



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Master's Theses

Graduate College

12-1990

The Effect of Organization Type on Job Satisfaction: Private and Public Sector Employees in Saudi Arabia

Saeid Al-Hajri

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Labor Relations Commons

Recommended Citation

Al-Hajri, Saeid, "The Effect of Organization Type on Job Satisfaction: Private and Public Sector Employees in Saudi Arabia" (1990). *Master's Theses*. 1067.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/1067

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATION TYPE ON JOB SATISFACTION:
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES IN SAUDI ARABIA

by

Saeid Al-Hajri

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
Department of Sociology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1990

**THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATION TYPE ON JOB SATISFACTION:
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES IN SAUDI ARABIA**

Saeid Al-Hajri, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1990

This study was designed to explore job satisfaction facets, similarities, differences, and associations among 324 public and private sector employees in Saudi Arabia. Results indicated that subjects from the private sector were satisfied 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), while subjects from the public sector were satisfied with four job satisfaction factors (responsibility, recognition and relationships with peers and subordinates, supervisory techniques, working conditions, and security and salary) and dissatisfied with five factors (personal development and opportunity to make own decision, time demands and requirements of the job, organizational policies and personal recognition, social status and opportunity for advancement).

All subjects agreed on one factor as the most important for them: responsibility, recognition and relationships with peers and subordinates. Recommendations are made for improving job satisfaction in both sectors. Opportunities for further research are identified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks and great appreciation to my academic advisor and chairperson, Dr. James Petersen, for his guidance, direction, and continual encouragement.

I am indebted to the other committee members, Dr. Jawid Abdul Ghani and Dr. Thomas VanValey, for their recommendations, criticisms, and encouragement through this study.

I would like to express my thanks to the many Saudi managers and employees in the public and private sectors in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, who took the time to fill in the questionnaire.

Appreciation is also expressed to Anne Kyes-Hill for her assistance in the task of typing and proofreading.

My humble and deep appreciation to my mother, Hamsa, for her understanding, support, encouragement, and prayers.

Many thanks and respects go to my dear wife, Mona, and my lovely daughter, Ghada, for their love, support, sacrifice, and encouragement, that were needed to bring this study to completion.

Finally, many thanks and prayers go to my friends, Ibrahim Al-Mansoor, Abdullah Yosif, Khalid Al-Mubarak, Khalid Al-Awwad, Abdullah Al-Fawzan, Nassir Al-Muhaizee, Nassir Obaidallah, Abdullah Al-Hilailah, and Hummod Al-Kanaan.

Saeid Al-Hajri

DEDICATION

To my wonderful mother,
My father (may his soul rest in peace),
My brothers and sisters,
and all Saudi public and private organizations.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1342631

The effect of organization type on job satisfaction: Private and public sector employees in Saudi Arabia

Al-Hajri, Saeid Hamad, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Definitions.	2
Job Satisfaction.	2
Public Sector	2
Private Sector.	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Significance of the Problem.	4
Growth and Development of the Private Sector in Saudi Arabia	8
Incentives Offered by the Government to Encourage the Private Sector	10
Saudi Industrial Fund (SIF)	10
Encouraging and Protecting National Industries.	10
Foreign Capital Investment.	11
Governmental Supply Security.	11
Joubail and Yanbou Industrial Cities (JYIC) . .	12
Support to the Agricultural Sector.	12
Other Incentives.	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Introduction.	14

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER		
	Effects of Organization Type on Job Satisfaction.	15
III.	METHODS.	20
	Description and Selection of the Sample	20
	Description of the Questionnaire.	21
	Procedure of Adapting the Questionnaire	22
	Administration of the Questionnaire	24
IV.	TREATMENT OF THE DATA AND RESULTS.	27
	Descriptive Summaries	28
	Frequency Distributions of Demographic Items.	28
	Means and Standard Deviations, Correlations and Comparisons of Demographic Variables of the Attitude Factors.	44
	Means and Standard Deviations of the Attitude Factors	44
	Discussion of Each Factor	52
	Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships With Peers and Subordinates.	52
	Working Conditions	53
	Opportunity for Advancement.	53
	Personal Development and Opportunities to Make Own Decisions.	55
	Time Demands and Requirements of the Job	56
	Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition.	57
	Security and Salary.	58

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Social Status	59
Supervisory Techniques	60
Summary	62
Analysis of Instrument	64
Factor 1. Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions	64
Factor 2. Security and Salary	65
Factor 3. Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships With Peers and Subordinates	66
Factor 4. Supervisory Techniques	67
Factor 5. Opportunities for Advancement	68
Factor 6. Working Conditions	69
Factor 7. Time Demands and Requirements of the Job	70
Factor 8. Status	70
Factor 9. Organizational Policies and Personal Recogniton	72
V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	74
Discussion of the Nine Job Satisfaction Factors	74
Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships with Peers and Subordinates	76
Working Conditions	76
Opportunity for Advancement	77
Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions	78
Time Demands and Requirements of the Job	78

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition	79
Security and Salary	80
Social Status	80
Supervisory Techniques.	81
Analysis of the Instrument	81
Recommendations for Management in Both Sectors . .	83
Implications for Future Study.	85
APPENDICES.	87
A. Job Satisfaction Questionnaire Cover Page-- Private and Public	88
B. Job Satisfaction Questionnaire	95
C. Tables 30-38: Group Comparisons of the Demographic Variables to the Attitude Factors.	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	169

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Growth of Limited Companies in Saudi Arabia	9
2.	Distribution of Respondents by Age.	29
3.	Distribution of Respondents by Income	30
4.	Distribution of Respondents by Length of Employment at the Present Job	31
5.	Distribution of Respondents by Work Experience.	32
6.	Distribution of Respondents by Level of Education	34
7.	Location of Education or Training	35
8.	Distribution of Respondents by Effect of Foreign Education on Work	37
9.	Distribution of Respondents by Position	38
10.	Distribution of Respondents by Father's Position.	40
11.	Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status	41
12.	Distribution of Respondents by Type of Residence	42
13.	Distribution of Respondents by Location of Residence in Riyadh	43
14.	Job Satisfaction for Private Sector Respondents	45
15.	Job Satisfaction for Public Sector Respondents.	46
16.	Importance of Job Satisfaction Factors in the Private and Public Sectors.	47
17.	Correlation Between Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction in the Private Sector	48
18.	Correlation Between Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction Factors in the Public Sector.	49

List of Tables--Continued

19.	Correlation Between Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction Factors in Both Private and Public Sectors.	50
20.	T-test for Independent Samples of Type of Organization.	51
21.	Factor 1. Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions	64
22.	Factor 2. Security and Salary	66
23.	Factor 3. Responsibility, Recognition, and Relationships With Peers and Subordinates	67
24.	Factor 4. Supervisory Techniques.	68
25.	Factor 5. Opportunities for Advancement	69
26.	Factor 6. Working Conditions.	70
27.	Factor 7. Time Demands and Requirements of the Job.	71
28.	Factor 8. Status.	71
29.	Factor 9. Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition.	72
30.	Group Comparisons of Security and Salary.	120
31.	Group Comparison of Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions	126
32.	Group Comparison of Supervisory Techniques.	132
33.	Group Comparisons of Working Conditions Factor.	138
34.	Group Comparison of Social Status	144
35.	Group Comparison of Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships with Peers and Subordinates	149
36.	Group Comparison of Opportunity for Advancement Making Own Decisions.	154

List of Tables--Continued

37.	Group Comparison of Time Demands and Requirements of the Job.	159
38.	Group Comparisons of Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition.	164

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, studies of job attitudes and the description of how workers feel about their jobs became a significant phenomenon in the early half of this century. Organizational behavior specialists recognized the importance of job satisfaction for workers and started conducting studies on the topic. This recognition continued to develop as people learned more about worker performance and productivity, training development programs, and employee-employer relationships (Al-Adaily, 1981).

Interest in job satisfaction has extended to other countries, such as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. As a developing country, Saudi Arabia is not an industrial country, but it is trying to be. Saudi Arabia depends on oil as its main economic resource. The increase of oil prices in the 1970s gave Saudi Arabia the opportunity to develop and build up its economic infrastructure base. The government formed five-year development plans, starting the first in 1970. These plans focus on different economic facets as well as developing indigenous human resources. However, few studies were conducted in this field. Job satisfaction is a new area of study.

Definitions

Job Satisfaction

There is no consensus about a united definition for job satisfaction. "Job satisfaction [as a term] lacks adequate definition" (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell, 1967, p. 1). The American Heritage Dictionary (1985) defines satisfaction as "the fulfillment or gratification of a desire, need, or appetite" (p. 1092).

Tracy (1985) defined job satisfaction as follows:

Job satisfaction, the summation of an individual's feelings about his or her job, is a subset of attitudes and can be looked at in two ways--as a global entity, which implies a compensatory model where satisfaction in one area offsets dissatisfaction in another, and as being made up of a set of independent facets consisting of management, working conditions, compensation, job characteristics, relationships with co-workers, and so on (p. 716).

Public Sector

Perry and Rainey (1988) noted that "public organizations are those owned and funded by government" (p. 184). Accordingly, the public sector in this study includes those organizations which are owned and funded by the government.

Private Sector

Perry and Rainey (1988) noted that private organizations are "those owned and funded through sales or private donations" (p. 184). Private sector in this study is the type of organization which is

owned by stockholders, has a board of trustees, and is managed by a management bureau.

Statement of the Problem

This thesis compares the factors associated with job satisfaction among private and public sector employees in Saudi Arabia.

There have been several studies comparing job satisfaction among public and private sector employees in the United States and other industrialized countries (e.g., Al-Adaily, 1981). As Staw (1984) noted, these studies compared different factors of job satisfaction among private and public sector employees with regard to different aspects of individual behavior, such as absenteeism, turnover, commitment, productivity, etc.

The purpose of this study is to determine the similarities and differences in job satisfaction between public and private sector employees in Saudi Arabia. This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What are the most important factors affecting job satisfaction in the public sector?
2. What are the most important factors affecting satisfaction in the private sector?
3. To what extent are similar factors associated with job satisfaction in both the private and public sectors?

Another purpose is to test the reliability of the adapted form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (long form) (Al-Adaily,

1981) in the private sector. This questionnaire has previously been tested in the public sector (Al-Adaily, 1981).

Significance of the Problem

Job satisfaction is probably the one variable which concerns the occupational researcher in the United States more than any other dependent variable in the field (Staw, 1984). Staw (1984) noted that "At last count over 3,000 studies contained some documentation or examination of job satisfaction [in the United States]" (p. 630).

Job satisfaction factors such as security, wages, opportunity for advancement, social aspects, working conditions, hours, ease of the job, supervision, company, and management were considered most when studying job satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1967). Staw (1984) mentioned that working conditions, pay, supervision, promotion, recognition, use of skills and abilities, and features with satisfaction factors were to be examined when studies were conducted on long-scale survey as well as countless studies with small samples.

Saudi Arabia, as a developing country, depends on oil as its main economic source. The Saudi government recognized the instability of the oil market and decided to find alternative economic sources besides oil. Attention was directed to the private sector. The government offered loans to the private sector, and encouraged Saudi citizens to participate with the government in pushing the development wheel forward. Loans were directed to various sectors, such as education, health, small industry, food industry, services,

transportation, banks, hotels and tours (Ministry of Planning, 1987).

Active concern for economic diversification began with the second development plan (1975-1980), and has continued to be emphasized in the third (1980-1985), and fourth (1985-1990) (Ministry of Planning, 1987); and in the fifth plan (1990-1995) (Ministry of Planning, 1990) development plans. To accomplish the goals of these development plans, the government sought workers from outside the country in order to handle the huge projects that needed a skilled and experienced work force. During the five plans government has focused on developing indigenous human resources.

During the oil boom of the 1970s the government of Saudi Arabia invested most of its budget in building up the economic infrastructure base. For various reasons, this investment in huge projects could not be completed by an exclusively Saudi work force. One reason was the lack of experience, another was the lack of specialization. This does not mean there were no experts or specialists, but they were few in number.

The decrease in oil prices and completion of the basic economic infrastructure in the 1980s, together with the large number of educated and well-trained Saudi employees, led the government to stop immigration of foreign workers and substitute them with Saudi workers. As a result, the government has been encouraging the private sector to employ Saudi citizens.

Saudi Arabia is a rich country, and the Saudi citizens are offered many benefits, such as free health and education facilities. Saudi citizens prefer to own businesses or share them, and do not want to work in the private sector as employees. This was a result of the employment opportunities that the government offers. The government insures employment opportunities for every Saudi. To encourage people to work in the private sector, the government has, therefore, stopped creating employment opportunities in the public sector. However, there is still resistance from the employee side.

The Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1989) found that Saudi employees have a negative attitude toward working in the private sector. They prefer to work for the public sector because it (a) offers higher salaries than the private sector, (b) provides high stability and security, (c) gives social status, (d) has high prestige, and (e) less effort is required. Society values the public sector more than the private sector, especially in the middle class. The value is normal in Saudi society because the middle class is the working class.

Conversely, people have a negative attitude toward working in the private sector. The private sector (a) demands long working hours--forty-five hours a week while the time demand in the public sector is thirty-five, (b) has tight control and a day-to-day work load schedule, (c) requires direct contact between worker and owner in some organizations, and (d) promotion and advancement is subject

to the evaluation of the worker's activity and productivity (Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 1989).

The private sector is not willing to hire Saudi workers for the following reasons:

1. Those from the foreign work force can be hired at a low salary rate and have a higher rate of productivity.
2. The kind and quality of characteristics that an employer wants are not always available in the Saudi workers.
3. Foreign workers will work in any place the organization asks them to, while Saudis prefer to work in those places near their families.
4. Saudi workers are less committed to the organization they work for because they are always looking for better chances and a higher salary.
5. 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.
6. It is easier to terminate the contract and send away the foreign worker in case of dispute or project completion.
7. For each Saudi employee, the private sector employer is required to pay 8% 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 (Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 1989, pp. 4-6).

