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The primary objectives of the present study were to explore the level of job satisfaction and commitment among private sector employees in Saudi Arabia, and to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and employees' commitment.

Seven alternative hypotheses were tested against seven null hypotheses. Chi-square \((x^2)\) was the test statistic for all seven hypotheses. The critical value of chi-square was determined by the degrees of freedom \((df)\) and an alpha level of .05. Three hypotheses were confirmed that related job satisfaction to employees' commitment, satisfaction with length of working hours, and satisfaction with opportunities for interaction with co-workers on the job. Hypotheses that were not supported related job satisfaction to income, education level, age, and marital status.

The results in this study confirm that job satisfaction and commitment are positively related among private sector employees as predicted. In addition, the study demonstrated that employees in the private sector have a high level of satisfaction and commitment to their job and to the organization itself.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For over 50 years, job satisfaction has been the focus of repeated studies. An estimate by Locke (1976) suggested that over 3,000 studies have been produced to date, and the number today is certainly larger. Thus, job satisfaction remains the most common topic studied relative to the work place. Most employees spend a large part of their lives at work, so an understanding of factors involved in job satisfaction is an important aspect in the overall happiness of employees' lives. More recently, the concept of organizational commitment has gained increased attention and has been related to a variety of outcome variables, including job satisfaction (Mathieu, 1991, p. 607).

Saudi Arabia has had massive development for the last twenty years. The Saudi government has a program to encourage development of the private sector. The government has also encouraged the private sector to employ Saudi citizens. In addition, the Institute of Public Administration has designated different programs for training to enable Saudis to participate in the private sector. Therefore, investigating the problems of Saudi employees' attitude toward their work environment is a very significant issue.

According to the Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1989) (cited in Al-Hajri, 1990), people in Saudi Arabia have a negative
attitude toward working in the private sector for the following reasons: (a) it demands long working hours—45 hours per week, (b) it has tight control of the day-to-day work load schedule, (c) it requires direct contact between workers and owners in some organizations, and (d) each Saudi private sector employee is required to pay 8 percent of his salary to the Social Insurance Agency, which he does not have to do in the public sector. Thus, in this present study, it is very important to investigate how commitment affects job satisfaction and to explore the level of job satisfaction and job commitment among Saudi employees in private organizations in Saudi Arabia.

Statement of the Problem

Employee attitudes are important to human resource management because they affect organizational behavior. In particular, attitudes relating to job satisfaction and organizational commitment are of major interest to the field of organizational behavior and the practice of human resource management. Job satisfaction focuses on employees' attitudes toward their job and organizational commitment focuses on their attitudes toward the overall organization (Luthans, 1992, p. 113).

Thus, the problem of this thesis is to explore the level of job satisfaction and commitment among Saudi employees in private organizations in Riyadh City, Saudi Arabia. The purpose of this study is to explore: (a) the degree of job satisfaction and commitment among employees in the private sector in Saudi Arabia, (b) how commitment
affects job satisfaction in the private sector in Saudi Arabia, and (c) the relationship between job satisfaction and selected demographic characteristics of the private sector employees in Saudi Arabia.

Significance of the Problem

Job satisfaction has been studied in both public and private sectors by both management and psychology scholars. Management studies have concentrated on work and environment characteristics or job context. Psychologists have considered, on the other hand, the individual's characteristics and work and environment characteristics. Most of these studies, however, have been done in the United States of America and in Europe (Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 109).

According to the Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1989), (cited in Al-Hajri, 1990) the private sector in Saudi Arabia is not willing to hire Saudi workers for the following reasons:

1. Saudi workers are less committed to the organization they work for because they are always looking for better chances and a higher salary.

2. Foreign workers will work in any place the organization asks them to, while Saudis prefer to work in those places near their families.

3. Those from the foreign work force can be hired at a low salary rate and have a higher rate of productivity.

4. For each Saudi employee, the private sector employer is required to pay 8 percent of the worker's basic salary to the Social
Insurance Agency, and must pay the Saudi worker compensation for service when the contract is terminated by the owner.

5. The kind and quality of characteristics that an employer wants are not always available in the Saudi workers.

6. It is easier to get visas for foreign workers, and to have them ready faster, than to find Saudis who meet the organization's immediate needs.

7. It is easier to terminate the contract and send away the foreign worker in case of dispute or project completion.

For the reasons above, research in this neglected area is needed to explore employees' attitudes in private organization environment which would help the Ministry of Planning in Saudi Arabia to improve employee satisfaction and commitment to its human resources development programs.

Definition of Terms

Job Satisfaction

Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as "any combination of physiological, psychological, and environmental circumstances causing a person truthfully to say 'I am satisfied with my job,'" (Hopkins, 1983, p. 21).

Kreitner & Kinicki (1992) defined job satisfaction as an affective or emotional response toward various facets of one's job. In other words, job satisfaction involves a person's positive (or
negative) feelings about his or her job (p. 58).

Organizational Commitment

Porter, Steers, & Mowday (1974) defined organizational commitment in terms of the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Such commitment can generally be characterized by at least three factors: "(a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership," (p. 604).

Private Sector

According to the Business Dictionary (1984), the private sector is the part of the economy that includes individuals, corporations, small business, and other institutions that are not under government control (p. 133). The private sector in this study is composed of private organizations which may receive a government subsidy, but make decisions without government control.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The study of job satisfaction has enjoyed a long history in the discipline of industrial and organizational psychology. Since Hoppock's *Monograph on Job Satisfaction* in 1935, a substantial amount of research has been conducted on this topic (Vroom, 1964, p. 99).

