Quality and the independent variables Working Atmosphere, Interpersonal Relationships, Working Morale, Communication Culture, Employer Characteristics, and Leadership Characteristics has been conducted. This analysis showed
that all five factors, except of Working Atmosphere, influence Service Quality. The results are shown in table 5.

| Table 3 |
|------------------|------------------|
| Predictors of dependent variable Service Quality | Significance |
| Interpersonal Relationship | 0.041 |
| Working Morale | 0.033 |
| Communication Culture | 0.007 |
| Employer Characteristics | 0.002 |
| Leadership Characteristics | 0.002 |
| Quality of Information Technology (CBL) | 0.002 |

7 Discussion

The interviews and the questionnaire of the present study show, that within an e-government workplace, environmental factors such as Interpersonal Relationships, Communication Culture, and Leadership Characteristics influence employees’ job satisfaction. Although, in the present study the construct Job Satisfaction is not related to Service Quality, employees’ job satisfaction is of great importance in service organisations as several studies confirmed that employees’ job satisfaction has an influence on customers’ perception of service quality (Snipes, et al., 2005; Vilares & Coelho, 2003).

Further, Kim et al. (2009) emphasized that satisfied employees are more motivated to go an extra mile for customers. Satisfied employees are rather willing to help customers and colleagues in need than unsatisfied employees. In a service organisation it is very important that an employee is willing to do the extra mile for customers as this behaviour has an impact on the customers’ perception of the service quality. The present study confirms the finding of Kim et al. (2009) that Extra Role Customer Behaviour is a significant antecedent of Service Quality.
Additionally, satisfied employees have less turnover intentions (Back, et al., 2010). According to Back et al. (2010) and Kim (2005) it is important to reduce employees’ turnover intentions by increasing their satisfaction because loyal employees perform their jobs better, enhance customers’ satisfaction, and reduce organisation’s cost (Back, et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the length of employment increases work experiences and the more experienced, the more knowledge does an employee have and hence is more able to provide the requested service of customers. The length of employment as well as work experience and knowledge might be one the most antecedents for employee’s confidence and work performance (Hartline & Ferrell, 1996).

Of particular interest is the finding that the Quality of Information Technology, in this case CBL, is the only factor contributing to overall job satisfaction with a direct influence on service quality. This result shows that the service quality of e-government is mainly dependent on the quality of its electronic systems. Without reliable electronic systems hardly any e-governmental institution is able to provide good service, no matter how satisfied the employees are.

7.1 Implications

The results show that the quality of an e-government information technology is of great importance as it contributes to the employees’ job satisfaction as well as it is relates to service quality. For any e-government institution this implies emphasizing on regular monitoring, supervisions and quality checks of their electronic system. E-government needs a system that is easy to use, reliable, and offers the information that is needed. The system should always be available and particularly efficient. Efficiency is not only important in regard to the customers’ use of the system but also in regard to the employees who are working with it.
The success of e-government also depends on the electronic system to help the employees carrying out their work. In the present case more than 46% disagreed or totally disagreed with the statement “I have less work to do with CBL” and only 20% agree that it has improved their work. Nevertheless, overall they agreed that the system is a good system which is easy to use and well organised which helps them to perform their jobs, although it crashes frequently and does not always launch and run right away. This implies the importance of the system’s ease of use and how it is structured. Further, it indicates that the comfortableness of a system is more important than its technical reliability.

In the present case of COMPASS, where five sub regions work with the same IT system, it is most important that the system works consistently. The interviews, as well as the questionnaire, show that CBL needs improvements concerning its consistency and connections to the other partner organisations. For example any given information and notes of a client needs to be visible and accessible to all employees.

It is very interesting that the increased workload, due to the implementation of CBL, has no influence on the employees’ overall positive evaluation of CBL and their satisfaction. This shows that other factors such as Interpersonal Relationships, Communication Culture, and Leadership Characteristics might have a bigger impact on employees’ job satisfaction. Therefore, it is recommended that any employer does not disregard the importance of interpersonal relationships and does not only tolerate but rather encourage social activities with and within the team. This could raise team spirit and hence enhance team performance.