As a result of the preceding discussion, this study seeks to identify how satisfied Saudi employees are in the private sector and how they perceive the most important factors compared to employees in the public sector.

Growth and Development of the Private Sector in Saudi Arabia

The first limited company in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was established in 1934. The need for a transportation company to carry pilgrims from airports and ports to the Holy places in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was behind establishing the Arabian Limited Company for Cars (ALCC), with a capital of 21 million Saudi Riyal. Twenty years later, in 1953, there was a total of six limited companies in Saudi Arabia, with capital of 943 million Saudi Riyal (Al-Braidy, 1987).

During the period from 1954-1964, the number of the limited companies increased by 11, with capital of 2.012 billion Saudi Riyal and 20 million in stocks. Therefore, the total of limited companies in Saudi Arabia was 17, with capital of 2.955 billion Saudi Riyal (see Table 1) (Al-Braidy, 1987).

Ten years later, by 1974, 37 limited companies were established with total capital of 3.554 billion Saudi Riyal and 16 million in stock. The grand total of limited companies at the end of 1974 was 54, with capital of 6.509 billion Saudi Riyal and 35 million in stock (Al-Braidy, 1987).

During the 1975-1980 period 34 more limited companies were started, with capital of 27.125 billion Saudi Royal and 142 million

in stock. By the end of 1980 there were 98 limited companies, with capital of 34 billion Saudi Riyal and 187 million in stock (Al-Braidy, 1987).

The electric limited companies in Saudi Arabia were merged into one limited company in 1981. By then the limited companies in Saudi numbered 50, with capital of 48 billion Saudi Riyal, and stock of 306 million. The number grew to 53 limited companies in 1986, with capital of 40.197 billion Saudi Riyal and stock of 407 million. In 1987 the number reached 61 limited companies (Al-Braidy, 1987).

Table 1
Growth of Limited Companies in Saudi Arabia

Year	# of Companies	Capital (billions of Saudi Riyals)	Stock
1935	1	.021	--
1953	6	.943	--
1964	17	2.955	--
1974	54	6.509	35
1980	98	34.000	187
1981	50	48.000	370
1986	53	40.197	407
1987	61	--	--

(Al-Braidy, 1987)

Incentives Offered by the Government to Encourage the Private Sector

The government of Saudi Arabia planned to facilitate and open opportunities for investment to the private sector. The private sector was given the opportunity to invest capital through an open market and free economy. Formal rules and laws applied to these opportunities, and were enforced by certain government agencies, including the Ministries of Trade, Industry and Work Affairs.

The following sections discuss the many ways the private sector benefits from government incentives (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Saudi Industrial Fund (SIF)

Established in 1974, SIF offers interest free short- and long-term loans to industrial organizations. These loans cover from 1% to 50% of the project cost. Furthermore, SIF offers economical, technical, and administrative consultation to industrial organizations when needed (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Encouraging and Protecting National Industries

There are several reasons why national industries prosper:

1. No taxes are required for Saudi companies, whether industrial or non-industrial.
2. No custom fees are required for the imported machinery, tools, materials, crude material, and parts used by Saudi companies.

3. There are discounted land rent rates for the private sector. Furthermore, the government has built industrial zones in most of the major cities, such as Riyadh, Dammam, Jeddah, Qassim, Najran, and Jazan. The government built two large industrial cities in Joubail (eastern province) and Yanbou (western province), respectively.

4. National industries are protected by raising tax rates on identical imported industries.

5. There is a free tax rate for export industries (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Foreign Capital Investment

In order to allow the private sector to benefit from new technology and to gain experience by cooperating with the more expert and specialized companies, the government offers incentives to the foreign companies, such as: (a) No custom fee is required for importing machines, tools, and spare parts, (b) no income tax is levied for ten years, (c) free land or space for construction of the project, (d) free land for the company headquarters and branches, and (e) the foreign company can benefit from the SIF loans (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Governmental Supply Security

Priority and preferability is given to Saudi industries as suppliers for governmental needs. If there is more than one Saudi supplier for the same product, the companies are subject to open

competition (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Joubail and Yanbou Industrial Cities (JYIC)

JYIC were established to facilitate the Kingdom's industrial needs. Private industry therefore benefits from JYIC through (a) discounted workshops, and (b) training programs for Saudi factories (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Support to the Agricultural Sector

The Saudi government supports the agricultural sector directly and indirectly. The government is concerned with the agricultural infrastructure, which is directly benefited by dams, roads, electricity, agricultural education, agricultural research and consultation centers, and other services.

Indirectly, the government supports agriculture by offering long-term loans to the private sector, which invests this capital in the agricultural sector. These loans are interest free and available for companies as well as individual farmers.

The government buys the farmers' products at high prices (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

Other Incentives

Electricity rates are discounted for the industrial sector, where the rate is 5 halalas/k.w.s and water is .25 halalas per cubic meter.

The government provides free training for Saudi workers both inside and out of the country (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Job satisfaction has been the concern of the organizational behavior sociologists as well as industrial psychologists since the mid-fifties of this century. Attempts were made to identify job satisfaction. There "was an agreement among the analysis that job satisfaction is not an unidimensional attitude" (Herzberg et al., 1967, p. 1).

As long as the answer to "what gives rise to job satisfaction?" is not clear, a question of what effects job satisfaction has on organizational members' behavior can be asked. In other words, how does job satisfaction/dissatisfaction affect workers' behavior? Evidence such as absences, performance, turnover, and accidents are seen as consequences of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. These dependent variables emerged in a series of studies of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction (Johns, 1978; Matheu & Kohlar, 1990; Robinson, Athanasiou & Head, 1969; Waters & Roach, 1979).

Job satisfaction/dissatisfaction has also been treated as a dependent variable by researchers who have related it to such independent variables as organization climate (Pritchard & Karasick,

1973); personal and organizational characteristics (Newman, 1975); discrepancies between current job experience and desired levels of those same job facet experiences (Rice, McFarlin & Bennet, 1989); role of negative affectivity (Levin & Stokes, 1989); job content and context factors (Armstrong, 1971); intrinsic and extrinsic job motivating (Centers & Bugental, 1966); motivator and hygiene factors (Halpern, 1966); occupational level (Starcevich, 1972); role conflict and role ambiguity (Schuler, 1975); achievement striving and impatience-irritability dimensions (Bluen, Barling & Burns, 1990); exchange variables-reward and cost (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981); end-user compiling (Abdul Ghani & Al-Meer, 1989); and effect of type of organization on job satisfaction in terms of public versus private (Cacioppe & Mock, 1984; Cherniss & Kane, 1987; Newstrom, Reif & Monczka, 1976; Paine, Carroll, Jr. & Leete, 1966; Porter & Mitchell, 1967; Smith & Nock, 1980; Solomon, 1986).

Since the purpose of this study is to explore factors that contribute to job satisfaction in the private sector as well as public sector in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the literature review will focus on effects of organization type on job satisfaction.

Effects of Organization Type on Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been the subject of considerable research. Numerous scholars have attempted to correlate job satisfaction with various job characteristics and quality of work (Smith & Nock, 1980). Other studies have been concerned with social class and its relation

to job satisfaction, e.g., social class in the same organization and in different organizations, or even social class in the private and public sectors (Smith & Nock, 1980). Another group of studies compares satisfaction between the same employee in the same organization with regard to job climate, such as field work and central office work (Paine et al., 1966).

Paine and others (1966) conducted a study comparing need satisfaction of managers in field work with the need satisfaction of similar managers in central office work within a government agency. In the same study, Paine compared the need satisfaction in the government agency with a similar group from private industry. Paine found that field managers were more satisfied in terms of needs for self-esteem, independent thought and action, growth and development, and sense of self-fulfillment. Paine found differences between managers in the public and private sectors as regards need satisfaction in terms of job security. He states: "Thus, in this agency [government agency] field work was some what more satisfying than central office work, especially in self-actualization need category" (p. 249). He added: "the government managers have considerably less need satisfaction...than similar managers from private industry" (1966, p. 249).

Another study (Porter & Mitchell, 1976) was conducted with the aim to compare need satisfaction in military and business hierarchies. The comparison was in the area of need fulfillments and need satisfaction. They found that within the two groups, business

hierarchies and military hierarachies, self-actualization needs were the least satisfied. However, the groups differed in terms of other variables, such as autonomy for the managers, and the esteem need area for the officers. Security was the need most satisfied for both groups.

Organizational climate has been the concern of some scholars. Organizational climate includes, the interaction between members of the organization, autonomy to make decisions, pressure, and directing activity on job satisfaction (Pritchard and Karasick, 1973).

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) found that there is a relation between organizational climate and job satisfaction. They concluded:

Satisfaction relates positively to individual's perceptions of the supportiveness and friendliness of the climate, how effectively it deals with its operating and competitive problems, how well the climate rewards it employees, and the degree of democratization achieved in the organization. If the climate possesses these characteristics, it is likely that job satisfaction will also be present. (p. 142).

Newstrom, Reif and Monczka (1976) studied security, self-actualization, fringe benefits, and economic reward among public sector employees and private sector employees in terms of job satisfaction. They found that security and direct economic benefits are less important for public sector employees and very important for private sector employees. There were significant findings in terms of dissatisfaction in the area of direct economic benefits, self-actualization, compensation, and indirect economic benefits. The authors concluded: "Security is perceived as less important for public employees than those in the private sector, and they are more satisfied with

security as an organizational reward" (p. 71). They added: "Public employees were found to be significantly more satisfied with direct economic benefits than private employees" (Newstrom, et al., 1976, p. 72).

In a study comparing private blue and white collar workers to their counterparts in the public sector, Smith and Nock (1980) found that blue collar workers in the public sector were more satisfied than their counterparts in the private sector. They found that certain items concern white collar employees in the public sector: "Lack of opportunities for personal development through work, lack of interesting work and lack of freedom to do their work" are problematic to the white collar workers in the public sector (Smith and Nock, 1980, p. 70).

Al-Adaily (1981) conducted a study to measure public employee satisfaction in Saudi Arabia, and he found that the public employees were satisfied in general. He found the public employees were very satisfied with the following job satisfaction factors: responsibility, recognition on relationship with peers with subordinates; working conditions; and supervisory techniques. On the other hand, the Saudi employees in the public sector were less satisfied with the following job satisfaction factors: salary and security; organizational policies and personal recognition; and time demands and requirements of the job (Al-Adaily, 1981).

Cacioppe and Mock (1984) conducted a study comparing private sector employees and employees in the Australian public sector in

terms of the quality of work experience. They found that "Australian public sector employees are significantly less satisfied with their quality of work experience than their private sector counterparts." (p. 935). They concluded: "The findings also demonstrated an association between the type of organization and the employee's motive for work" (p. 935).

Solomon (1986) conducted an empirical investigation of job characteristics and organizational climate in private and public sector managers. She found that "Private sector managers...reported significantly higher satisfaction than the public" (p. 256).

There are other factors that affect job satisfaction, such as job design. Job design consists of five components: (1) skill variety, (2) task identity, (3) task significance, (4) autonomy, and (5) feedback (Staw, 1984).

Individual personality affects job satisfaction, too. The way individuals perceive their job, what they expect from their job, and their ability to handle the job all contribute to an individual's evaluation of job satisfaction (Staw, 1984).

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter contains four sections: (1) description and selection of the sample, (2) description of the questionnaire used to collect the research data, (3) procedures used to adapt the questionnaire, and (4) administration of the questionnaire.

Description and Selection of the Sample

The sample of this study consists of two groups: (1) public employees and (2) private employees. Both groups are from the Riyadh area. Riyadh, as the capital city of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, presented the best selection of public and private employees coming from different cities, towns and environmental backgrounds.

Consideration was given to background or demographic variables to select the sample. The demographic variables of age, monthly income, number of years employed (in the current job), experience in all kinds of jobs, level of education, place where advanced training or education was received, the impact of experience in a foreign country upon feelings or attitudes toward work, occupied position, father's occupation, marital status, type of residency, and location of residence in Riyadh City were used.

The sample included middle managers, assistant managers, and clerks. Studies indicate people in a high level or position are more

satisfied than people in middle management positions (Paine et al., 1966; Porter & Mitchell, 1967; Starcevich, 1972). People in high level positions, such as general managers or decision makers, were excluded.

Description of the Questionnaire

One of the accepted measures of job satisfaction is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), created by Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquest in 1967. MSQ was used to measure subjects' satisfaction with their jobs. The MSQ consists of two forms, a long form and a short form. The short form consists of 20 items; the long form consists of 100 items. Each item refers to a reinforcer on the job. Five responses are presented for each item: (1) Very dissatisfied, (2) Dissatisfied, (3) Neither (dissatisfied nor satisfied), (4) Satisfied, and (5) Very satisfied.

Each long-form MSQ scale consists of five items. The items appear in blocks, with items constituting a given scale appearing at twenty-item intervals as follows: ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social services, social status, supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), variety, and working conditions.

Procedure of Adapting the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was modified by Al-Adaily (1981). Al-Adaily felt that the MSQ long form was too long, and not useful for the purpose of his study without some modification.

Al-Adaily eliminated all items which appeared to overlap and/or were not appropriate for work in Saudi Arabia. He eliminated 41 items, with 59 items remaining.

Al-Adaily added five items he considered important to employees in Saudi Arabia. These five items were: (1) # 45, "Tea and coffee are provided on the job"; (2) # 58, "The reputation my family gets from the job"; (3) # 60, "The way my organization provides opportunities and helps in entertainment for my family" ; (4) # 61, "Opportunity to be around important people"; and (5) # 64, "The amount of time my job allows me to be with my family."

The modified questionnaire consists of 64 items; 32 questions related to intrinsic satisfaction and 32 related to extrinsic satisfaction. The neutral point "Neither" was changed to "Don't Know" to be clear when it was translated into the Arabic language (Al-Adaily, 1981).