The literature review will concentrate on theoretical approaches related to job satisfaction, some previous studies conducted to test relationships among various factors and job satisfaction, studies on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and finally, some studies conducted about job satisfaction in Saudi Arabia.

Theoretical Approach

According to Taylor's (1910), "Scientific Management," the basic factor which determines the quality of working life was the financial monetary factor. In the 1930s and 40s there was great interest in wage incentive plans, but gradually this approach has declined. In modern industries and organizations, the emphasis has shifted away from financial rewards to reward systems based upon other values. So, in the late fifties, the focus of attention was directed from the financial incentive concerns to such factors as satisfaction, motivation, and quality (Sinha, 1986).

The best known theories relevant to job satisfaction are Maslow's
Hierarchy of Needs, two-factor theory of Herzberg, Alderfer's E.R.G. theory, expectancy theory and equity theory.

Maslow and the Need Hierarchy Theory

The "need hierarchy" theory of Abraham Maslow (1943) became most significant in job satisfaction research. Maslow's theory was based on the idea that an individual's needs develop in a sequence from "lower order to higher order" needs (Carroll, 1973).

According to Johns (1983), Maslow identified five levels of needs that are arranged in a hierarchy, beginning with the most basic and compelling needs (see Figure 1).

![Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs](image)

Figure 1. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs.

**Physiological Needs**

These include those needs that must be satisfied for the person to survive, including food, water, oxygen, shelter, and so on. Organizational factors that might satisfy these needs include the minimum pay necessary for survival and working conditions that promote
existence.

Safety Needs

As people fulfill physiological needs, they gradually become more concerned with the safety needs for security, stability, freedom from anxiety, and a structured and ordered environment. Organizational conditions that might meet these needs include safe working conditions, fair and sensible rules and regulations, job security, a comfortable work environment, and pay above the minimum needed for survival.

Social Needs

These include needs for social interaction, affection, love, belongingness, companionship, and friendship. Organizational factors that might meet these needs include the opportunity to interact with others on the job, friendly and supportive supervision, opportunity for teamwork, and the opportunity to develop new social relationships.

Esteem Needs

The esteem needs represents the higher needs of humans. The need for power, achievement, independence, confidence and the deserved appreciation and recognition of these characteristics by others. Organizational factors that might satisfy these needs include the opportunity to master tasks leading to feelings of achievement and responsibility. Also, awards, promotions, prestigious job titles, professional recognition, and the like may satisfy needs when they are
felt to be truly deserved.

**Self-Actualization Needs**

The final level, self-actualization, is the state in which the person desires and attempts all that he or she is innately capable of becoming (Larwood, 1989, p. 82). Maslow suggests that self-actualizing people have clear perceptions of reality, accept themselves and others and are independent, creative, and appreciative of the world around them. Organizational conditions that might provide self-actualization include absorbing jobs with the potential for creativity and growth as well as a relaxation of structure to permit self-development and personal progression (Johns, 1983, pp. 178-179).

In support of the Maslow's approach, many studies have found that self-actualization and autonomy, or the highest need categories, were felt to be most important and least fulfilled across most levels of management (Porter, 1962). According to Kreitner & Kinicki (1992), research does not clearly support this theory because results from studies testing the need hierarchy are difficult to interpret (p. 167).

**Herzberg's Theory**

In 1959, psychologist Frederick Herzberg and two colleagues reported a study in which 203 accountants and engineers in the Pittsburgh area were asked to discuss a time when they felt exceptionally good about their job and a time when they felt exceptionally bad (Herzberg, 1959).
Herzberg found that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are produced by different work factors. What makes people satisfied at work are factors that relate to the content of their jobs, specifically, achievement, recognition for achievement, interesting work, increased responsibility, growth, and advancement. On the other hand, what makes people unhappy at work is not what they do but how well (or poorly) they are treated. These treatment factors (dissatisfiers) are related not to the content of work, but to the context of the job. The main factors in this group are company policy and administration practices, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security. To Herzberg, because these factors describe the job context and, in their negative aspects, serve to provide job dissatisfaction, we have called them hygiene factors, symbolizing the fact that they represent preventive and environmental conditions of work (Herzberg, 1974).

The satisfier factors are known as motivators because if they are present in appropriate amounts in any organization, they bring about work motivation as corollary to their creating positive attitudes of job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1974).

Since the publication of The Motivation to Work by Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman in 1959, many studies have examined the two-factor theory. Bordier (1988) stated that rated achievement and interpersonal relationships with co-workers are work incentives. Opportunity for advancement and working conditions on the other hand, were seen as disincentives (p. 155).
Overall, Herzberg added much to the better understanding of job content factors and satisfaction, but he fell short of a comprehensive theory of work motivation and satisfaction. His model describes only some of the content of work motivation; it does not adequately describe the complex motivation/satisfaction process of organizational participants (Luthans, 1992, pp. 160-161).

Alderfer's ERG Theory

Clayton Alderfer has developed another need theory called ERG theory. It involves a streamlining of Maslow's need classifications and some different assumptions about the relationship between need and satisfaction/motivation (Johns, 1983).

According to Johns (1983) Alderfer identified three categories of needs:

1. Existence Needs. These are needs that are satisfied by some material substance or condition. These include the need for food, shelter, pay, and safe working conditions.

2. Relatedness Needs. These are needs that are satisfied by open communication and exchange of thoughts and feelings with other organizational members.

3. Growth Needs. These are needs that are fulfilled by strong personal involvement in the work setting. They involve the full utilization of one's skills and abilities and the creative development of new skills and abilities. Growth needs correspond to Maslow's need for self-actualization and some aspects of his esteem needs (p. 180).
Unlike Maslow and Herzberg, Alderfer does not contend that a lower-level need has to be fulfilled before a higher-level need is motivating or that deprivation is the only way to activate a need. For example, under ERG theory, the person's background or cultural environment may dictate that the relatedness needs will take precedence over unfulfilled existence needs and that the more the growth needs are satisfied, the more they will increase in intensity (Luthans, 1992).