Another aspect that contributes to an increase of team spirit and working morale is the employees’ relationship to the manager. According to the employees of the current case, approachability, trust, and support constitute to a good manager and to a good employee-manager relationship. This leadership characteristics as well as good interpersonal relationships are probably the most important drivers for job satisfaction within an e-government work environment.
Furthermore, another important advice for e-government institutions is to emphasize on their communication. Although during the interviews other major issues such as too much workload and staff shortages became apparent, one of the most frequently mentioned problems in need of improvement was communication. The present study shows that communication influences the employees’ job satisfaction and the service quality. Therefore, it is an important aspect that needs more attention. One interviewee responded to the question why she perceives the manager as a good manager:

“She is available to all of us, so we know where she is, what she is doing. She always tells us when she is going out or where she is going, when she is going on a meeting, what time she will be back. 
(...)
In general you expect a lot of them [managers], and I think she even goes beyond and above some time, she will go for an extra mile for you if she can help you. More than necessary, she will do her best” (N. Lodge, personal interview, June 30, 2011).

Finally, the results from the questionnaire and in particular the interviews highlighted the necessity of good internal relationships between the colleagues and the managers which can be improved by better communication. In general one can say that within the present case of e-government the employees on average are satisfied with their job and employer, but the interviews emphasised the urgent need of staff and workload improvements.

As a conclusion the study demonstrates the importance of quality provision within an e-government with regard to its electronic system in use and with regard to environmental factors in order to have satisfied employees who are willing and able (due to the aid of IT systems) to provide high quality of service delivery

7.2 Limitations

The present study’s limitation is the number of respondents from the questionnaire. The link of the questionnaire was sent to all employees working with CBL. Although all of
the twenty-five employees working with CBL declared themselves to participate in the
interviews, only fifteen of them completed the questionnaire. This is not a representative
sample size and thus the results cannot be generalized at all. It is very likely that the results
from this study will be different with a bigger sample size. For future research the
questionnaire should be forwarded to all employees of the partner organisations.

Furthermore, the questionnaires were self-reports and as such another threat to the
study’s reliability. It is not given that the participants exposed the whole truth, especially
concerning the questions covering their extra role customer service behaviour and service
quality. The threat of self-reports could have been avoided when the questionnaire would
have been distributed to different groups of participants. For future research the construct
*Extra Role Customer Service Behaviour* should be evaluated by the manager, giving the
opinion on the particular employee’s behaviour. Additionally, the construct *Service Quality*
should be evaluated by customers.

Furthermore, the present study is a case study of a governmental institution in North
England. Although, the interviews and the questionnaire were conducted in five different
partner organisations, they all belong to the same district. Therefore, social and cultural
aspects and differences might have influenced the results.

Despite the limitations and although only fifteen participants have completed the
questionnaire, the present research investigated determinants of e-government employees’ job
satisfaction. Based on those determinants a model was developed with which the internal
quality of e-government can be measured by means of the attached questionnaire. In this way
possible improvements for its service quality can be detected.
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Appendix A

The following shows the interview summary sheet which has been used during each interview, including the introduction text, a description of the study’s purpose, declaration of confidentiality and the acknowledgement at the end.

My Name is Pia Kroll and I am a master student from the University of Twente in the Netherlands. I am here to conduct my master thesis with the topic of how to improve the service quality of Compass.

I would like to interview you on this topic and I promise that everything what is said is kept confidentially.