According to the purpose of the questionnaire--to measure both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction either on employee's present job or any past jobs--the following instructions were included at the beginning of the questionnaire:

- a. Please read each statement carefully.

b. Then think of a time when you felt exceptionally good (happy or satisfied) or exceptionally bad (unhappy or dissatisfied) about your job, either your present or any other job you have had.

c. "Satisfied" or "Very satisfied" means that the statement was important to you in feeling good about the job experience you are describing.

d. "Dissatisfied" or "Very dissatisfied" means that the statement was important for you in feeling bad about the job experience you are describing.

e. "Don't Know" means that you are undecided about how important the statement is in feeling good or bad about the job experience you are describing. "Don't Know" may also mean that you are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied about this statement and your job (See Appendix B for questionnaire).

This researcher added five demographic questions--how many years have you worked for your current employer; father's occupation; marital status; residency; and location of residence in Riyadh--to the seven demographic variables in Al-Adaily study in a separate section.

In order to test whether the 1981 questionnaire's content was meaningful in terms of Saudi culture and the employment environment, the questionnaire was given to ten Saudi students studying at Humboldt State University, California, USA (where Al-Adaily was studying). This researcher also assumes that this validated that the

questions are useful for getting data needed for this study, and that the questionnaire directions were clear.

The 1981 questionnaire was translated into Arabic by Al-Adaily and three Arab advisors at the Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Then it was sent to another translator to be translated from Arabic into English. This English translation was compared with the original English questionnaire, and no significant difference was noted (Al-Adaily, 1981).

The 1981 questionnaire was then given in its final Arabic form to 10 Saudi employees in different occupations at the Institute of Public Administration in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, for their review. From their responses it was concluded that the questionnaire was understandable to the practitioners (Al-Adaily, 1981).

In order to test whether the questionnaire items were understandable, this researcher gave 20 copies of the same questionnaire to the employees who applied to the Institute of Public Administration training programs in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia during the interview time in the summer of 1990. The results show that the questionnaire items were understandable and clear, which supported what Al-Adaily had found in 1981.

Administration of the Questionnaire

Public relations officials in 20 organizations (10 private and 10 public) were contacted to participate in the study. Eight public and nine private organizations agreed to participate in the study.

After obtaining their consent, one thousand questionnaires were distributed to the participating organizations by the researcher in July 1990.

The questionnaire was distributed by drop off and pick up. Copies of the questionnaire were given to the public relations directors of each organization (public and private) to distribute to the employees in their organizations. In order to distinguish between private and public sector respondents, a cover page was added to copies sent to the private sector with the heading "Questionnaire about Job Satisfaction among Private Sector Employees in Saudi Arabia." The same procedures were done for the public questionnaire, but "public" was substituted for "private," i.e., "Questionnaire about Job Satisfaction among Public Sector Employees in Saudi Arabia." The questionnaires were then returned to the public relations director to be picked up by the researcher.

Two weeks later, the questionnaires were picked up by the researcher. Three hundred and fifty-seven (357) or 35.7% were collected. Three hundred and twenty-four (324) were completed (32.4%) and used for the study; the remainder were incomplete.

The data were coded in Part I, the 64 item section, in the following manner: Very satisfied = 1, Satisfied = 2, Don't Know = 3, Dissatisfied = 4, and Very dissatisfied = 5. In Part II, the demographic section, the data was coded so that 1 = the first category, 2 = the second category, and so forth.

Missing values were coded = 0. The type of organization was coded 1 = private organization and 2 = public organization.

According to Al-Adaily (1981) nine factors were considered to contribute to overall satisfaction. These factors are: (1) personal development and opportunity to make own decision; (2) security and salary; (3) responsibility, recognition, and relationship with peers and with subordinates; (4) supervisory techniques; (5) opportunities for advancement; (6) working conditions; (7) time demands and requirements of the job; (8) status (social status); and (9) organization policies and personal recognition.

In this study, the mean and standard deviation for each factor item were computed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X, 1988).

T-tests were computed to compare the factors scale score and the type of organization. A series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) calculations were used to compare the factors scale score and demographic items.

CHAPTER IV

TREATMENT OF THE DATA AND RESULTS

Statistical analysis for this study was completed utilizing statistical software (SPSS-X, 1988), available at Western Michigan University's Computer Lab in Kalamazoo. Responses on each questionnaire were encoded and the information entered into a computer file.

First, descriptive statistics were generated for each item in the questionnaire. Frequency distributions were generated for the demographics items along with means and standard deviations for relevant items.

Attitude items were factor analyzed. This permitted a comparison with the results of Al-Adaily's (1981) study. Results of the factor analysis of attitude items are presented in the following sections with a comparison to Al-Adaily (1981). Separate factor analyses were done for the attitude items with the public sector and private sector employees.

Finally, Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was run on each of the nine factors for the private and public sectors separately. The values of Alpha were all above .7 (with the exception of working conditions Alpha = .6).

Descriptive Summaries

Frequency Distributions of Demographic Items

A description of the sample characteristics appears in Tables 2 through 12.

Age

Table 2 presents the Saudi employee ages, showing that most employees of the sample (57.3%) were between ages 26-35, and the lowest number (5.3%) were between ages 46-55. Furthermore, it appears that most employees of the sample, in the private sector (58.2%) and in the public sector (56.4%), were between 26-35, and the fewest number in both the private sector (3.6%) and public sector (7.1%) were between 46-55.

It appears from the result that the majority of the sample (about 78.2%--83.7% in the private sector, 72.4% in the public sector) were young employees, regardless of their position in the workplace. This result supports Abdulwab's study (1979) about Saudi managers and decision-making, which stated "most Saudi managers in government agencies and organizations were young" (cited in Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 97). Also, the results support Al-Adaily's study concerning job satisfaction among Saudi government employees (managers and workers) in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: "The highest percentages of our sample were young employees and lowest percentage were old employees" (p. 60).

Table 2
Distribution of Respondents by Age

Age	N	%	Private		Public	
			N	%	N	%
18-25	67	20.9	42	25.5	25	16.0
26-35	184	57.3	96	58.2	88	56.4
36-45	53	16.5	21	12.7	32	20.5
46-55	17	5.3	6	3.6	11	7.1
Total	321	100.0	165	100.0	156	100.0

Level of Income

Table 3 shows the distribution of income. The highest percentage (38.2%) of the sample had an income between 3,001 to 6,000 Saudi Riyal (3.75 Saudi Riyal = 1 U.S. dollar). The lowest percentage (.6%) was in the category of less than 1,000 Saudi Riyal. The income level with the highest percentage in the private sector (38.0%) and in the public sector (38.0%) was between 6,001 to 9,000 Saudi Riyal. The lowest in the private (4.2%) and in the public (.6%) was the category of more than 15,000 Saudi Riyal.

The results support Al-Adaily (1981) in terms of the income category: "Fifty percent of our sample had an income between 3,001 to 6,000 Saudi Riyal" (p. 62). However, the results do not support Al-Adaily's (1981) finding that "the lowest percentage is between 9,001 to 12,000 S.R." (p. 62).

Table 3

Distribution of Respondents by Income

Income (Saudi Riyal)	N	%	Private		Public	
			N	%	N	%
Less than 1,000	2	.6	-	-	2	1.3
1,001 to 3,000	51	15.8	31	18.7	20	12.8
3,001 to 6,000	123	38.2	63	38.0	60	38.5
6,001 to 9,000	98	30.4	39	23.5	59	37.8
9,001 to 12,000	30	9.3	18	10.8	12	7.7
12,001 to 15,000	10	3.1	8	4.8	2	1.3
more than 15,001	8	2.5	7	4.2	1	.6
Total	322	100.0	166	100.0	156	100.0

Length of Employment at the Present Job

The number of years respondents had been working in their present job is presented in Table 4. Results indicate the highest percentage (44.5%) had been working between 1-5 years, and the lowest percentage (5.6%) between 11-15 years.

Table 4 shows that the highest percentage of the employees in the private sector (45.2%) and the highest percentage in the public sector (43.8%) had worked between 1-5 years. Likewise, the lowest percentage (1.2%) in the private sector had worked more than 15 years, while the lowest percentage in the public sector (9.8%) had worked less than one year.

Table 4
Distribution of Respondents by Length of Employment
at the Present Job

Length of Employment at the Present Job			Private		Public	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Less than 1 year	48	15.0	33	19.9	15	9.8
1 - 5 years	142	44.5	75	45.2	67	43.8
6 - 10 years	89	27.9	46	27.7	43	28.1
11 - 15 years	22	6.9	10	6.0	12	7.8
More than 15 years	18	5.6	2	1.2	16	10.5
Total	319	100.0	166	100.0	153	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Work Experience

Table 5 presents the work experience of the sample, which indicates that the highest percentage (34.8%) of the sample have work experience between 1-5 years and the lowest percentage (12.3%) of the sample have more than 15 years work experience.

The table shows that the highest percentage of the sample in the private sector (39.6%) and in the public sector (29.9%) have 1-5 years work experience. On the other hand, the lowest percentage of the sample in the private sector (6.7%) have more than 15 years experience while the lowest percentage in the public sector (9.7%) have less than one year experience. This supports Al-Adaily (1981) in terms of the high percentage of Saudi employees having work

experience between 1-5 years (p. 63). However, it does not support his finding that the lowest percentage of Saudi employees have between 11-15 years work experience (p. 63).

The fact that the lowest percentage in the public sector have less than one year experience (9.7%) versus (15.4%) in the private sector, and (9.8%) length of employment (Table 4) in the public sector versus (19.9%) in the private sector, is consistent with the idea that the government has reduced employment opportunities in the public sector and encouraged employment in the private sector since 1985.

Table 5
Distribution of Respondents by Work Experience

Work Experience	<u>N</u>	%	Private		Public	
			<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Less than 1 year	37	12.6	23	15.4	14	9.7
1 - 5 years	102	34.8	59	39.6	43	29.9
6 - 10 years	80	27.3	43	28.9	37	25.7
11 - 15 years	38	13.0	14	9.4	24	16.7
More than 15 years	36	12.3	10	6.7	26	18.1
Total	293	100.0	149	100.0	144	100.0

Level of Education

Table 6 presents the level of education in the sample, which indicates that the highest percentage (41.2%) have graduated from a university, and the lowest percentage (3.0%) had an elementary school education.

The table shows that the highest percentage of the sample in the private sector (38.5%) have graduated from high school and the highest percentage in the public sector (46.9%) have graduated from a university. On the other hand, it appears that the lowest percentage of the sample in the private sector (3.2%) and the lowest percentage in the public sector (2.8%) had an elementary education.

The results support Al-Adaily (1981) in that the lowest percentage of Saudi employees have only an elementary education. However, it does not support his findings in terms of the highest percentage of Saudi employees having completed no more than high school (p. 63).

Table 6
Distribution of Respondents by Level of Education

Level of Education	N	%	Private		Public	
			N	%	N	%
Elementary	9	3.0	5	3.2	4	2.8
Intermediate	50	16.6	27	17.3	23	15.9
Secondary	93	30.9	60	38.5	33	22.8
University	124	41.2	56	35.9	68	46.9
High education	25	8.3	8	5.1	17	11.7
Total	301	100.0	156	100.0	145	100.0

Source of Education or Training

Table 7 indicates that the highest percentage of the sample (82.3%) received their education in Saudi Arabia and the lowest percentage (11.7%) in a foreign country. It appears from the table that the highest percentage of the sample in the private sector (76.7%) and the public sector (87.8%) have received their education in Saudi Arabia and the lowest percentage in the private sector (2.3%) received their education partly in a foreign country. In the public sector .8% received their education partly in Saudi Arabia. The results support Al-Adaily (1981), which states that the highest percentage of Saudi employees were educated in Saudi Arabia while the lowest percentage were educated in a foreign country. The table also

shows that only 3.8% of Saudi employees received their education in another Arabic country.

Table 7
Location of Education or Training

Location	N	%	Private		Public	
			N	%	N	%
Only in Saudi Arabia	214	82.3	99	76.7	115	87.8
Partly in Saudi Arabia	8	3.1	7	5.5	1	.8
Only in Arabic country	10	3.8	6	4.7	4	3.1
Only in a foreign country	23	8.8	14	10.9	9	6.9
Partly in a foreign country	5	1.9	3	2.3	2	1.5
Total	260	100.0	129	100.0	131	100.0

Effect of Education or Training in a Foreign Country

The highest percentage of the sample (39.6%) felt that their attitude completely changed while 17.0% reported being affected quite a bit. However, 10.7% of the sample obtained their education from a foreign country. Thirty-three percent reported no change. It can be said that 56.6% of the sample reported being affected by attending college, school or a training program in a foreign country, while 33.3% reported a negative effect.

The highest percentage in the private sector (47.1%) felt that their attitude was affected by attending college or school or a training program in a foreign country while 27.9% reported no change.

In the public sector, the high percentage (43.6%) reported no change at all while 25.5% reported they were completely changed and 16.4% reported quite a bit of change.

This difference in respondents between the public and private sectors may be due to the difference in the nature of their jobs. In the public sector, jobs are administrative, while in the private sector they are technical and physical, often requiring foreign training. Technology and computer training are required in the private sector. To keep up with new technology, the private sector sends its employees abroad to attend training programs and seminars. On the other hand, the Institute of Public Administration (IPA) handles the public sector training programs. Therefore, most public sector employees attend training programs in the IPA, and thus reported less effect of attending college or school or a training program in a foreign country.

Position

The results in Table 9 show that the highest percentage of the study sample (63.2%) are clerks, 17.1% assistant unit managers, and 11.4% assistant department managers. The remainder (8.2%) did not report their position.