**Vroom's Expectancy Theory**

Victor Vroom formulated a mathematical model of expectancy theory in his 1964 book, *Work and Motivation*. The basic idea underlying expectancy theory is the belief that satisfaction/motivation is determined by the outcomes that people expect to occur as a result of their actions on the job (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Johns, 1983).

According to Vroom (1964), there are many outcomes which are positively or negatively valent to persons, but are not in themselves anticipated to be satisfying or dissatisfying. The strength of a person's desire or aversion for them is based not on their intrinsic propensities, but on the anticipated satisfaction or dissatisfaction associated with other outcomes to which they are expected to lead. People may desire to join groups because they believe that membership will enhance their status in the community, and they may desire to perform their jobs effectively because they expect that it will lead to a promotion. (pp. 15, 16).

Expectancy Theory model is built around three concepts as follows:

1. **Valence.** As Vroom used the term, it refers to the positive or negative value people place on outcomes.
2. Expectancy. According to Vroom's terminology, this represents an individual's belief that a particular degree of effort will be followed by a particular level of performance.

3. Instrumentality. It represents a person's belief that a particular outcome is contingent on accomplishing a specific level of performance. Performance is instrumental when it leads to something else. For example, passing exams is instrumental to graduating from college (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992, pp. 213-214).

Equity Theory

As a theory of work motivation and satisfaction, equity theory was developed by J. Stacy Adams. The theory argues that a major input into job performance and satisfaction is the degree of equity (or inequity) that people perceive in their work situation (Luthans, 1992). According to Johns (1983), equity theory asserts that workers compare the inputs they invest in their jobs and the outcomes they receive against the inputs and outcomes of some other relevant person or group. When their ratios are equal, the worker should feel that a fair and equitable exchange exists with the employing organization. Such fair exchange should contribute to job satisfaction. When the ratios are unequal, dissatisfaction should be experienced (p. 191).

Overall, equity model satisfaction is a function of how "fairly" an individual is treated at work. Satisfaction results from one's perception that work outcomes relative to inputs compares favorably with a significant other's outcomes/inputs (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992,
Previous Studies in Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction most frequently is studied as a correlate of other variables or clusters of variables. Even where the method is cross-sectional, however, the most logical inference from most studies is that job satisfaction is implicitly assumed to be an outcome variable determined at least in part by variation in the other concept or concepts being studied. The areas most frequently investigated as determinants of job satisfaction are goal setting, demographic profile, reward system, organizational characteristics, leadership, decision participation, and individual differences (Chadha, 1988, p. 106).

But one of the problems confronting the industrial psychologist is to account for the fact that people differ in the extent to which they report satisfaction with their jobs. It is typically assumed that the explanation of these differences lies in the nature of the jobs which these people perform. They express different amounts of job satisfaction because they have different supervisors or different co-workers, because they work for different companies, or because they have different duties (Vroom, 1964, pp. 104-105).

Thus, a number of studies have been conducted to test relationships among job satisfaction and various factors of job attitude (Chadh, 1988; Weaver, 1977; Snyder & Mayo, 1991; Bokemeier & Lacy, 1987; and McNeely, 1988).

Bokemeier and Lacy (1987) studied job values, rewards, and work
conditions as factors in job satisfaction among American women and men workers. The finding confirms that women receive significantly fewer job rewards than men, have significantly different job conditions, and possess slightly different work values. However, there is no difference in job satisfaction between women and men; as a consequence these factors may not affect levels of job satisfaction or men's and women's job satisfaction may be determined by different determinants.

McNeely (1988) conducted a study about age and job satisfaction in human service among 1,337 human service workers. The finding was that older workers were significantly more job satisfied than younger workers. The contributing factors to the higher satisfaction of older workers is that older workers constitute the survivors of those who entered human services work at an earlier age and working conditions tend to be superior to those of others engaged in similar work (p. 167).

In a study of the relationships among pay, race, sex, occupational prestige, supervision, work autonomy, and job satisfaction, Weaver (1977) found that pay, race, occupational prestige, supervisory status, and work autonomy are associated with job satisfaction and that sex is not (Weaver, 1977, p. 437).

Moltaz (1986) conducted a study about gender differences in work satisfaction, work-related rewards and values, and the determinants of work satisfaction. The findings show that there is no significant difference between men and women in overall work satisfaction. Both men and women in higher-level occupations report significantly higher
levels of work satisfaction than their counterparts in lower-level occupations. These findings confirm that overall satisfaction is positively related to occupational level, but not related to gender (p. 364).

Humphrys and O'Brien (1986) examined the relationship between skill utilization, professional orientation and job satisfaction for pharmacists. They found that community, not hospital, pharmacists had significantly lower levels of skill utilization and job satisfaction than that found for other professional occupations. Skill utilization was the major predictor of job satisfaction (p. 315).

Bhushan and Sinha (1987) conducted a study comparing job satisfaction in two major steel plants, Bhilai Steel Plant (BSP) in the public sector, and the Tata Iron and Steel Company (TISCO) in the private sector. They found that workers drawn from the public sector industry (BSP) were significantly higher in overall job satisfaction than those from the private sector industry (TISCO). The results also indicate that the BSP workers have scored significantly higher than the TISCO workers in three of the five dimensions of job satisfaction, i.e., pay, relations with superiors and relation with peers (p. 25).