The interview will take approximately 20 minutes.
Do you mind if I tape the interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Years of working:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal working place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to work properly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere/ climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- anything missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- appreciate the most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable, why</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointing Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Managers/ Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to manager/ employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- colleague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other partner organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- impact/ changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- problem/ improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything else you would like to say in relation to what we have been discussing? Thank you very much for participating and have a nice day.
Appendix B

An extract of the interview matrix is shown above. The complete version can be found on the enclosed CD in Appendix F on page 54.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Gail Atkinson</th>
<th>Carol Bruce-Manager</th>
<th>Angela Cammish-Manager</th>
<th>Liah Beachill-Manager</th>
<th>Kalsoom Din</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Quality</strong></td>
<td>job performance</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>job performance, customer care</td>
<td>job performance, relationships, communication, structure, management</td>
<td>structure, customer care, communication, management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs</strong></td>
<td>technology, management, relationships, management support, team work, relationships, approachability, empathy</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>relationships, respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal working place</strong></td>
<td>team work, working moral, communication, approachability</td>
<td>trust, honesty, approachability, reliability, equity, empathy</td>
<td>environment, relationships, communication, approachability, accessibility</td>
<td>structure, communication, approachability, accessibility</td>
<td>friendly, welcoming, warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate</strong></td>
<td>good, relationships, team work, working moral, knowing job roles</td>
<td>good, team work, management</td>
<td>ok, relationships, environment</td>
<td>changes, struggle</td>
<td>customer behaviour, friendly, joy, workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication to Manager</strong></td>
<td>good, approachability, education</td>
<td>very good, relationships, respect, empathy</td>
<td>good, approachable management, trust, education, trust</td>
<td>good, slow, rumor, approachability</td>
<td>approachability, relationships, empathy, intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication to Colleagues</strong></td>
<td>relationships, fine</td>
<td>knowing job roles, relationships, good</td>
<td>support, good, nice</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>open, support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to Partner Orga</td>
<td>approachability, fine</td>
<td>structure, ok</td>
<td>structure, working morale, involvement, very good</td>
<td>good, team work</td>
<td>no contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Communication to M or C</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>seriousness</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>motivation, employee retainment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>yes, relationships</td>
<td>yes, relationships, challenging, job</td>
<td>yes, job, support, organisation's reputation</td>
<td>yes, job, customer care, relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate</td>
<td>approachability, support, team work, education, empathy</td>
<td>team work</td>
<td>relationships, support</td>
<td>job, support, organisation' s reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>no, same level</td>
<td>yes, respect as superior</td>
<td>No, approachable useful</td>
<td>No, equity, empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Day</td>
<td>customer care, meet the target</td>
<td>meet the target, customer care, achieve something</td>
<td>meet the target, achieve something, done a lot</td>
<td>customer care, meet the target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissapointing Day</td>
<td>meet the target, customer care, customer behaviour</td>
<td>meet the target, challenge, work load</td>
<td></td>
<td>customer behaviour, progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of Manager</td>
<td>empathy, support</td>
<td>trust, honesty, approachability, reliability, equity, empathy, support, challenge, knowing job roles</td>
<td>approachability, empathy, support</td>
<td>honesty, communication, support, structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of Colleagues</td>
<td>relationships, equity, support</td>
<td>trust, honesty, reliability, relationships, support</td>
<td>working moral, customer care</td>
<td>honesty, approachability, team work, responsibility</td>
<td>responsibility, equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggest Problem</td>
<td>structure, knowing job roles, communication, structure</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>staff, workload,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement (general)</td>
<td>staff, education, structure, team work</td>
<td>support, involvement</td>
<td>staff, payment</td>
<td>structure, communication, team work</td>
<td>staff, workload,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL</td>
<td>good system, behind the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>efficiency, clarity, transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggest Problem CBL</td>
<td>internet access, ease of use, understanding skills</td>
<td>ease of use, elderly, understanding, internet access</td>
<td>understanding, dublicates, transferring information, time consuming, ease of use, inconsistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement CBL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Goal</td>
<td>meaningful job</td>
<td>customer care</td>
<td>survive the day</td>
<td></td>
<td>customer care, meaningful job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

The memory cards of the interview codes and sorted according to the context they were mentioned.