Table 8
Distribution of Respondents by Effect of Foreign
Education on Work

Effect of Foreign Country on Work			Private		Public	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Not at all	53	33.3	29	27.9	24	43.6
Quite a bit	27	17.0	18	17.3	9	16.4
Don't know	16	10.1	8	7.7	8	14.5
Completely changed	63	39.6	49	47.1	14	25.5
Total	159	100.0	104	100.0	55	100.0

The table shows that 57.6% of the sample in the private sector were clerks, 18.8% assistant unit managers, and 16.0% assistant department managers; 7.6% did not report their position.

In the public sector, 69.2% of the sample were clerks, 15.4% assistant unit managers, and 6.6% assistant department managers; 8.8% did not report their position.

This sample represents a full cross section of Saudi employees in the private and in the public sectors. The sample for the private sector included various sectors, such as banks, transportation

companies, service companies, etc. The public sector included various sectors, such as health, education, justice, social affairs, etc.

Table 9
Distribution of Respondents by Position

Position			Private		Public	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Assistant department manager	32	11.4	23	16.0	9	6.6
Assistant unit manager	48	17.1	27	18.8	21	15.4
Clerk	117	63.2	83	57.6	94	69.2
Others	23	8.2	11	7.6	12	8.8
Total	280	100.0	144	100.0	136	100.0

Father's Occupation

Table 10 indicates that the father's occupation for the highest percentage of the sample (50.0%) was public sector employee. The father's occupation with the lowest percentage (6.4%) was private sector employee. Thirty-four percent reported their father's occupation as businessman, while 13.2% did not report their father's occupation.

In terms of type of organization, 45.7% of the sample in the private sector reported their father's occupation was public sector employee, 5.8% reported their father was a private sector employee, and 31.2% reported their father's occupation was businessman. In comparison, 55.4% of the sample in the public sector reported their father's occupation was public sector employee, 7.1% reported their father was a private sector employee, and 29.5% reported their father was a businessman.

The results show the distribution of the workforce in Saudi Arabia, with the highest percentage being public sector employees, the next businessmen, and the last private sector employees.

Marital Status

It appears from Table 11 that the highest percentage of the sample (65.3%) are married and the lowest percentage (.3%) are widowers. In addition, 28.0% of the sample is single, 5.1% divorced with no children, and 1.3% divorced with children.

Table 10
Distribution of Respondents by Father's Occupation

Father's Occupation			Private		Public	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Public employee	125	50.0	63	45.7	62	55.4
Private employee	16	6.4	8	5.8	8	7.1
Businessman	76	30.4	43	31.2	33	29.5
Not reported	33	13.2	24	17.4	9	8.0
Total	250	100.0	138	100.0	112	100.0

In the private sector, the highest percentage of the sample (60.2%) are married, 30.4% are single, 6.8% are divorced without children, 1.9% are divorced with children, and .6% are widowers.

In comparison, 70.6% of the sample in the public sector are married, 25.5% are single, 3.3% are divorced without children, and .7% are divorced with children. There were no widowers in the public sector sample.

Marital status is considered to affect job satisfaction. One who has problems at home may behave inappropriately at work, which will affect his chances of recognition and advancement.

Table 11
Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

Marital Status	N	%	Private		Public	
			N	%	N	%
Married	205	65.3	97	60.2	108	70.6
Single	88	28.0	49	30.4	39	25.5
Divorced, no children	16	5.1	11	6.8	5	3.3
Divorced, children	4	1.3	3	1.9	1	.7
Widower	1	.3	1	.6	--	--
Total	314	100%	161	100%	153	100%

Type of Residence

Table 12 shows that the highest percentage of respondents of the sample (36.7%) own a villa, and the lowest percentage of respondents (4.5%) rent a villa.

It also appears that 22.4% rent an apartment and 12.3% rent a floor in a villa (usually the owner lives on the ground floor and rents the first floor). The extended family is common in Saudi society. One can work and live with his father, mother, and brothers with his wife and children. However, there has been a trend toward nuclear families recently, especially among those who study abroad and those descended from wealthy families.

In the private sector, 31.4% of the sample own villas, 4.5% rent villas, 14.1% rent a floor, 22.4% rent an apartment, and 27.6%

live with their families.

Table 12
Distribution of Respondents by Type of Residence

Type of Residence	<u>N</u>	%	Private		Public	
			<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Rented apartment	69	22.4	35	22.4	34	22.4
Rented villa	14	4.5	7	4.5	7	4.6
Owned villa	113	36.7	49	31.4	64	42.1
Rent a floor	38	12.3	22	14.1	16	10.5
Live with family	74	24.0	43	27.6	31	20.4
Total	308	100.0	156	100.0	152	100.0

In the public sector, 42.1% of the sample own villas, 4.6% rent villas, 10.5% rent a floor, 22.4% rent apartments and 27.6% live with their families.

The majority or highest percentage of the sample respondents (36.7%) own villas. This result leads to the following discussion. It was stated in the preceding results and tables that the highest percentage of the sample respondents are young people with a monthly income ranging between 6,001-9,000 Saudi Riyal. How can they afford to build their own villa? This fact is not surprising if one knows that the Saudi government provides eligible Saudi citizens with interest free and reducible loans as well as free land on which to build a house. This has resulted in modern cities such as Riyadh,

Jeddah, Dammam, Mecca, etc. These loans are provided to any eligible Saudi anywhere in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Location of Residence in Riyadh

Results in Table 13 indicate that 28.6% of the sample live in East Riyadh, 26.6% live in North Riyadh, 18.3% live in South Riyadh, 15.3% live in West Riyadh, 10.7% live in downtown Riyadh and .6% do not live in Riyadh. Riyadh City is divided into five districts.

Table 13

Distribution of Respondents by Location
of Residence in Riyadh

Location of Residence	N	%	Private		Public	
			N	%	N	%
North side	82	26.6	50	32.1	32	21.1
South side	56	18.2	24	15.4	32	21.1
East side	88	28.6	51	32.7	37	24.3
West side	47	15.3	13	8.3	34	22.4
Downtown	33	10.7	17	10.9	16	10.5
Do not live in Riyadh	2	.6	1	.6	1	.7
Total	308	100.0	156	100.0	152	100.0

Most of the wealthy government elite and businessmen live in North and East Riyadh, the middle class live in South and West Riyadh, and those with lower income live in downtown Riyadh. Furthermore, King

Khalid International Airport is located on the north side, as well as the business district and shopping center, while the industrial zone and factories are located on the south side.

Means and Standard Deviations, Correlations and
Comparisons of Demographic Variables of the
Attitude Factors

In this section tables of means and standard deviations of the attitude factors in the private, public and both sectors will be introduced. Tables of correlations between overall satisfaction, and attitude factors in the private, public, and both sectors will be introduced.

Following the tables each attitude factor will be discussed independently in regards to its contribution to job satisfaction, correlation with overall satisfaction and comparisons to demographic variables. Note that a score less than 3 on a factor indicates employee dissatisfaction and a score higher than 3 indicates employee satisfaction.

This section will conclude with a summary of the preceding discussions.

Means and Standard Deviations of the Attitude Factors

Table 14 presents the means and standard deviations of the attitude factors in the private sector.

Table 14
Job Satisfaction for Private Sector Respondents

Rank	Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1	Responsibility, recognition and relationships with peers and subordinates.	146	3.79	.73
2	Working conditions.	160	3.76	.97
3	Opportunities for advancement.	155	3.47	1.16
4	Personal developments and opportunity to make own decisions.	144	3.43	.93
5	Time demands and requirements of the job.	136	3.24	.80
6	Organizational policies and personal recognition.	151	3.14	.89
7	Social status.	157	3.12	.92
8	Security and salary.	148	3.18	.95
9	Supervisory techniques.	152	2.52	.92

Table 15 presents the means and standard deviations of the attitude factors in the public sector.

Table 16 represents the importance of each attitude factor among Saudi employees in the private as well as in the public sector. It was considered that job satisfaction and importance are synonymous (Al-Adaily, 1981).

Table 15

Job Satisfaction for Public Sector Respondents

Rank	Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1	Responsibility, recognition and relationships with peers and subordinates.	139	3.59	.68
2	Supervisory techniques.	146	3.27	1.16
3	Working conditions.	152	3.25	1.16
4	Security and salary.	145	3.11	.79
5	Personal development and opportunity to make own decisions.	144	2.93	.93
6	Time demands and requirements of the job.	142	2.90	.75
7	Organizational policies and personal recognition.	145	2.88	.74
8	Social status.	151	2.81	.93
9	Opportunity for advancement.	150	2.75	1.70

He states: "Satisfaction and importance are synonymous...because of the meaning of those two terms in Saudi Arabia and the way the terms were used in the questionnaire" (p. 89).

Table 16
 Importance of Job Satisfaction Factors in
 the Private and Public Sectors

Job Satisfaction Factors	Private	Public
Responsibility, recognition and relationships with peers and subordinates.	1	1
Working conditions.	2	3
Opportunities for advancement.	3	9
Personal development and opportunity to make own decisions.	4	5
Time demands and requirements of the job.	5	6
Organizational policies and personal recognition.	6	7
Security and salary.	7	4
Social status.	8	8
Supervisory techniques.	9	2

Table 17 represents the Pearson Zero Order Correlation between overall satisfaction and job satisfaction factors in the private sector.

Table 17

Correlation Between Overall Job Satisfaction and Job
Satisfaction in the Private Sector

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00									
2	.85									
3	.93	.70								
4	.84	.64	.78							
5	.85	.71	.77	.67						
6	.84	.77	.78	.64	.73					
7	.37	.35	.38	.36	.34	.25				
8	.92	.80	.78	.72	.77	.80	.31			
9	.75	.69	.57	.56	.51	.60	.23	.83		
10	.85	.77	.75	.65	.78	.80	.33	.93	.66	1.00
1 = Satisfaction						6 = Opportunity for advancement				
2 = Security and salary						7 = Working conditions				
3 = Personal development and opportunity to make own decisions						8 = Time demands and requirements of the job				
4 = Responsibility, recognition, and relationship with peers and subordinates						9 = Social status				
5 = Supervisory techniques						10 = Organizational policies & personal recognition				

Table 18 presents the Pearson Zero Order Correlation between overall satisfaction and the job satisfaction factors in the public sector.

Table 18
Correlations Between Overall Job Satisfaction and Job
Satisfaction Factors in the Public Sector

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00									
2	.78									
3	.93	.67								
4	.83	.59	.79							
5	.87	.57	.75	.65						
6	.77	.66	.72	.55	.25					
7	.52	.43	.45	.35	.44	.25				
8	.86	.70	.79	.74	.67	.61	.48			
9	.65	.61	.57	.57	.38	.45	.32	.85		
10	.83	.57	.76	.68	.74	.58	.43	.89	.60	1.00

1 = Satisfaction	6 = Opportunity for advancement
2 = Security and Salary	7 = Working conditions
3 = Personal development and opportunity to make own decisions	8 = Time demands and requirements of the job
4 = Responsibility, recognition, and relationship with peers and subordinates	9 = Social status
5 = Supervisory techniques	10 = Organizational policies & personal recognition

Table 19 presents the Pearson Zero Order Correlation between overall satisfaction and job satisfaction factors in both private and public sectors.

Table 20

T-test for Independent Samples of Type of Organization

Factors	Private			Public			Significant
	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
1	148	3.13	.946	245	3.11	.785	.690
2	144	3.43	.929	149	2.92	.861	.000
3	140	3.79	.725	139	3.60	.680	.021
4	152	3.48	.919	146	3.27	.936	.053
5	155	2.97	1.163	150	2.75	1.067	.089
6	160	3.76	.968	152	3.25	1.142	.000
7	136	3.24	.798	142	2.90	.753	.000
8	157	3.13	.924	151	2.81	.933	.004
9	151	3.15	.924	151	2.88	.794	.000

1 = Security and salary

6 = Working conditions

2 = Personal development and
opportunity to make
own decisions7 = Time demands and
requirements
of the job3 = Responsibility, recog-
nition, and relationship
with peers and
subordinates

8 = Social status

4 = Supervisory techniques

9 = Organizational policies
& personal recognition5 = Opportunity for
advancement

Discussion of Each Factor

Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships With Peers and Subordinates

Responsibility, recognition and relationships with peers and subordinates is reported as the most satisfying factor in the private sector (mean = 3.79, SD = .73; Table 14) as well as in the public sector (mean = 3.59, SD = .68; Table 15). However, though both sectors reported it as the most satisfied factor, employees in the private sector were more satisfied (mean = 3.79) than their counterparts in the public sector (mean = 3.59).

Table 16 indicates that employees in both private and public sectors ranked this as the most important factor to them. Responsibility, recognition, and relationships with peers and subordinates is significantly correlated to overall satisfaction in the private ($r = .84$) as well as public sector ($r = .83$). It is correlated to the overall satisfaction in the whole sample--combined private and public samples ($r = .84$). However, it is not the most correlated factor.

T-test (Table 20) indicates that subjects in the private sector were significantly ($p = .021$) more satisfied with this factor than their counterparts in the public sector. No significant variance was found between this factor and demographic variables (Table 35, Appendix C).

Working Conditions

Saudi employees in the private sector reported relatively higher scores for "working condition" factor (mean = 3.76, SD = .97) (Table 14) than their counterparts (mean = 3.25, SD = 1.16) (Table 15). This result supports Al-Adaily (1981). He found that Saudi employees in the government agencies were most satisfied with working conditions. He ranked this item third.

In the current study, Saudi employees in the public sector ranked "working conditions" as the third most important factor.

It was found to be the factor least correlated with overall satisfaction in the private sector ($r = .37$; Table 17) as well as in the public sector ($r = .52$; Table 18) and in the whole sample--combined samples of private and public sectors ($r = .48$; Table 19).

T-test (Table 20) shows that private sector employees were significantly ($p = .000$) more satisfied with this factor than their counterparts in the public sector.