Chadha (1988) conducted a study of the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction among 150 supervisors in an automobile manufacturing organization. The organizational climate consisted of eight dimensions, while job satisfaction was measured relevant to the work situation areas viz interpersonal relations, task involvement, self-realization, and opportunities for recognizable
advancement. Results indicated that organization climate had varying impacts on different types of satisfaction.

In a study that examined levels of job satisfaction for MPA graduates employed in the public, private and non-profit sectors, Blunt and Spring (1991) found that MPA graduates derive greater satisfaction with pay and promotion opportunities in the private sector than in the public of non-profit sector. No significant differences were noted between the sectors with regard to work satisfaction or satisfaction with supervisor or co-workers. Also, findings show that no differences in levels of satisfaction were noted between pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers of public sector employment, federal, state, regional or local (p. 449).

Organizational Commitment Studies

Recently, the nature of the relationship between job satisfaction and organization commitment has been a point of debate among researchers (Mathieu, 1991; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; and Mathieu & Farrell, 1991).

Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) studied patterns in organizational commitment and job satisfaction across time as they relate to turnover among a sample of employees, psychiatric technicians. They found that satisfaction represents an unstable and immediate affective reaction to the work environment compared with organizational commitment, which they viewed as a long-term, slower developing attitude. Therefore, they proposed that satisfaction would
causally precede organizational commitment.

Mathieu (1991) conducted a study of a cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. He found that commitment and satisfaction were depicted as reciprocally related, although the influence of satisfaction on commitment was found to be stronger than the reverse effect (p. 616).

Farrell and Rusbult's (1981) study was designed to explore the ability of investment model to predict job satisfaction, job commitment, and job turnover. They found that job satisfaction was best predicted by the reward and cost value of the job, and job commitment was best predicted by a combination of reward and cost values, alternative value, and investment size. Both satisfaction and commitment were correlated with job turnover, but job commitment was more strongly related to turnover than was satisfaction.

Mathieu and Farr (1991) investigated the relationship between job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The results of this study provided evidence for the discriminant validity of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job involvement among employees sampled from three different populations.

Studies in Saudi Arabia

Al-Hajri (1990) studied the effect of organization type on job satisfaction in private and public sector employees in Saudi Arabia. The finding indicated that the private sector is more satisfied than the public sector with eight job satisfaction factors (responsibility,
recognition and relationship with peers and subordinates, working conditions, opportunity for advancement, personal development and opportunity to make own decision, time demands and requirements of the job, organizational policies and personal recognition, social status, and security and salary) and dissatisfied with one factor (supervisory techniques).

By using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Al-Adaily (1981) studied job satisfaction/dissatisfaction for Saudi government employees (managers and workers) in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. He found that employees were satisfied with: responsibility, recognition, relationship with peers and subordinates, working conditions, and supervisory techniques; and less satisfied with salary and security, organizational policies and personal recognition and time demands and requirements of the job. But in general, he found that government employees were satisfied in their job.

Al-Goblan (1981) studied the effects of job training on job satisfaction in Saudi Arabia. He found that employees are more satisfied with items such as working conditions, co-workers, and steadiness of employment and less satisfied with items that are related to organizational policies and management (p. 61).

Al-Khaldi (1983) conducted studies on job content and context factors related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction in three occupational levels of the public sector in Saudi Arabia. The findings indicated that employees at a higher occupational level were more satisfied with job content factors than the employees on lower levels,
but only in three content factors: achievement, work itself and recognition. Lack of the responsibility was closely associated with dissatisfaction among all employees and they had no participation in making decisions. Also, findings indicated that all employees had low satisfaction with their opportunities for advancement and their salary (p. 188-189).

Al-Amri (1992) conducted a study about job satisfaction among public school teachers in the Riyadh area of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. He found that overall job satisfaction was moderate. Satisfaction with achievement, activity, compensation, supervision/human relations, supervision/technical, co-workers, independence, moral values, and social status was high. Satisfaction with school policies and practices, creativity, security, social services, and working conditions was moderate. And finally, satisfaction with ability utilization, advancement, authority, recognition, responsibility, and variety was low (p. 51).

Research Hypotheses

The following major hypotheses for the study were formulated based on the literature review:

1. More highly paid employees are more satisfied with their work than lower paid employees.

2. There is a relationship between job satisfaction and level of education.

3. Older employees are significantly more job satisfied than
younger employees.

4. There is a positive relationship between employees' commitment and job satisfaction.

5. There is a relation between job satisfaction and satisfaction with length of working hours.

6. Married employees have a higher degree of job satisfaction than do single employees.

7. Employees' satisfaction with their jobs is related to their satisfaction with opportunities for interaction with co-workers on the job.
CHAPTER XII

STUDY DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This chapter presents the design and procedures of the study, including: the population selected, operational measurement, procedures used in translation and pre-testing the questionnaire, and data collection.

Population and Sampling

The population of interest for this research study is Saudi employees in private sector organizations which are located in Riyadh, the capital city of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The sample consists of private organizations which are representative of the private sector organizations. Four organizations were randomly chosen to participate in this study from organizations located in Riyadh. These organizations are: (1) Saudi Basic Industries Corporation (SABIC), (2) Saudi Consolidated Electric Company in the central region, (3) Saudi Arabia Marketing and Refining Company (SAMARC), and (4) The National Shipping Company of Saudi Arabia. These types of private organizations have similar characteristics and policy. These policies were adopted by the Saudi government to reflect the new economic conditions which focus on: (a) increasing opportunities for the private sector to acquire, manage, and operate projects by the government; (b) encouraging and facilitating private sector investment; and (c) becoming involved in the

The sample was selected from organizations listed on the computer network at the Institute of Public Administration in Riyadh City, Saudi Arabia. The population list is organized to be representative of private organizations. From these organizations, approximately 450 employees were randomly chosen to participate in the study.