The resulting categories:
Appendix D

The Word Cloud of the interview answers concerning the employees’ opinion on CBL.

Created by www.wordle.net.
Appendix E

The complete and original questionnaire including the removed items which are signed as crossed out. The online version of the questionnaire, including further results, can be found in the Appendix F.

---

e-Government Job Satisfaction Survey

Dear all,

This year in June I have conducted several interviews with some of your colleagues in order to find out how we can improve the service quality of the choice based lettings scheme (CBL). In particular, my interest is in what you, as an employee, need for delivering good service. Therefore, I am investigating your degree of satisfaction within the current work environment.

With your support in completing the following questionnaire hopefully we will find a way to improve CBL, and definitely you will have contributed to my graduation.

For sure, all documents and information will be kept in private and confidence and exclusively used for the purpose of my master thesis.

Thank you very much.

Pia Kroll

**Independent variables**

**Working atmosphere:**
- We have a good atmosphere here at work
- We have enough time to relax
- We have enough time to socialize
- We have a balanced workload

**Interpersonal Relationships**
- I have a good relationship to the people I work with
- The people I work with are honest
- The people I work with respect each other
- Whenever I have a concern I can go to the people I work with
- The people I work with appreciate my work
- The people I work with are approachable
- I trust the people I work with

**Working Morale**
- We have a good working morale
- We have a good team work
- We support and help each other out
- We work professionally
- We can rely on each other
- Everyone works as hard as I do
- Everyone does their duties
- Everyone does what he/ she is supposed to do
- Everyone tries to meet the target

**Communication Culture**
- We have a good communication
- I receive enough information from the people I work with
- I receive the information I need on time
- We have enough face-to-face meetings
- I am sufficiently involved in what is happening
- The people I need to communicate with are reachable
Employer Characteristics
My employer has a good reputation
My employer offers me good future opportunities
My employer pays me enough salary
My employer has a good human resource management (e.g.: having enough staff)
My employer gives me enough training
My employer gives me enough job security
My employer offers me the facilities (e.g.: technology, work environment) I need
My employer has standardised and consistent policies

Leadership Characteristics
My manager gives me enough explanations
My manager has enough time
My manager is approachable
My manager appreciates my work
My manager gives enough feedback
My manager is listening to me
My manager is trustworthy
My manager gives me enough support
My manager is able to delegate tasks to the team
My manager knows his job
I can go to my manager whenever I have a concern
My manager is able to solve my problems
My manager gives constructive criticism

Quality of Information Technology (CBL)

Efficiency
CBL makes it easy to find what I need
CBL enables me to complete a transaction quickly
CBL loads its pages quickly
CBL is simple to use
CBL is well organized
I save time by working with CBL
I have less work to do with the CBL
CBL has improved my work

Information flow
I receive the information I need (concerning CBL)
The information I need is well organized (concerning CBL)
The Information I need is well interlinked (concerning CBL)

Ease of use
I have the skills to work with the CBL
CBL is easy to use

System availability
CBL is always available
CBL launches and runs right away
CBL does not crash
CBL does not freeze after I enter my order information

Dependent Variables

Overall job satisfaction
I am satisfied with my job
I am satisfied with my career path within the organization
I am happy with what I am doing with the current job

Extra role customer service behaviour
I voluntarily assist customers even if it means going beyond the job requirements
I often go beyond and above the call of duty when serving customers
I frequently go out of the way when to help customers I try very hard to help customers

Service quality
Our customers receive prompt service from us
We are never too busy to respond to our customers’ requests
Our behaviour instill confidence in our customers
Our customers feel safe with the transactions they do with us
We are always friendly to our customers
We have the ability to answer our customers’ questions
We pay enough attention to our customers
We have our customers’ best interests at heart
We understand our customers’ specific needs

Demographics

Age
What is your age?

Years of Work
For how many years have you been in this organization?