Analysis of variance (Table 33, Appendix C) indicates that "father's occupation" was found to affect job satisfaction significantly ($p = .019$) for this factor. Individuals whose fathers were businessmen tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Opportunity for Advancement

Private sector employees reported relatively high scores for the "opportunity for advancement" factor (mean = 3.47, SD = 1.16; Table 14). This factor was ranked as the third most important job

satisfaction factor in the private sector (Table 16). Saudi private sector employees feel there are opportunities for advancement within the private organization.

In comparison, public sector employees reported this factor relatively low (mean = 2.75, SD = 1.70). Furthermore, they ranked it the least important factor.

In the second half of the 1980s, the Saudi government implemented the Fourth Development Plan, 1985-1990 (Ministry of Planning, 1985). In that plan, emphasis was put on reducing and restricting employment opportunities and promotions in governmental agencies. The private sector was encouraged to hire Saudi employees and give them good incentives and fringe benefits.

The "opportunity for advancement" factor was found relatively correlated with the overall satisfaction ($r = .84$) in the private sector. But it was less correlated with the overall satisfaction in the public sector ($r = .77$). However, it is correlated with overall satisfaction in the whole sample--combined private and public sample ($r = .81$).

T-test (Table 20) indicates no significant differences ($p = .89$) between employees in both sectors.

Analysis of variance (Table 36, Appendix C) indicates that the effect of education and training in a foreign country (Tra) was found to affect job satisfaction significantly ($p = .019$) for this factor. People who got their education, or part of their education, in a foreign country tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Personal Development and Opportunities to Make Own Decisions

The subjects in the private sector reported relatively high scores of satisfaction (mean = 3.43, SD = .93) on the "personal development and opportunity to make own decisions" factor (Table 14). Furthermore, they ranked it as the fourth most important factor.

In comparison, the subjects in the public sector reported a less satisfaction score (mean = 2.93, SD = .93; Table 15) for this factor. Public sector employees ranked it fifth in importance.

Employees in the private sector may be satisfied with this factor because of the freedom they have. As there is no direct connection with the political system, employees in the private sector are able to make decisions without any consideration for Congress or interest groups. Most private sector decisions are made by

defining the problem accurately; collecting and analyzing relevant data, costing out the alternatives; and choosing the option most likely to enhance their product divisions, region or corporation. In several places within the...government a similar process does take place; however, once the alternatives have been costed out, the final decision will be subjected to vagaries of the political decision-making system (Ross, 1988, p. 29).

Compared to all other factors, this factor showed the highest correlation with the overall satisfaction in the private sector ($r = .93$; Table 19). The same was true in the public sector ($r = .93$; Table 18). In the whole sample--combined private sector sample and public sector sample--it is the highest correlated factor ($r = .93$; Table 19).

T-test (Table 20) indicates that employees in the private

sector were significantly ($P = .001$) more satisfied than employees in the public sector.

Analysis of variance (Table 31, Appendix C) indicates that "position" was found to affect job satisfaction significantly ($P = .046$) for this factor. The assistant unit manager tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Time Demands and Requirements of the Job

Table 14 indicates that employees in the private sector reported satisfaction with time demands and requirements of the job (mean = 3.24, SD = .80). They ranked this factor fifth in importance (Table 16). In contrast, the public sector employees reported less satisfaction with this factor (mean = 2.90, SD = .75; Table 15). They ranked it as sixth in importance (Table 16).

The economic change implemented by the government in the 1980s led to reductions and limitations on the overtime hours and fringe benefits in government agencies. Employees in the public sector are required to do a lot of work with limited pay or salary. Government employees are ranked, while those in the private sector are not. Salary and benefits in the private sector are subject to contracts between the private organizations and the applicants.

Time demands and requirements of the job is the second highest correlated with overall satisfaction in the private sector ($r = .92$; Table 17), but it is the third in the public sector ($r = .16$; Table 18). In the whole sample it is the second highest correlated factor

($r = .89$; Table 19).

T-test (Table 20) indicates that people in the private sector reported significantly ($p = .000$) more satisfaction in this factor than those in the public sector.

Analysis of variance (Table 37, Appendix C) indicates four demographic variables were found to affect satisfaction with this factor: (1) income ($p = .005$) the higher the income the more satisfied the person, (2) age ($p = .046$) the older the person the more satisfied he would be, (3) effect of education and training in a foreign country ($p = .031$) individuals who had training or education in a foreign country tended to be more satisfied with their jobs, and (4) marital status ($p = .031$) divorced people who have no children tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition

Subjects of this study in the private sector reported satisfaction with the organizational policies and personal recognition (mean = 3.14, SD = .89). Private sector employees reported satisfaction in "feelings about their personal recognition and their entertainment from their organization" (Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 79). They feel satisfied with "supportive organizational policies that insure employee competency and initiative are recognized and rewarded" (Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 79). They ranked this factor sixth in importance. However, this is not the case for public sector employees, who reported less satisfaction (mean = 2.88, SD = .74; Table 15). They ranked this

factor seventh in importance.

These differences appear to be due to the decision-making processes. It is much easier for management in the private sector to reward and promote a distinguished employee because the promotion is not subjected to the political system in the government directly. On the other hand, it is not easy to promote or reward a distinguished employee in the public sector without having authorization from the legislature, or sticking with the reward system in place, which requires dealing with and persuading more than one director.

The organizational policies and personal recognition factor is relatively highly correlated with overall satisfaction in the private sector ($r = .85$; Table 17). But it is less correlated in the public sector ($r = .83$; Table 18). In general, it is relatively highly correlated ($r = .85$) for the whole sample (Table 19).

T-test (Table 20) indicates that the private sector employees were significantly ($p = .006$) more satisfied with this factor than their public sector counterparts.

Security and Salary

Table 14 indicates that the private sector sample reported satisfaction with the security and salary factor (mean = 3.13, SD = .95) and ranked it seventh in importance (Table 16). The private sector employees reported higher satisfaction scores in this factor (mean = 3.13, SD = .95) than their counterparts in the public sector (mean = 3.11, SD = .79; Table 15). The security and salary factor

was ranked fourth in terms of importance in the public sector (Table 16). Al-Adaily (1981) found the [public] employee in Saudi Arabia [agencies] was less satisfied with pay (mean = 2.68, SD = 1.24). However, the findings of the current study do not support this. Security and salary is significantly correlated with the overall job satisfaction in both sectors ($r = .81$; Table 19). It is higher correlated with overall job satisfaction in the private sector ($r = .85$; Table 17) than the public sector ($r = .78$; Table 18).

T-test (Table 20) indicates no significant difference ($p = .690$) between employees in both sectors.

Analysis of variance (Table 30, Appendix C) shows that three demographic variables show significant differences: (1) income ($p = .006$) the higher the income the more satisfied the person would be, (2) age ($p = .001$) the older the person the more satisfied he would be, and (3) marital status ($p = .006$) the married people tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Social Status

Subjects in the private sector reported satisfaction with social status (mean = 3.12, SD = .92; Table 14), while subjects in the public sector reported less satisfaction (mean = 2.81, SD = .92; Table 15) with this factor. However, subjects in both sectors ranked it as the eighth factor in importance (Table 16). The results of this current study show that employees in the public sector were less

satisfied with social status and family reputation obtained from the job. The results here do not support Al-Adaily (1981) which states: "still other items such as...the reputation my family gets from my job are in the middle between satisfaction and dissatisfaction" (p. 74).

Social status is significantly correlated with overall satisfaction in both sectors ($r = .70$; Table 19). It is higher in the private sector ($r = .77$; Table 17) than in the public sector ($r = .65$; Table 18).

T-test (Table 20) indicates that private sector employees are significantly ($p = .004$) more satisfied with this factor than their counterparts in the public sector.

Analysis of variance (Table 34, Appendix C) indicates that there are three demographic variables which affect job satisfaction for this factor: (1) income ($p = .004$) the higher the income the more satisfied the person. (2) effect of education and training in a foreign country ($p = .026$) individuals who had education or training in a foreign country tended to be more satisfied with their jobs, and (3) location of residence in Riyadh ($p = .020$) individuals people who live in downtown Riyadh tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Supervisory Techniques

This factor is the least (mean = 2.52, SD = .92) and the only factor that subjects in the private sector reported less satisfaction with (Table 14). They are less satisfied with the effectiveness of

their supervisors in defining responsibilities of employees and in providing positive working relationships between supervisors and employees. They are less satisfied with the effectiveness of their supervisors in administering defined organizational policies and practice. Management stress in the private sector tied to control and role conflict, and role ambiguity causes less satisfaction. "Providing more information about tasks through information and rational type communication should increase...satisfaction" (Alexander, Helms, & Wilkins, 1989).

The subjects in the private sector ranked supervisory techniques ninth in importance (Table 16). In comparison, subjects in the public sector reported relatively high scores (mean = 3.27, SD = 1.16) and therefore satisfaction with this factor (Table 15). They ranked supervisory techniques second in importance (Table 16). Role ambiguity is almost eliminated and role conflict is minimized. Formulated rules and well defined regulations, almost eliminated role ambiguity and minimized role conflict in the public sector making it easy for supervisors to define responsibilities of employees and to provide positive relationships between the boss and employees, as well as administering defined organizational policies and practices.

Table 17 indicates that the supervisory techniques factor is significantly ($r = .85$) correlated to overall satisfaction in the private sector. However, it is less than in the public sector (Table 18), where the correlation significance is higher ($r = .87$). In

addition, it is also significantly correlated to overall satisfaction in the whole sample--public and private--($r = .86$; Table 19).

T-test (Table 20) indicates that public sector subjects were significantly ($p = .053$) more satisfied than their private sector counterparts.

Analysis of variance (Table 32, Appendix C) indicates that three demographic variables significantly affect job satisfaction in the supervisory techniques factor: (1) income ($p = .039$) the higher the income the more satisfied the person would be, (2) age ($p = .48$) the older the person the more satisfied he would be, and (3) place where degree was obtained ($p = .046$) individuals who obtained their degree partly in Saudi Arabia tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Summary

To conclude the preceding discussion, the following section will summarize the results. It appears from Table 14 that subjects in the private sector were satisfied with eight of the job satisfaction factors and less satisfied with only one factor (supervisory techniques). On the other hand, Table 15 indicates that subjects in the public sector were satisfied with four job satisfaction factors and less satisfied five factors. It can be concluded that subjects in the private sector reported more satisfaction with their job than their public sector counterparts.

Correlations with overall satisfaction factors (Tables 17, 18, and 19) indicate that all nine factors are significantly correlated with overall satisfaction. The highest correlated factor is the same for both sectors--personal development and opportunity to make own decisions. The second highest correlated factor is not the same--time demands and requirements of the job ranked second highest in the private sector, while supervisory techniques ranked second in the public sector. The lowest correlated factor for both sectors is working conditions. Therefore, it can be concluded that time demands and requirements of the job is the most important factor affecting job satisfaction in the private sector. It can also be concluded that supervisory techniques is the most important factor affecting job satisfaction in the public sector. On the other hand, personal development and opportunity to make own decisions is a job satisfaction factor associated with both sectors.

T-test (Table 20) indicates that subjects in the private sector are significantly more satisfied with six factors and significantly less satisfied with one factor--supervisory techniques--and not significantly satisfied with two factors--security and salary; opportunity for advancement.

Analysis of variance (Tables 30-38, Appendix C) indicates that some demographic variables significantly affect job satisfaction in some factors.

Analysis of Instrument

A factor analysis was run on all the scale 64 items. Twelve factors emerged, explaining 69% of the variance. In the following tables the results of the current study are compared with the factor loadings of Al-Adaily (1981).

Factor 1. Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions

Table 21 indicates that this factor corresponds closely to Factor 1 in the current study. The reliability, as measured by Cronbach's Alpha, equal .95.

Table 21

Factor 1: Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
44 The freedom to use my own judgment.	.68	.65	1
18 The opportunities to develop new and better ways to do my job.	.67	.57	1
62 The opportunities to make decision on my own.	.65	.69	1
47 The opportunities to try my own ideas.	.62	.61	1
7 The opportunity to try my own methods of doing the job.	.60	.71	1
48 The opportunities to do my best at all times.	.59	.58	1

Table 21--continued

5 Opportunities to do a whole job.	.58	.56	1
11 The opportunities to develop my skills and abilities.	.57	.57	1
34 The opportunities I have to do something that make me feel good about myself as a person.	.55	.57	1
22 The opportunity to learn new things.	.55	.62	1
12 Being able to do something I think is worthwhile.	.49	.72	1
53 The opportunity to be responsible for the work of others.	.46	.58	1
21 The opportunity for training and experience on the job that will help my growth.	.46	.59	3
25 The opportunity to be important in the eyes of others.	.43	.54	1

Alpha = .95

Factor 2. Security and Salary

Table 22 indicates that the items for security and salary loaded on at least three different factors (7, 4 and 9). Items 50 and 38 did not load clearly on any of the 12 factors.

It seems that here Al-Adaily (1981) has mixed two different constructs: (1) items 36 and 10 measure relative salary satisfaction, and (2) items 27, 37, and 49 measure security.

The loadings of items 50, 45 and 38 indicate that these items

are unrelated to these two constructs. Cronbach's Alpha = .85.

Factor 3. Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships With Peers and Subordinates

Table 23 indicates that four of the eight items in this factor loaded highly on Factor 8 in the results. The remaining four items

Table 22

Factor 2. Security and Salary

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
36 My pay and the amount of work I do.	.80	.67	7
10 The amount of pay for the work I do.	.80	.75	7
27 The way my job provides for a secure future.	.63	.48	4
37 How steady my job is for the future.	.55	.70	4
50 The way I get full credit for the work I do on my job.	.48	.35	1
49 The way my job provides for steady employment.	.47	.69	4
45 The way tea and coffee are provided on the job.	.41	.71	9
33 Fulfillment of personal needs.	.40	.58	2

Alpha = .85

in this factor loaded on four different factors in the results of the current study. Where item 28 loaded on factor 12, item 26 loaded on

factor 1, item 30 loaded on factor 5 and item 42 loaded on factor 6. Factor analysis indicates that this factor is a mixture of five different factors. Cronbach's Alpha = .83.