Operational Measurement

Measurement of Job Satisfaction

There are many ways to measure job satisfaction, but in this study, the investigator used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) which was designed by David J. Weiss, Rene V. Dawis, George W. England, and Lloyd H. Lofquist in 1967. The MSQ is an instrument that measures satisfaction with several different aspects of the work environment (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire consists of two forms: the short form, and the long form of 100 items. The short form questionnaire was used in this study (see Appendix C).

The short form MSQ consists of three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction. The intrinsic items consist of ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, social service, social status, and working conditions; the extrinsic
items consist of authority, company policy and practices, recognition, responsibility, security, and variety; and general satisfaction items are all drawn from the twenty items above. Each item refers to a reinforcer in the work environment. The respondent indicates how satisfied he is with the reinforcer on his present job. Five responses are presented for each item as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choice</th>
<th>Scoring Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied (VDS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied (DS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (N)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied (VS)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, scale scores are determined by summing the weights for the responses chosen for the items in each scale (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967, pp. 1-2).

Measurement of Job Commitment

Job commitment was measured by four items asking: (1) How likely is it you will stay at this job? (2) How likely is it that you will quit the job you have now? (3) How committed are you to this job? and (4) How attached do you feel to this job? (see questions 23, 24, 25, and 26 in Appendix C). Anchored seven-point semantic differential response categories were provided for each question. This scale was adapted from one used for the study of "Commitment, Absenteeism and the Study of New Employees" from Dan Farrell and James Petersen (1984).
The researcher added seven questions which are important to Saudi employees. These questions were: (1) seeing the results of my work (question 21), (2) number of working hours (question 22), (3) the feeling that the job allows me to make friends (question 27), (4) the feeling that the job provides me good health services (question 28), (5) finding the job related to the employee's education (question 29), (6) finding enjoyment in the job (question 30), and (7) on the whole, satisfaction with the work the employees do (question 31).

Responses to items 27 through 30 were placed on a five-point scale: (1) = strongly disagree; (2) = disagree; (3) = neither agree nor disagree; (4) = agree; and (5) = strongly agree.

Items 21, 22, and 31 required the participants to express their feelings about their present job by responding in the same manner as the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Demographic variables were asked of the sample to get general information about age, income, level of education, marital status, title of job, responsibilities in the current job, time spent to get to work, and the number of employees working in the department.

Procedures Used in Translation and Pre-testing the Questionnaire

In December 1992, the questionnaire was given to the translation department of the Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire was translated by the researcher and two Arabic translators at the translation department. Pre-tests were conducted with 25 employees who worked in private organizations in
different positions. This pre-test group was asked to give their opinion about the questionnaire. The outcome was that the questionnaire was very well-organized, understandable, and clear to all of the 25 in the pre-test group. After that, the researcher took the Arabic copy to the private translation office to be translated from Arabic to English. Comparing this to the original copy, no differences were noted between the two copies.

Data Collection

A total of 450 questionnaires were distributed to the four private organization employees (workers, assistant managers and managers) by the researcher and assistant researcher on Sunday, December 19, 1992. The questionnaires were distributed at two organizations by an assistant to the researcher, and the other questionnaires were given to the public relations directors to distribute to the employees in their organizations. After three weeks, the researcher and his assistants collected 214 (or 47.6%) questionnaires which were appropriately completed and used for this research. While this response rate is lower than one might wish for, it is acceptable for research in this context. It was not possible in this study to determine the characteristics of nonrespondents. Thus, some caution should be used in generalizing from the data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, standard descriptive statistics were used to present the findings about the characteristics of respondents and their attitudes toward their working environment. Cross-tabulation and chi-square were used to test the research hypotheses.

Frequency Distributions of Background Information

Age

Figure 2 shows the age of respondents. The majority of the sample (59.3%) was between the ages of 26 and 35. The smallest age group (.5%) was the group of 56 years and over. In addition, just 22.9 percent of the sample were between the ages 36 and 45 years, and only 13.1 percent of respondents were between the ages 18 and 25 years.

Income

Figure 3 shows the percentage distribution of monthly income of the respondents. Most of the sample (37%) had monthly incomes between 6,000 to 9,000 Saudi Riyal (SR) (1 U.S. dollar = 3.75 SR) and the smallest percentage (3.3%) had less than 3,000 SR. Eight percent of respondents had an income over 15,000 SR and 17.4 percent of the sample had an income between 9,000 to 12,000 SR. About 27.2 percent of the
respondents had monthly incomes between 3,001 and 6,000 SR ($800 to $1600).

**Age of Respondents**

![Age of Respondents Chart]

*n = 214*

**Figure 2. Age of Respondents.**

**Educational Level**

Figure 4 shows respondent frequencies for education level. Half of the sample (50%) had graduated from a college or university and the smallest percentage of the sample (3.7%) had an elementary school education. About one-quarter of the sample had a high school diploma.

**Marital Status**

Results in Figure 5 indicate that the majority and highest percentage of the sample (83.6%) were married and the smallest
percentage of respondents (1%) were divorced and widowed. In addition, just 15.4% of the respondents were single.

Income of Respondents
Percentage Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 6,000 S.R.</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 9,000 S.R.</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 3,000 S.R.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 13,000 S.R.</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001 - 16,000 S.R.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000 S.R.</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 214

Figure 3. Income of Respondents.