Education
What is your highest educational level?
  GCSE
  A-Level
  Certificate/ Diploma of higher education others
  Bachelor Degree or others
  Master Degree or others
  Doctorial Degree or others

Gender
What is your gender
  Female
  Male

Job position
What is your job position?
  Manager/ Team leader
  Employee

Thank you very much for participation and all the best.
Pia Kroll

Results of the online questionnaire in percentages

We have a good atmosphere here at work
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have enough time to relax
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement Level</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have enough time to socialize
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have a balanced workload
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have a good relationship to the people I work with
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The people I work with are honest
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The people I work with respect each other
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whenever I have a concern I can go to the people I work with
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I trust the people I work with
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1  0 (0 %)
2  1 (6.67 %)
3  4 (26.67 %)
4  4 (26.67 %)
5  6 (40 %)

We do not have a good working morale
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1  5 (33.33 %)
2  3 (20 %)
3  5 (33.33 %)
4  1 (6.67 %)
5  1 (6.67 %)

We have good team work
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  2 (13.33 %)
4  6 (40 %)
5  7 (46.67 %)

We support and help each other out
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  2 (13.33 %)
4  6 (40 %)
5  7 (46.67 %)

We work professionally
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  2 (13.33 %)
4  6 (40 %)
5  7 (46.67 %)

We can rely on each other
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1  0 (0 %)
2  0 (0 %)
3  4 (26.67 %)
4  4 (26.67 %)
5  7 (46.67 %)
Everyone works as hard as I do  
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (33.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everyone does what he/she is supposed to do  
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (26.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (46.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our communication is rather bad  
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (53.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I receive enough information from the people I work with  
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (26.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (53.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I receive the information I need on time  
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (26.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (46.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have enough face-to-face meetings  
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (33.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (33.33 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am not sufficiently involved in what is happening
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 3 (20 %)
2 3 (20 %)
3 4 (26.67 %)
4 4 (26.67 %)
5 1 (6.67 %)

The people I need to communicate with are reachable
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 0 (0 %)
2 1 (6.67 %)
3 2 (13.33 %)
4 5 (33.33 %)
5 7 (46.67 %)

My employer offers me good future opportunities
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 1 (6.67 %)
2 2 (13.33 %)
3 3 (20 %)
4 6 (40 %)
5 3 (20 %)

My employer has good human resource management (e.g.: we have enough staff)
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 1 (6.67 %)
2 4 (26.67 %)
3 4 (26.67 %)
4 5 (33.33 %)
5 1 (6.67 %)

My employer gives me enough training
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 0 (0 %)
2 2 (13.33 %)
3 4 (26.67 %)
4 5 (33.33 %)
5 4 (26.67 %)

My employer gives me enough job security
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 0 (0 %)
2 4 (26.67 %)
3 2 (13.33 %)
4 4 (26.67 %)
5 5 (33.33 %)

My employer offers me the facilities (e.g.: technology, work environment) I...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employer has standardised and consistent policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (53.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (26.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (33.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (40 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager appreciates my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (13.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (53.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (33.33 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager gives enough feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (40 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (20 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (26.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (60 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager gives me enough support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (6.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (26.67 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (60 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1. My manager is able to delegate tasks to the team
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 3 (20 %)
   - 5 (33.33 %)
   - 7 (46.67 %)

2. I can go to my manager whenever I have a concern
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 2 (13.33 %)
   - 8 (53.33 %)
   - 5 (33.33 %)

3. CBL makes it easy to find what I need
   - 1 (7.14 %)
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 2 (14.29 %)
   - 8 (57.14 %)
   - 3 (21.43 %)

4. CBL enables me to complete a transaction quickly
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 1 (7.14 %)
   - 5 (35.71 %)
   - 7 (50 %)
   - 1 (7.14 %)

5. I can navigate around the CBL system quickly
   - 1 (6.67 %)
   - 0 (0 %)
   - 4 (26.67 %)
   - 3 (20 %)
   - 7 (46.67 %)