Table 23

Factor 3. Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships
With Peers and Subordinates

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
41 My relationship with my peers.	.67	.80	8
28 The creativity of my job.	.64	.51	12
26 The way I am informed about my job performance.	.60	.55	1
6 The working relationship with my subordinates.	.59	.52	8
23 Recognition from my peers.	.58	.67	8
30 My responsibilities of my job.	.53	.44	5
24 The feeling of accomplishment I get from by job.	.56	.41	8
42 The kind of job I have.	.45	.60	6
Alpha = .83			

Factor 4. Supervisory Techniques

Table 24 indicates that this factor consists of two different factors. Seven items loaded highly on factor 2 in the current results, while three items loaded on factor 5.

It seems that two constructs were mixed in Al-Adaily (1981). Items 19, 31, 17, 43, 54, and 4 measure the relationship between loss

and employees. Items 51, 29, and 39 deal with the organization policies and practices. Cronbach's Alpha = .92.

Table 24

Factor 4. Supervisory Techniques

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
19 The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.	.71	.79	2
31 The personal relationship between my boss and his employee.	.71	.68	2
17 The way my boss handles his employees.	.69	.77	2
43 The way my boss provides help on hard problems.	.63	.69	2
54 The way my boss trains his employees.	.58	.64	2
4 The way my supervisor and I understand each other.	.57	.69	2
33 The way my boss delegates work to others.	.56	.58	2
51 The way organizational policies are put into preactice.	.56	.55	5
29 The way the organization treats its employees.	.52	.64	5
39 The policies and practices toward employees.	.50	.57	5
Alpha = .92			

Factor 5. Opportunities for Advancement

Table 25 indicates that three items loading highly on factor 3,

while one item loaded on factor 1 in our results.

Again, this factor is a mix of two constructs in Al-Adaily (1981). Cronbach's Alpha = .90.

Table 25
Factor 5. Opportunities for Advancement

Item	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
9 The opportunities for advancement on my job.	.75	.73	3
32 The way promotions are given out on my job.	.75	.76	3
20 The opportunities of getting ahead on my job.	.54	.54	1
55 My feeling for advancement.	.48	.68	3
Alpha = .60			

Factor 6. Working Conditions

Table 26 indicates that this factor corresponds to factor 9 in the current results. The two items that comprise this factor in Al-Adaily (1981) loaded highly for factor 9 in the current results.

Cronbach's Alpha = .60.

Table 26

Factor 6. Working Conditions

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
8 The working conditions (heating, ventilation, etc.) in my job.	.65	.79	9
35 The pleasantness of the working conditions.	.65	.57	9
Alpha = .60			

Factor 7. Time Demands and Requirements of the Job

Table 27 indicates that the items for time demands and requirements of the job (Al-Adaily, 1981) loaded on at least three different factors in the current study results. Items 57 and 64 loaded on item 10. Item 59 loaded on factor 4, and item 16 loaded on factor 9 in the current results. Cronbach's Alpha = .85.

Factor 8. Status

Table 28 indicates that items of status (Al-Adaily, 1981) loaded on two factors in the current study. Item 61 loaded on factor 1 and items 58 and 46 loaded highly on factor 6. Cronbach's Alpha = .70.

Table 27

Factor 7. Time Demands and Requirements of the Job

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
57 How my work hours compare with those for similar jobs in other organizations.	.70	.70	10
64 The amount of time my job allows me to be with my family..66		.78	10
59 The way layoffs and transfers are made in my job.	.47	.41	4
16 The difficulties of my job.	.47	.41	9

Alpha = .85

Table 28

Factor 8. Status

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
61 Opportunities to be around important people.	.65	.53	1
58 The reputation my family gets from my job.	.64	.63	6
46 The social status I get from my job.	.46	.64	6

Alpha = .70

Factor 9. Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition

Table 29 indicates that the status factor (Al-Adaily, 1981) is a mixture of four constructs in the current results. Approximately every one of the factor 5 items loaded on different factors, and one item (3) is not related to any factor.

Item 15 loaded on factor 2, item 40 loaded on factor 1, item 2 loaded on factor 5 and item 60 loaded on factor 11. However, Cronbach's Alpha = .75. Al-Adaily (1981) refers in his footnotes (p. 88) that this factor (status) is related to factor 4 (supervisory techniques).

Table 29

Factor 9. Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition

Item #	Al-Adaily Loading	Al-Hajri Loading	Factor
15 The way employees are informed about organizational policy.	.53	.45	2
40 The praise I get for doing a good job.	.47	.45	1
3 The way I am noticed when I do a good job.	.45	.35	1
2 Organizational policies and the way in which they are administered.	.42	.56	5
60 The way my organization provides opportunities and help in entertainment for me and my family.	.40	.58	11

Alpha = .75

In conclusion, factor analysis in this current study indicates that job satisfaction is composed of 12 factors. These results do not support Al-Adaily (1981), except in one factor (personal development and opportunity to make own decisions). However, the reliability analysis is relatively high. Thus, the results can be accepted in spite of the differences between the current factor analysis and Al-Adaily's (1981).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter four sections are presented: (1) Discussion of the nine job satisfaction factors, (2) analysis of the instrument (the adapted Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire), (3) recommendations for increasing employee satisfaction, and (4) implications for future research.

Discussion of the Nine Job Satisfaction Factors

It was the aim of this study to explore how type of organization, i.e., private and public, affects job satisfaction among 324 Saudi employees in both sectors. An additional aim was to explore the most important factors that affect job satisfaction in each sector, as well as the associated factors between them.

The adapted Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Al-Adaily, 1981) was used in this study to show how Saudi employees--in the public as well as private sectors--feel about their jobs during this time of rapid development in Saudi Arabia.

Nine job satisfaction factors were tested in each sector. These were: (1) Personal development and opportunity to make own decisions, (2) Security and salary, (3) Responsibility, recognition, and relationships with peers and with subordinates, (4) Supervisory techniques, (5) Opportunities for advancement, (6) Working

conditions, (7) Time demands and requirements of the job, (8) Social status, and (9) Organizational policies and personal recognition.

(Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 77).

These nine factors were produced by Al-Adaily's (1981) analysis. They are a mix of intrinsic and extrinsic items.

The findings of the current study indicate that the private sector is more satisfied than the public sector in general.

Pritchard and Karasick (1973), Smith (1980), Solomon (1986) and Cacioppe and Mock (1984) found that type of organization affects job satisfaction. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) found there is a relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. They found different characteristics in the organization, such as

individuals' perceptions of the supportiveness and friendliness of the climate, how effectively it deals with its operating and competitive problems, how well the climate rewards its employees, and the degree of democratization achieved in the organization (p. 142).

affect job satisfaction.

Smith (1980) found that white collar workers in the private sector were more satisfied than their counterparts in the public sector. Cacioppe and Mock (1984) found that "Australian public sector employees were significantly less satisfied with their quality of work experience than their private sector counterparts" (p. 935).

Solomon (1986) found that private sector managers reported significantly higher satisfaction than their counterparts in the public sector.

The nine job satisfaction factors were tested in each sector in

order to determine the similarities and differences between public and private sector employees in Saudi Arabia. The following is a discussion of each factor for both sectors.

Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships
With Peers and Subordinates

Saudi employees in both the private and public sectors reported high satisfaction with this factor. Both sectors ranked this the most important for them. However, the private sector was found to be significantly more satisfied with this factor than their counterparts in the public sector.

Al-Adaily (1981) found that public sector employees in Saudi Arabia reported high satisfaction with this factor.

Responsibility is very important in the private sector. It is related to productivity and therefore to the evaluation and rewards. When the employee is delegated a responsibility, he has to cope with that responsibility to prove to his boss that he is qualified and can handle the job. Delegation of responsibility leads to feelings of satisfaction because the person feels he is important in the organization and can participate in the development and growth of the organization. Emotional and material rewards for distinguished production lead to a feeling of satisfaction.

Working Conditions

Results of this study indicate that Saudi employees reported satisfaction with this factor. Al-Adaily (1981) found that Saudi

employees were satisfied with working conditions in the public sector. However, there is a significant difference between the two groups in terms of this factor. Private sector employees reported significant satisfaction, which was more than their public sector counterparts. The private sector is provided with modern designed offices with modern furniture and new decorations to meet employees physical needs. It seems that the physical surroundings, such as heating, lighting, ventilation, etc., are more comfortable in the private than in the public sector.

Results reported by Sahally's 1977 study (cited in Al-Adaily, 1981) indicates that managers of public employees ranked working conditions as the third most important incentive. Thus, it is apparent that both the private and public sectors have satisfied a need which employees regard as important.

Opportunity for Advancement

Employees in the private sector reported satisfaction with this factor, more so than public sector employees, who reported less satisfaction.

The result of this study does not support Al-Adaily (1981). Al-Adaily found this factor among what he called "Intermediate Satisfaction Factors." He states

Three factors falling between the extremes of high and low job satisfaction are (1) opportunity for advancement, (2) status, and (3) personal development and opportunity to make own decisions (p. 105).

In the Fourth Development Plan (1985-1990) (Ministry of

Planning, 1985), emphasis was put on reducing and restricting employment opportunities and promotions in government agencies. At the same time, the private sector was encouraged to hire Saudi employees and offer them good incentives and fringe benefits.

The reason employees may feel dissatisfied in their personal development and opportunity to make their own decision may be due to organizational policies and the way in which they are administered (Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 105).

Personal Development and Opportunity to Make Own Decisions

Subjects from the private sector reported satisfaction with this factor, while subjects from the public sector reported less satisfaction. Private sector employees reported significantly more satisfaction than their counterparts in the public sector. The current study's results do not support Al-Adaily (1981), who classified this factor with the "Intermediate Satisfaction Factors."

The results of this study are consistent with Paine et al. (1966). He found that field managers were more satisfied than their counterparts in central offices in terms of growth and development.

Current results are also consistent with Smith and Nock (1980).

Smith and Nock found:

Problematic for the white collar workers in the public sector are items relating to: Lack of opportunities for personal development through work, lack of interesting work and lack of freedom to do their work are problematic for the white collar workers in the public sector (p. 70).

Time Demands and Requirements of the Job

The current study indicates that employees in the private sector

reported significantly more satisfaction in this factor than employees in the public sector. This is consistent with Al-Adaily (1981). Al-Adaily classified this factor with the "Low Satisfaction Factors."

The economic changes implemented by the government in the 1980s led to reductions and limitation in the overtime hours and fringe benefits in government agencies. Employees in the public sector are required to do a lot of work with limited pay or salary. Government employees are ranked, while those in the private sector are not. Salary and benefits in the private sector are subjected to contracts between the private organizations and the applicants.

Organizational Policies and Personal Recognition

Subjects in the private sector reported significantly more satisfaction than subjects in the public sector.

The results of this study support Al-Adaily's (1981) in terms of the public sector satisfaction with this factor. Al-Adaily found public employees were dissatisfied with this factor. The differences between the two groups in this study may be due to the decision-making processes. Since it is not subjected to the political system in the government directly, it is much easier for management in the private sector to reward and promote exceptional employees. On the other hand, it is difficult to promote or reward distinguished employees in the public sector. It requires authorization from legislators, or stick with the reward system which requires dealing

with and persuading in more than one direction to have the right to reward or promote.

Security and Salary

Results of this study indicate no differences between the employees in the private and public sectors. Employees in both sectors reported comparable satisfaction with security and salary.

The results of this study are not consistent with Al-Adaily (1981) and Sahally (cited in Al-Adaily, 1981). Al-Adaily found that public employees were less satisfied with security and salary (p. 103). Sahally found "public employees (managers and technicians) are more dissatisfied than employees of private organizations with their level of economic rewards" (Al-Adaily, 1981, p. 103).

Social Status

Subjects in the private sector were significantly more satisfied than subjects in the public sector. Al-Adaily (1981) placed this factor among the "intermediate satisfaction factors." In other words, Al-Adaily did not find this factor affected job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. He states: "still other items such as the reputation my family gets from my job, are in the middle between satisfaction and dissatisfaction" (p. 74).

The results of this study do not support this. Subjects in the private sector are satisfied while subjects in the public sector are not.

Supervisory Techniques

This factor is the only one which subjects in the private sector reported less satisfaction with. In comparison, subjects in the public sector reported relatively high satisfaction on this factor.

The private sector were less satisfied with the effectiveness of their supervisors in defining responsibility of employees and in providing positive working relationship between supervisors and employees. They are less satisfied with the effectiveness of their supervisors in administering defined organizational policies and practices. Management stress in the private sector ties in to control and role conflict, and role ambiguity causes less satisfaction (Alexander et al., 1989).

This is not the case in the public sector, where subjects reported satisfaction with this factor and ranked it second in importance. In the public sector rules are formulated and regulations are well defined, role ambiguity is almost eliminated and role conflict is minimized. "Providing more information about tasks through information and national type communication should increase...satisfaction" (Alexander et al., 1989, p. 417).

Analysis of the Instrument

It was the researcher's desire to run a reliability test in order to determine the reliability of the adapted Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Al-Adaily, 1981). In other words, the researcher wished to see how consistent the items are within each factor. The

reliability test indicates that Cronbach's Alpha was high and therefore, the adapted Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was reliable to the extent that it can be used as an instrument to collect data in Saudi society (Tables 30-38, Appendix C).

In addition, a factor analysis was run on all the scale items. Twelve factors emerged which explained 69% of the variance. In comparison with the Al-Adaily (1981) factor analysis (9 factors) the following were found:

1. Two of Al-Adaily's (1981) factors correspond closely to two factors in the present study: (1) Factor 1 in Al-Adaily "personal development and opportunity to make own decisions" corresponds to factor 1 in this study, and (2) factor 6 in Al-Adaily's "working conditions" corresponds to factor 9 in this study.