Education Level of Respondents
Frequency Distribution

Figure 4. Education Level of Respondents.
Title of the Job

Table 1 provides respondent frequencies according to the title of the job. The highest percentage (29.1%) did not report their job title, while the smallest percentage of the sample (1.9%) were social workers. In addition, 23.5 percent of the sample were supervisors, 15.5 percent of the sample were clerks, and 17.8 percent of the sample were accountants.

Responsibility in the Job

Figure 6 shows that the majority of the sample (52.4%) are workers, 20.8 percent were assistant managers, and just 9.4 percent of the respondents were general managers. On the other hand, 17.5 percent
of the sample did not mention their responsibility in their current job.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Cases = 1

Figure 6. Job Responsibility
Distance of Residence From Work

Table 2 shows that the highest percentage of the sample respondents (43.5%) spent 10 to 20 minutes by car to arrive at their job; 39.7 percent of the sample spent from 20 to 30 minutes; 13.1 percent of the respondents took more than a half-hour, and just 3.7 percent of the respondents spent less than 10 minutes to get from home to the workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Work</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 minutes by car</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20 minutes by car</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30 minutes by car</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 minutes by car</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Employees in the Department

Table 3 shows that the highest percentage of sample respondents (62.3%) worked with less than 15 co-workers. Almost nineteen percent of the sample worked with more than 30 employees, and the same percentage (18.7%) worked with between 15 and 30 employees in the department.

Table 4 shows that most of the sample (66%) were satisfied with seeing the results of their work; on the other hand, 19.8 percent of the respondents were not satisfied. The remainder (14.2%) did not
report whether they were satisfied or not.

Table 3

Number of Employees in the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 employees</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 30 employees</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 employees</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Seeing the Results of the Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 reports response frequencies regarding feelings about working hours. More than half of the sample respondents (52.3%) were satisfied with working hours. On the other hand, 35.5% were not satisfied, and the remainder (12.1%) were undecided whether they were satisfied or not with their working hours.

The results in Table 6 present employees' feelings toward their work. The majority of the sample respondents (73.2%) felt that their
job allows them to make friends. Also, most of the respondents (80.3%) felt that their job provides them good and free health services in different private hospitals in Saudi Arabia. On the other hand, 59.3 percent of Saudi private employees work on jobs which are related to their education background, and 29 percent of the sample were not. In addition, 80.9 percent of the sample found enjoyment in their job and a small percentage (10.8%) of the respondents did not find enjoyment in their job.

Table 5
Feelings About the Working Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither dissatisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Cases = 0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the frequency distribution regarding employees' satisfaction with the work they do. The majority of the sample respondents (80.4%) were satisfied and just 11.2 percent of them were not satisfied with the work they have been doing. Under ten percent of the sample did not report whether they were satisfied or not.

Table 8 shows general job satisfaction scale scores which were determined by summing the weights for the responses chosen for the 20 items of the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.
In order to use the scale in cross tabulations, the summed scores were recoded into four approximately equal categories.

Table 6
Feelings Toward Their Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel my job allows me to make friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my job provides me good health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find my job is related to my education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find enjoyment in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 provides commitment scale scores. This summated scale was recoded into three categories: low commitment, moderate commitment, and high commitment to permit the scale to be used in cross-tabulations. High level of commitment, as shown in the table, suggested that
employees in the private sector may have a feeling of psychological involvement and a feeling of loyalty to the organization as a place to work.

Table 7

Satisfaction With the Work They Do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

General Job Satisfaction Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest (Low - 57)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (58 - 65)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (66 - 75)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest (76- high)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing the Research Hypotheses

Seven alternative hypotheses were tested against seven null hypotheses. These hypotheses tested were set out in the second chapter. Chi-square ($\chi^2$) was the test statistic for all seven hypotheses. The critical value of chi-square was determined by the
degrees of freedom (df) and an alpha level of .05.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (Low - 16)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (17 - 20)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (21 - high)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summated scale of job satisfaction was dichotomized into a high and low category at the distribution's midpoint to permit the construction of cross-tabulations where cell frequencies would not be too small. Job satisfaction scores were divided into two approximately equal groups by placing scores of 65 and below into a low category and scores above 65 into a high category.

Hypothesis 1

H0: There is no relationship between highly paid employees and job satisfaction.

H1: More highly paid employees are more satisfied with their work than lower paid employees.

Table 10 provides the result of this test. The test results indicate that ($x^2 = 5.837$, df = 5, $P = .322$) which means the null hypothesis failed to be rejected at the .05 level of confidence.
Therefore, the first hypothesis is not supported.

Table 10

The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.837, \text{ df } = 5, P = .322 \]

Hypothesis 2

H0: There is no relationship between job satisfaction and education level.

H1: There is a relationship between job satisfaction and education level.

Table 11 shows that the chi-square \((x^2) = 2.207, \text{ df } = 3, P = .530\), so the null hypothesis failed to be rejected at the .05 level of alpha. Thus, the results failed to support the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between level of education and job satisfaction.
Table 11

The Relation Between Job Satisfaction and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Intermed. School</th>
<th>Secondary School</th>
<th>Univ. Degree</th>
<th>Other Degree</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x^2 = 2.207, df = 3, P = .530

Hypothesis 3

H0: No relationship exists between older employees and job satisfaction.

H1: Older employees are significantly more job satisfied than younger employees.

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected (x^2 = 2.259, df = 3, P = .520) which indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and age of employees (see Table 12). This hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 4

H0: There is no relationship between job satisfaction and employees' commitment.
H1: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employees' commitment.