CBL is not well organized
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not save time by working with CBL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have less work to do with CBL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL has improved my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive the information I need (refers to CBL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information I need is well organized (refers to CBL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Information I need is well interlinked (refers to CBL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

I have the skills to work with CBL

CBL is easy to use

CBL is always available

CBL launches and runs right away

CBL crashes frequently

The CBL screen does not freeze after I enter my order information
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)

1. I am satisfied with my job

2. I am satisfied with my career path within the organization

3. I am happy with what I am doing with the current job

4. I voluntarily assist customers even if it means going beyond the job requir...

5. I often go beyond and above the call of duty when serving customers

6. I try very hard to help customers
Our customers receive prompt service from us
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 0 (0 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 3 (20 %)
4 6 (40 %)
5 6 (40 %)

We are never too busy to respond to our customers' requests
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 1 (6.67 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 2 (13.33 %)
4 7 (46.67 %)
5 5 (33.33 %)

Our behaviour instills confidence in our customers
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 1 (6.67 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 2 (13.33 %)
4 5 (33.33 %)
5 7 (46.67 %)

Our customers feel safe with the transactions they do with us
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 0 (0 %)
2 0 (0 %)
3 3 (20 %)
4 7 (46.67 %)
5 5 (33.33 %)

We are always friendly to our customers
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 0 (0 %)
2 2 (13.33 %)
3 1 (6.67 %)
4 5 (33.33 %)
5 7 (46.67 %)

We do not have the ability to answer our customers' questions
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1 7 (46.67 %)
2 7 (46.67 %)
3 0 (0 %)
We pay enough attention to our customers
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1. 0 (0 %)
2. 0 (0 %)
3. 2 (13.33 %)
4. 7 (46.67 %)
5. 6 (40 %)

We have our customers' best interests at heart
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1. 0 (0 %)
2. 1 (6.67 %)
3. 0 (0 %)
4. 6 (40 %)
5. 8 (53.33 %)

We understand our customers' specific needs
Please indicate in how far you agree with this statement (totally disagree - totally agree)
1. 0 (0 %)
2. 1 (6.67 %)
3. 1 (6.67 %)
4. 9 (60 %)
5. 4 (26.67 %)

What is your highest educational level?
- GCSE: 3 (20 %)
- A-Level: 4 (26.67 %)
- Certificate/Diploma of higher education or others: 5 (33.33 %)
- Bachelor Degree or others: 2 (13.33 %)
- Master Degree or others: 1 (6.67 %)
- Doctoral Degree or others: 0 (0 %)

What is your gender?
- Female: 12 (80 %)
- Male: 3 (20 %)

What is your job position?
- Manager/ Team leader: 5 (33.33 %)
- Employee: 10 (66.67 %)
Appendix F

Overview of categories detected by the second researcher Julia Lange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Explanation/ items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>amount of work (pressure, very busy), have time to socialize, to come down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships: client-employee relationship (CER), employee-employee relationship (EER)</td>
<td>understand each other, being honest, be approachable, trust, respect, rewarding/appreciate, customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>team work, support, do their jobs, know their jobs, be committed, being fair, on time, meet targets, stay up to date, same aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>being approachable and reachable, all access to same info, Pass on information, meetings or F2F, taking notes, be involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Reputation, future opportunities, payment, good human resource management (staff shortage), get regular training/having skills, job security, get challenging tasks, working policies/procedures/structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>rules, regulations, structures, efficiency, how to do things, work standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Job performance</td>
<td>having skills, being adaptable, understanding of all sections, politeness, achieved a lot, being content, being proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>facilities, equipment, work conditions, quietness, bigger office, plants, it-system, desk, kitchen, open office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>support, manage, time to explain, positive and negative feedback, listen, understand and resolve problems, trust, confidentiality, lead, approachability, have competencies, advice, be interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Appendix G

CD including

a. the full length of transcribed interviews and its records, as well as
b. the matrix of the analysed interviews in form of keywords, and
c. the online version of the questionnaire including the results and SPSS output.