2. Three of Al-Adaily's factor items loaded on two factors in the present study: (1) factor 4 "supervisory techniques" loaded on factors 2 and five, (2) factor 5 "opportunity for advancement" loaded on factors 1 and 3, and (3) factor 8 "status" loaded on factors 1 and 6.

3. Two of Al-Adaily's factor items loaded on three factors in the present study. Factor 2 "security and salary" loaded on factors 7, 4, and 9 in the present study. However, two items did not load. Factor 7 items in Al-Adaily--"time demands and requirements of the job"--loaded on factors 9, 10 and 4 in the present study.

4. One of Al-Adaily's factor items loaded on four different factors in the present study. Factor 9--"organizational policies and

personal recognition"--items loaded on factors 1, 2, 5, and 11. One item did not load.

5. One of Al-Adaily's factor items loaded on five different factors in the present study. Factor 3--"responsibility, recognition and relationship with peers and with subordinates"--items loaded on factors 1, 5, 6, 8, and 12 in the present study.

In conclusion, in spite of the differences between the factor analysis in this study and Al-Adaily's, the results of these factors as job satisfaction factors are acceptable. The differences may be due to time period (almost ten years).

Recommendations for Management in Both Sectors

Results in this study indicate that employees in the private sector in Saudi Arabia were satisfied with their job aspects in general. However, when the job satisfaction factors were tested, one factor was reported less satisfactory. Supervisory techniques factor was ranked as the least in importance, and subjects reported less satisfaction with this factor. Supervisory techniques include (as defined by Al-Adaily, 1981) an:

Emphasis on management capabilities and competency of supervisor. Supervisors are seen as effective in defining responsibilities of employees and in providing positive working relationships between boss and employees, support when needed, and in administering defined organizational policies and practices (p. 87).

Using this definition of supervisory techniques, we can assume a lack of management skills in the private sector, a lack of well-trained and educated managers and supervisors, and a lack of training

programs.

Creating training programs or sending supervisors to training programs is an additional cost to the organization, but it is for the benefit of the organizational future. Therefore, it is recommended that private organizations hire experienced supervisors and train the supervisors in management skills as well as training employees to understand organizational rules and regulations, understanding demands of the job, duties and worker rights. As Al-Awwad (1988) noted:

Training employees to understand organizational purposes and the particular techniques that these require is a function of supervisory and staff development personal. It is an important function, as training can to some extent lessen the need for control. Training prepared the organization member to reach satisfactory decision himself without the need for the constant exercise of authority. ...Training procedures are alternatives to the exercise of authority or advice as a means of control over the subordinate's decision (p. 95).

Secondly, in order to increase job satisfaction in the public sector, the researcher recommends the following:

1. The promotion process needs to be improved in order to increase employees motivation. Note that the current policy may have been designed to encourage Saudis to join the private sector rather than the public sector.
2. Team management should be implemented to ensure participation of all the organization's members.
3. Educate employees about the importance of using work hours and allocating work loads fairly.
4. Delegate responsibilities to employees to increase their

feelings of importance and value to the organization.

Implications for Future Study

The researcher would agree with Al-Adaily (1981) that studies in the United States have ignored cultural differences and how they contribute to job satisfaction. Al-Adaily's study in 1981 explored job satisfaction in the public sector in another country. In the current study, the researcher explored job satisfaction in the public and private sectors and compared it to Al-Adaily's 1981 findings, as well as exploring and comparing job satisfaction in the private sector to the public sector. To the best of this researcher's knowledge, this is the first study that explores job satisfaction among Saudi employees in the private sector in Saudi Arabia and furthermore, it is the first study to compare private sector employees to public sector employees in Saudi Arabia.

The following research is recommended for the future:

1. Use different instruments to measure job satisfaction in the private sector as well as the public sector. Some of the job satisfaction facets are not clear in the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and it is a long questionnaire. Using other instruments, such as Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kandell, and Hulin, 1969), or Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form) (Weiss, et al., 1967) will help to determine which scale or method fits and has the best reliability.
2. Study the effect of job satisfaction on performance in both

sectors. Performance could include values such as tardiness, absenteeism and turnover.

3. Study the effect of types of control on performance to determine how Saudi workers perceive Western managers in comparison to Saudi managers.

4. Study why workers in the private sector are not satisfied with supervisory techniques.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

**Job Satisfaction Questionnaire
Cover Page--Private and Public**

Western Michigan University
Department of Sociology
Kalamazoo, Michigan
United States of America

Questionnaire About Job Satisfaction Among
Private Sector Employees in Saudi Arabia.

by

Saeid Al-Hajri

JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
AMONG THE PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Dear Sir,

I am an Administrative Advisor and Instructor at the Institute of Public Administration in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. At the present time I am on a study leave from my job to study for a Master's degree in Sociology at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, United States of America.

My Master's thesis is about (motivation and job satisfaction among Saudian employees) as compared to some of the studies in the United States. The information from this questionnaire will be used to give me some of the information I need to complete my Master's degree.

The questionnaire has been prepared to give you a chance to report how you feel about your job--what things you are satisfied with and what things you are dissatisfied with. Your name will not appear on the questionnaire so all your responses will be anonymous. Please be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your job.

The questionnaire is in two parts. The first part asks for your personal feelings about your job. The second part consists of background information questions. Each part has instructions at the beginning. If you need help in understanding how to complete the questionnaire, you can reach me at Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh. Your response is kindly requested; it is essential for the completion of my thesis.

Thank you for your response.

Saeid H. Al-Hajri

Western Michigan University
Department of Sociology
Kalamazoo, Michigan
United States of America

Questionnaire About Job Satisfaction Among
Public Sector Employees in Saudi Arabia.

by

Saeid Al-Hajri

JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
AMONG THE PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Dear Sir,

I am an Administrative Advisor and Instructor at the Institute of Public Administration in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. At the present time I am on a study leave from my job to study for a Master's degree in Sociology at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, United States of America.

My Master's thesis is about (motivation and job satisfaction among Saudian employees) as compared to some of the studies in the United States. The information from this questionnaire will be used to give me some of the information I need to complete my Master's degree.

The questionnaire has been prepared to give you a chance to report how you feel about your job--what things you are satisfied with and what things you are dissatisfied with. Your name will not appear on the questionnaire so all your responses will be anonymous. Please be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your job.

The questionnaire is in two parts. The first part asks for your personal feelings about your job. The second part consists of background information questions. Each part has instructions at the beginning. If you need help in understanding how to complete the questionnaire, you can reach me at Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh. Your response is kindly requested; it is essential for the completion of my thesis.

Thank you for your response.

Saeid H. Al-Hajri

قسم علم الأحياء⁹³
جامعة غرب ميتسغن
كامزرو - ميتسغن
الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

إستفتاء عن الرضا الوظيفي عند موظفي القطاع الخاص في المملكة العربية السعودية

إعداد

اسعيد بن محمد الهاجري

94
قسم عام الاجتماع
جامعة غرب ميشيغن
كامزور - ميشيغن
الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

إِسْتَفْهَاءٌ عَنِ الرِّضَاءِ الْوَفِيفِيِّ عِنْدَ مَوْظِعِي الْفَطَاعِ الْعَامِ فِي الْمَمْلَكَةِ الْعَرَبِيَّةِ السُّعُودِيَّةِ

إعداد
سعيد بن محمد الهاجري

Appendix B
Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

96-104

University Microfilms International

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

PART II

Instructions:

This part consists of some background information questions which may help me to analyze the data for my study.

Please put a checkmark (/) or an X in the space following the statement which most nearly describes your own background.

What is your age?

- 19 to 25 26 to 35 36 to 45
 46 to 55 56 to 65 66 and over

Your monthly income:

- Less than 1,000 SR 1,001 to 3,000 SR
 3,001 to 6,000 SR 6,001 to 9,000 SR
 9,001 to 12,000 SR 12,001 to 15,000 SR
 15,001 SR or more

How many years have you worked for your current employer?

- Less than one year 1 to 5 years
 6 to 11 years 11 to 15 years
 More than 15 years

How many years have you been working (in all kinds of jobs)?

- 1 to 5 6 to 10 years
 11 to 15 years More than 15 years

What level of education have you completed?

- Elementary school Intermediate school
 Secondary school University degree
 High degree Others (specify)
-

Where did you receive your advanced education or training?

- Only in Saudi Arabia
- Partly in Saudi Arabia and partly in foreign country
- Only in Arabian country
- Partly in Arabian country
- Only in foreign country
- Partly in foreign country

If you attended college or school in a foreign country, how much do you think that experience affected your attitude or feelings towards work?

- Not at all A little bit, slight change
- Don't know; uncertain Quite a bit, changed a lot

What is your level of responsibility in your present job?

- General manager, Executive, or Assistant for a major department or division.
- Manager or Assistant for a large unit or program (such as finance, public relations, etc.)
- Director or Assistant for a special program or subunit (such as middle manager, etc.)
- Other (please specify)_____

What is your father's occupation?

- Bedouin Driver Teacher
- Public employee Private employee
- Businessman Other (specify)_____

Marital Status

- Single Married
 Divorced with no children
 Divorced with children

Residency

- Rental apartment Rental house
 Rental townhouse Own apartment
 Own house
 Share residency with my parents and brothers

Where do you live?

- North Riyadh South Riyadh
 East Riyadh West Riyadh
 Downtown Don't live in Riyadh

What kind of job do you do?

- Supervisor Clerk Accountant
 Engineer Secretary
 Other (specify)_____

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND PARTICIPATION.

أخي الكريم :

أنا أحد أعضاء هيئة التدريس بمعهد الإدارة العامة بالرياض ومبتعث حالياً لدراسة الماجستير في مجال علم الاجتماع في جامعة غرب ميتشغن بمدينة كلمزو في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية.

وموضوع رسالتي عن الرضاء الوظيفي عند الموظفين في المملكة العربية السعودية ، ونظراً لأهمية شعورك نحو عملك ومعرفة الأشياء التي أنت راض عنها والتي أنت غير راض عنها أرجو أن تساعدني في الإجابة على فقرات الاستبيان المرفق حتى أتمكن من استكمال المعلومات الضرورية لانهاء الرسالة علماً بأن المعلومات الواردة سوف تعامل معاملة سرية للغاية ولن تستعمل لغير أغراض البحث العلمي.

والاستبيان يتكون من جزئين : أحدهما يحتوي على أسئلة عن شعورك الشخصي نحو عملك والآخر يحتوي على أسئلة عن بعض المعلومات العامة.

أشكرك مرة أخرى على تعاونك وأرجو الا تتردد في الاتصال بي على تلفون

٤٧٦٨٨٨٨ تحويله ٣٦٦ اذا كان هناك أي استفسار.

سعيد بن حمد الهاجري

معهد الإدارة العامة بالرياض

الجزء الأول

تعليمات:

هذا الجزء من الاستبيان يحتوي على (٦٤) جملة أو سؤال عن أشياء قد تؤثر على شعورك نحو عملك قد لا تنطبق عليك كل هذه الأسئلة ولكن الرجاء محاولة الإجابة عليها جميعاً واتباع التالي :

- ١ - من فضلك اقرأ كل سؤال أو جملة بعناية تامة.
- ٢ - فكر في وقت شعرت فيه أثناء عملك بالسعادة الغامرة أو (الرضا التام) أو فكر في وقت شعرت فيه أثناء عملك بعدم السعادة أو (عدم الرضاء).
- ٣ - ضع علامة (صح) في إحدى الخانات التي تتلائم مع شعورك نحو السؤال أو الجملة.
- ٤ - "راض" أو "راض جداً" تعني أن الجملة كانت مهمة بالنسبة لك أثناء شعورك بالسعادة والرضا حول تجربة العمل التي تصفها.
- ٥ - "غير راض" أو "غير راض إطلاقاً" تعني أن الجملة كانت مهمة لك أثناء شعورك بعدم السعادة وعدم الرضا حول تجربة العمل التي تصفها.
- ٦ - "لا أدري" تعني أنك غير متأكد من أنك راض أو غير راض من شعورك نحو عملك وربما تعني أيضاً أن ليس لها علاقة بتجربة العمل التي تصفها.

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

Job Satisfaction Questions in Arabic

110-115

University Microfilms International

الجزء الثاني

تعليمات :

هذا الجزء يحتوي على بعض الأسئلة العامة التي سوف تساعدني في تحليل

الدراسة.

أرجو أن تتكرم بأن تضع علامة (صح) في الخانة المناسبة لكل جملة أو سؤال

ينطبق أو يتناسب مع وضعك.

كم عمرك ؟

- | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| () ٣٦ - ٤٥ | () ٢٥-٢٦ | () ٢٥- ١٩ |
| () أكثر من ٦٦ | () ٥٦ - ٦٥ | () ٥٥ - ٤٦ |

الدخل الشهري :

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| () ١٠٠١ - ٣٠٠٠ ريال | () أقل من ١٠٠٠ ريال |
| () ٦٠٠١ - ٩٠٠٠ ريال | () ٣٠٠١ - ٦٠٠٠ ريال |
| () ١٢٠٠١ - ١٥٠٠٠ ريال | () ٩٠٠١ - ١٢٠٠٠ ريال |
| | () أكثر من ١٥٠٠١ ريال |

كم المدة التي أمضيتها في عملك الحالي؟

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| () ٦ - ١١ سنة | () ١ - ٥ سنوات | () أقل من سنة |
| () أكثر من ١٥ سنة. | () ١١ - ١٥ سنة | |

كم الهدة التي أمضيتها في مختلف الوظائف التي عملت بها ؟

- () أقل من سنة () ١ - ٥ سنوات () ٦ - ١١ سنة
() ١١ - ١٥ سنة () أكثر من ١٥ سنة.