Table 13 illustrated that the chi-square ($\chi^2$) was calculated to be 9.92, df = 1, $P = .002$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance (alpha), which indicated that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and employees' commitment. A comparison of percentages in Table 13 indicates that the relationship is positive, as predicted.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 2.259, \text{ df} = 3, P = .520$

Hypothesis 5

H0: There is no relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with length of working hours.

H1: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with length of working hours.
Table 14 illustrated that the chi-square ($x^2$) was 16.68, $df = 4$, $P = .002$. These results indicated that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with length of working hours. Therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected at the .05 level of significance ($\alpha$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 9.920, df = 1, P = .001$

Hypothesis 6

H0: There is no relationship between marital status and job satisfaction.

H1: Married employees have a higher degree of job satisfaction than do single employees.

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected. The chi-square ($x^2$) for this data is .0051, the degree of freedom ($df$) is 1, and the correlation coefficient ($P$) is .943, which indicated that there is no
significant relationship between job satisfaction and marital status (see Table 15).

Table 14
Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Satisfaction With Length of Working Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With Length of Working Hours</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 16.686, \; df = 4, \; P = .002 \]

Table 15
Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .005, \; df = 1, \; P = .943 \]
Hypothesis 7

H0: There is no relationship between job satisfaction and the interaction with co-workers on the job.

H1: Employees' satisfaction with their job is related to their satisfaction with opportunities for interaction with co-workers on the job.

Table 16 shows that the null hypothesis was rejected ($\chi^2 = 20.97$, df = 4, P = .000) and that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and the interaction with co-workers on the job. Therefore, the research hypothesis was confirmed.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With Interaction With Co-Workers</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 20.978$, df = 4, P = .000
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a brief summary, discussion of the seven research hypotheses, and implications for further research.

Summary

The main objectives for this study were to explore: (a) the level of job satisfaction and job commitment among employees in private organizations, (b) the relationship between job satisfaction and selected demographic characteristics of the private organizations' employees, and (c) how commitment affects job satisfaction in the private sector in Riyadh City, Saudi Arabia.

Four private organizations were chosen to participate in this study. They were selected from a list on the computer network at the Institute of Public Administration in Riyadh City. The subjects of this research were 214 employees: workers, assistant managers, and managers in private organizations.

On January 10, 1993, the questionnaires were collected from the sample at Riyadh City, the capital of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire was translated into Arabic by the researcher and two Arabic translators. The instrument consisted of two parts. The first part consisted of the short-form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, job commitment questions, and the seven additional
questions which were added by the researcher. The second part consisted of questions to get information about selected demographic characteristics of the private organizations' employees.

Findings about the characteristics of respondents and their attitudes toward their working environment were presented in standard descriptive statistics. Cross-tabulation and chi-square were calculated to test the research hypotheses.

Generally, the results in this study confirm that job satisfaction and commitment are positively related among private sector employees. Also, the study showed that employees in private organizations have a high level of satisfaction and commitment to their job and organization itself.

Discussion of the Seven Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: More highly paid employees are more satisfied with their work than lower paid employees. The chi-square ($x^2$) analysis, however, did not support this hypothesis. There is no statistically significant relationship between higher paid employees and job satisfaction. Table 10 does show that the highest percentage of persons with high job satisfaction was found among the most highly paid. The pattern is not linear, however. One of the reasons behind this is that employees in private organizations have the right to have another job in the evening (not in public sector) which allows them to have extra income. So they are satisfied with their incomes. Second, usually employees who are higher paid have a higher occupational level,
so this enables them to have complex responsibilities in their jobs.

Hypothesis 2: There is a relationship between job satisfaction and level of education. Hypothesis 2 also failed to be confirmed (see Table 11). A reason that education level did not generally predict the job satisfaction in this study, however, may be that the workers who have a lower education level were already socialized into their jobs and high education employees may not have been strongly salient to them. Therefore, highly educated employees should not expect great differences between them and other types of workers.

Hypothesis 3: Older employees are significantly more job satisfied than younger employees. The chi-square ($x^2$) did not confirm the hypothesis since there is no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and older people (see Table 12). The relationship is in the predicted direction, but the small number of persons 46 and over affected the significance. These study results conflict with McNeely's (1988) study that there is a very strongly significant relationship between job satisfaction and older employees.

Hypothesis 4: Data confirmed the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employees' commitment (see Table 13). From the findings of the present investigation, satisfaction toward the job is essential and related to commitment to the job.

Hypothesis 5: The data did support the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with length of working hours. The findings indicated that there is a
positive and significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and length of working hours (see Table 14). The possible explanation is that in Saudi society, as Muslims, they must pray five times a day. One of these prayers is afternoon prayer (asar prayer), which usually comes between 3:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. and an individual needs 20 to 30 minutes for preparation and prayer. So, most Saudi employees in private organizations end their work at 3:00 p.m. Therefore, they will pray and then go home to have lunch with their families. Thus, the religious factor may have an influence on employees' behavior in the workplace in terms of satisfaction. In addition, most Saudi private organization employees are accustomed to work overtime to accomplish their tasks. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with length of working hours.

Hypothesis 6: Married employees have a higher degree of satisfaction than do single employees. This hypothesis was not confirmed. The results indicated that there is essentially no difference in the degree of job satisfaction between married and single employees. Apparently job satisfaction is distinct from family connections or obligations.

Hypothesis 7: Data supported the hypothesis that employees' satisfaction with their jobs is related to their satisfaction with opportunities for interaction with co-workers on the job (see Table 16). The findings in this study indicated that there is a statistically significant relation between Saudi private employees' satisfaction and opportunity for interaction with co-workers on the job. Apparently those Saudi private employees who were more satisfied with opportuni-
ties for interaction with co-workers were also generally satisfied with their jobs.

Implications for Further Research

Since this study explored the level of job satisfaction and commitment in private organizations in Saudi Arabia, the following are recommendations for new research:

1. Future study should be conducted on satisfaction and commitment among foreign workers in private organizations in Saudi Arabia.

2. To provide a complete picture of private employees' satisfaction and commitment, new research should use larger samples of private organizations in different cities in Saudi Arabia.

3. Future research should explore factors affecting satisfaction and commitment in the private organizations.

4. Future research should study job satisfaction and commitment in both private and public organizations to compare the results of the two sectors.
Appendix A

Permission to Use Job Satisfaction Questionnaire
August 13, 1993

Abdullah Al-Helelah  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Department of Sociology  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5189

Dear Mr. Al-Helelah:

This is in reply to your letter of August 4, 1993. I presume that you will be reproducing the Arabic version of the MSQ as an appendix to your M.A. thesis.

I appreciate your assigning the MSQ translation and its commercial rights in Arabic to Vocational Psychology Research at the University of Minnesota. As I explained to Dr. Petersen by phone, the time to obtain permission for use of instruments that are copyrighted is before they are translated, not after. We hope that in the future you will abide by these copyright regulations.

The faxed copy of the Arabic MSQ that you sent me won't be useful if we attempt to reproduce it. Therefore, please send me at your earliest convenience an original printed copy of the Arabic version of the MSQ as you translated it.

In your thesis you should include the following statement:

Translated by permission of Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota. Copyright 1993.

If you have any further questions let me know.

Cordially,

David J. Weiss  
Director  
Vocational Psychology Research  

cc: Professor James C. Petersen  
Department of Sociology  
Western Michigan University
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Approval From Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
Date: June 24, 1993

To: Abdullah Al-Helelah

From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 93-06-14

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Job satisfaction among Saudi employees in private organization in Saudi Arabia" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: June 24, 1994

xc: Petersen, SOC
Appendix C

Job Satisfaction Questionnaire*

*Translated and reproduced by permission of Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota. Copyright 1993.
JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to express your feelings about your present job, and to tell what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers, we hope to get a better understanding of what people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the following pages, you will find statements about your present job.

Read each statement carefully.

Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Choose one of the following responses:

1 - Very dissatisfied: If you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected.

2 - Dissatisfied: If you feel that your job gives you less than you expected.

3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: If you can't make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected.

4 - Satisfied: If you feel that your job gives you what you expected.

5 - Very satisfied: If you feel that your job gives you more than you expected.

Do this for all statements. Please answer every item. Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.
Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job:

1. Very dissatisfied (VD) means that I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
2. Dissatisfied (D) means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
3. Neither (N) means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
4. Satisfied (S) means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
5. Very satisfied (VS) means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>VS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my boss handles his workers.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>VD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>VS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgement.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The chance to try my own methods.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The working conditions.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Seeing the results of my work.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Numbers of working hours.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. **How likely is it you will stay at this job?**
   (Place an x in on of the following)

   NOT AT ALL    | EXTERMELY
   LIKELY       | LIKELY

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

24. **How likely is it that you will quit the job you have now?**

   NOT AT ALL    | EXTERMELY
   LIKELY       | LIKELY

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
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25. How committed are you to this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>EXTREMELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. How attached do you feel to this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>EXTREMELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I feel my job allows me to make friends:
- Strongly disagree ( )
- Disagree ( )
- Neither agree nor disagree ( )
- Agree ( )
- Strongly agree ( )

28. I feel my job provides me good health services:
- Strongly disagree ( )
- Disagree ( )
- Neither agree nor disagree ( )
- Agree ( )
- Strongly agree ( )

29. I find my job is related to my education:
- Strongly disagree ( )
- Disagree ( )
- Neither agree nor disagree ( )
- Agree ( )
- Strongly agree ( )

30. I find enjoyment in my job:
- Strongly disagree ( )
- Disagree ( )
- Neither agree nor disagree ( )
- Agree ( )
- Strongly agree ( )
31. On the whole how satisfied are you with the work you do?
   Very dissatisfied (  )
   Dissatisfied (  )
   Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (  )
   Satisfied (  )
   Very satisfied (  )

PART II  GENERAL INFORMATION:

32. What is your age?
   18 to 25 (  )
   26 to 35 (  )
   36 to 45 (  )
   46 to 55 (  )
   56 to 65 (  )
   66 or over (  )

33. How much does your income from your job figure out to be a month?
   Less than 1,000 S.R. (  )
   1,001 to 3,000 S.R. (  )
   3,001 to 6,000 S.R. (  )
   6,001 to 9,000 S.R. (  )
   9,001 to 12,000 S.R. (  )
   12,001 to 15,000 S.R. (  )
   Over 15,000 S.R. (  )

34. What is your formal education level?
   Elementary School (  )
   Intermediate School (  )
   Secondary School (  )
   University Degree (  )
   Other, please specify ____________________________

35. What is your marital status?
   single (  )
   married (  )
   divorced (  )
   widowed (  )
36. What is the title of your job?
   Supervisor ( )
   Engineer ( )
   Accountant ( )
   Social worker ( )
   Secretary ( )
   Clerk ( )
   Other, please specify _________________________

37. What is your responsibilities in your current job?
   General manager ( )
   Assistant manager ( )
   Worker ( )
   Other, please specify _________________________

38. How far do you reside from your work?
   Less than 10 minutes by car ( )
   10 to 20 minutes by car ( )
   20 to 30 minutes by car ( )
   More than 30 minutes by car ( )

39. About how many employees work in your department?
   (below 15 employees) ( )
   (15-30 employees) ( )
   (more than 30 employees) ( )
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