الى أي مرحلة أكملت في تعليمك ؟

- () المرحلة الابتدائية أو مايعادلها () المرحلة المتوسطة أو مايعادلها
() المرحلة الثانوية أو مايعادلها () المرحلة الجامعية
() درجة عالية (ماجستير أو دكتوراه) () مؤهلات أخرى (وضح من فضلك)

أين تلقيت تعليمك العالي أو تدريبيك ؟

- () في المملكة العربية السعودية فقط () في المملكة العربية السعودية جزئياً
() في بلد عربي فقط () في بلد عربي جزئياً
() في بلد أجنبي فقط () في بلد أجنبي جزئياً.
إذا سبق أن التحقت بكلية أو دورة في بلد أجنبي ساهدى تأثير تلك التجربة على إنجازاتك
الوظيفية وشعورك نحو عملك؟

- () لاشيء إطلاقاً () قليل جداً () لاأدري أو غير متأكد () تغير بعض الشيء.

ماهي وظيفتك ؟

- () مساعد مدير قسم () مساعد مدير وحدة أو مدير
شعبه مثال (مدير شئون مالية ، إدارية أو علاقات عامة)
() موظف () وظيفة أخرى (وضح من فضلك)-----

مانوع العمل الذي تقوم به ؟

() مشرف () كاتب () سكرتير () مهندس

() محاسب () أخرى (وضع من فضلك)

ماذا يعمل او كان يعمل والدك ؟

() سائق () مدرس () موظف حكومي () موظف بالقطاع الخاص

() رجل أعمال () عمل آخر (وضع من فضلك)

الحالة الاجتماعية :

() متزوج () أعزب () مطلق ولا يوجد أطفال () مطلق ولدي أطفال .

() أرمل .

نوع السكن :

() شقة مستأجرة () شقة ملك () فيلا مستأجرة () فيلا ملك

() دور فيلا مستأجر () ساكن مع الوالد والاخوان .

أين يقع سكنك في مدينة الرياض ؟

() شمال الرياض () جنوب الرياض () شرق الرياض

() غرب الرياض () وسط الرياض () لا سكن في الرياض

شكراً لك مرة أخرى على تعاونك و مشاركتك .

Appendix C

Tables 30-38: Group Comparisons of the Demographic
Variables to the Attitude Factors

Table 30 presents group comparisons of demographic variables of Security and Salary.

Table 30
Group Comparisons of Security and Salary

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Age					
18-25	62	2.78	.90		
26-35	165	3.13	.84	.006	Significant
36-45	49	3.33	.78		
Over 46	15	3.733	.66		
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	2	2.94	.26		
1001-3000 SR	48	2.63	.96		
3001-6000 SR	112	3.06	.81		
6001-9000 SR	87	3.30	.80	.001	Significant
9001-12000 SR	26	3.38	.77		
12000-15000 SR	10	3.54	.83		
More than 15000 SR	7	3.79	.54		

*at .05 level

Table 30--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than one year	44	3.18	.08		
1-5 years	128	2.96	.82		
6-10 years	80	3.28	.90	.17	NS
11-15 years	21	3.14	.89		
More than 15 years	16	3.41	.89		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	35	3.01	.79		
1-5 years	91	3.03	.94		
6-10 years	73	3.16	.85	.37	NS
11-15 years	37	3.11	.85		
More than 15 years	32	3.43	.75		
*at .05 level					

Table 30--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Level of Education					
Elementary	9	3.22	.87		
Intermediate	43	3.03	1.00		
Secondary	86	2.99	.86	.85	NS
University	115	2.28	.77		
High education	22	3.05	.79		
Place where degree was obtained					
Only in Saudi Arabia	199	3.05	.83		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.59	.72		
Only in Arabic country	10	3.18	1.06	.150	NS
Only in foreign country	20	3.30	.83		
Partly in foreign c.	5	3.43	.89		

*at .05 level

Table 30--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Effect of Education or Training in a Foreign Country					
Not at all	44	3.16	.93		
Quite a bit	27	2.96	.89	.425	NS
Don't know	15	3.20	.57		
Completely changed	55	3.37	.94		
Position					
Assistant department manager	29	3.16	.93		
Assistant unit manager	41	3.17	.78	.715	NS
Clerk	163	3.01	.86		
Others	22	3.19	.76		

*at .05 level

Table 30--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	116	3.22	.83		
Private employee	15	2.85	.88	.224	NS
Businessman	66	3.04	.89		
Others	27	3.17	.91		
Marital Status					
Married	184	3.24	.86		
Single	81	2.88	.81		
Divorced, no children	15	3.11	1.03	.006	Significant
Divorced, children	4	3.093	.97		
Widower	1	3.00	.00		
*at .05 level					

Table 30--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	63	2.92	.90		
Rented villa	11	3.63	.89		
Owned Villa	99	3.25	.81	.066	NS
Rent a floor	36	2.97	.82		
Live with family	70	3.13	.86		
Location of Residence					
North side	76	3.22	.76		
South side	49	2.98	.93		
East side	79	3.06	.88	.112	NS
West side	41	3.02	.93		
Downtown	32	3.40	.81		
Do not live in Riyadh	2	2.44	.44		

*at .05 level

Table 31 presents group comparisons of demographic variable of personal development and opportunity to make own decisions.

Table 31

Group Comparison of Personal Development and Opportunity
to Make Own Decisions

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
<u>Income</u>					
Less than 1000 SR	2	3.20	.75		
1000-3000	44	2.85	.98		
3001-6000	112	3.21	.85		
6001-9000	90	3.17	.96	.114	NS
9001-12000	27	3.33	.83		
12001-15000	10	3.44	1.03		
More than 15001	8	3.55	1.23		
<u>Age</u>					
18-25 years	57	2.94	.87		
26-35 years	169	3.25	.91	.150	NS
36-45 years	50	3.06	.99		
More than 46 years	16	3.67	.85		

Table 31--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than 1 year	42	3.39	.88		
1-5 years	126	3.06	.85		
6-10 years	83	3.23	1.01	.553	NS
11-15 years	21	3.16	.87		
More than 15 years	18	3.26	1.14		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	34	3.16	.79		
1-5 years	88	3.25	.95		
6-10 years	75	3.21	.97	.114	NS
11-15 years	37	2.82	.74		
More than 15 years	34	3.23	1.04		
*at .05 level					

Table 31--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
<u>Level of Education</u>					
Elementary	9	3.16	1.02		
Intermediate	45	3.13	1.05		
Secondary	81	3.09	.93	.861	NS
University	116	3.26	.85		
Higher education	24	3.13	1.03		
<u>Place Where Degree was Obtained</u>					
Only in Saudi Arabia	194	3.08	.90		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.62	.87		
Only in Arabic Country	10	3.31	.88	.062	NS
Only in Foreign Country	23	3.38	1.04		
Partly in Foreign C.	4	2.83	.91		
*at .05 level					

Table 31--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Effect of Education and Training in a Foreign Country					
Not at all	47	3.26	.80		
Quite a bit	25	3.04	.89	.212	NS
Don't know	16	3.15	.97		
Completely changed	56	3.48	1.01		
Position					
Assistant department manager	31	3.35	1.12		
Assistant unit manager	42	3.43	.70		
Clerk	161	3.06	.88	.046	Significant
Other	23	2.90	.93		
*at .05 level					

Table 31--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	117	3.15	.92		
Private employee	14	2.71	.89	.065	NS
Businessman	68	3.26	.87		
Other	29	3.37	.97		
Social Status					
Married	191	3.26	.93		
Single	78	2.96	.83		
Divorced, no children	15	3.15	1.25	.142	NS
Divorced, children	3	3.56	1.03		
Widower	1	3.87	.00		

*at .05 level

Table 31--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rental apartment	63	3.11	.92		
Rented villa	14	3.53	1.03		
Owned villa	100	3.17	.91	.666	NS
Rent a floor	37	3.15	.85		
Live with family	69	3.14	1.01		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	73	3.25	.92		
South side	50	3.11	.89		
East side	82	3.10	.91	.184	NS
West side	42	2.99	1.04		
Downtown	33	3.46	.86		
Do not live in Riyadh	2	2.60	.09		

*at .05 level

Table 32 presents group comparisons of demographic variables on the supervisory techniques factor.

Table 32
Group Comparison of Supervisory Techniques

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u> Significance
Income				
Less than 1000 SR	2	3.60	.99	
1001-3000	48	3.12	.94	
3001-6000	114	3.52	.86	
6001-9000	88	3.28	1.03	.039 Significant
9001-12000	29	3.42	.84	
12001-15000	9	3.67	.82	
More than 15000	7	3.27	1.05	
Age				
18-25 years	63	3.27	.94	
26-35 years	168	3.42	.92	.048 Significant
36-45 years	51	3.22	.97	
Over 46 years	15	3.87	.78	

*at .05 level

Table 32--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than 1 year	45	3.52	.92		
1-5 years	126	3.39	.86		
6-10 years	84	3.37	.96	.077	NS
11-15 years	22	3.02	1.02		
More than 15 years	17	3.48	1.13		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	36	3.34	.87		
1-5 years	91	3.51	.93		
6-10 years	72	3.37	.89	.059	NS
11-15 years	38	3.01	.87		
More than 15 years	34	3.39	1.06		
*at .05 level					

Table 32--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Level of Education					
Elementary	9	3.60	.87		
Intermediate	45	3.45	.96		
Secondary	89	3.35	.94	.727	NS
University	114	3.34	.89		
Higher education	22	3.35	1.00		
Place Where Degree Was Obtained					
Only in Saudi Arabia	198	3.33	.88		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	6	3.93	.59		
Only in Arab Country	8	3.18	1.08	.046	Significant
Only in foreign country	21	3.59	.94		
Partly in foreign country	5	3.28	1.36		
*at .05 level					

Table 32--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Effect of Education and Training in a Foreign Country					
Not at all	26	3.39	.90		
Quite a bit	27	3.18	.96		
Don't know	16	3.26	1.03	.692	NS
Completely changed	58	3.52	1.02		
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	29	3.43	1.14		
Assistant unit manager	45	3.31	.88		
Clerk	161	3.41	.86	.115	NS
Other	23	3.07	.99		
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	117	3.42	.93		
Private employee	14	3.30	.98	.487	NS
Businessman	70	3.24	.97		
Other	30	3.44	.90		

*at .05 level

Table 32--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Marital Status					
Married	188	3.42	.96		
Single	84	3.25	.82		
Divorced, no children	14	3.42	.94	.318	NS
Divorced, children	3	3.23	.94		
Widower	1	3.80	.00		
*at .05 level					

Table 32--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	60	3.40	.88		
Rented villa	14	3.91	1.02		
Owned villa	106	3.35	.91	.101	NS
Rent a floor	35	3.28	.82		
Live with family	69	3.31	.99		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	78	3.34	.94		
South side	50	3.27	.91		
East side	81	3.36	.90	.020	Significant
West side	42	3.32	1.02		
Downtown	32	3.66	.89		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	2.60	.56		

*at .05 level

Table 33 presents group comparisons of demographic variables on the working conditions factor.

Table 33
Group Comparisons of Working Conditions Factor

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	2	3.75	1.77		
1001-3000 SR	49	3.48	.95		
3001-6000 SR	117	3.44	1.11		
6001-9000 SR	96	3.50	1.14	.222	NS
9001-12000 SR	30	3.57	1.13		
12001-15000 SR	9	4.00	.75		
More than 15000 SR	8	4.13	.74		
Age					
18-25 years	65	3.35	.97		
26-35 years	175	3.61	1.09	.364	NS
36-45 years	53	3.33	1.17		
More than 45	17	3.71	1.03		

*at .05 level

Table 33--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than 1 year	45	3.71	.94		
1-5 years	135	3.36	1.13		
6-10 years	88	3.72	1.07	.071	NS
11-15 years	21	3.62	.85		
More than 15 years	18	2.97	1.16		
Working Experience					
Less than 1 year	35	3.56	.84		
1-5 years	97	3.57	1.11	.064	NS
6-10 years	78	3.79	.95		
11-15 years	37	3.08	1.10		
More than 15 years	36	3.26	1.28		
*at .05 level					

Table 33--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Level of Education					
Elementary	9	3.61	1.29		
Intermediate	48	3.30	1.10		
Secondary	90	3.37	1.12	.640	NS
University	122	3.63	1.05		
Higher education	22	3.68	1.02		
Place Where Degree Was Obtained					
Only in Saudi Arabia	209	3.43	1.07		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	8	4.06	.49		
Only in Arab country	10	3.85	1.23	.813	NS
Only in foreign country	22	3.57	1.08		
Partly in foreign country	5	3.90	1.08		
*at .05 level					

Table 33--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Effect of Education and Training in a Foreign Country					
Not at all	53	3.36	1.06		
Quite a bit	27	3.41	1.05	.075	NS
Don't know	16	3.34	1.30		
Completely changed	60	3.98	.79		
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	32	3.52	1.22		
Assistant unit manager	46	3.67	1.01	.715	NS
Clerk	169	3.47	1.10		
Other	23	3.26	.87		
Father's Occupation					
Public Employee	123	3.60	1.01		
Private employee	15	2.70	1.31	.017	Significant
Businessman	73	3.70	.99		
Other	30	3.58	1.01		
*at .05 level					

Table 33--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Marital Status					
Married	197	3.58	1.1		
Single	85	3.34	1.00		
Divorced, no children	16	3.50	1.21	.281	NS
Divorced, children	4	3.63	1.37		
Widower	1	5.00	.00		
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	64	3.54	1.15		
Rented villa	14	3.86	1.06		
Owned villa	111	3.47	1.03	.613	NS
Rent a floor	36	3.35	1.21		
Live with family	72	3.53	1.07		
*at .05 level					

Table 33--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	80	3.64	.96		
South side	53	3.32	1.10		
East side	86	3.66	1.00	.155	NS
West side	43	3.24	1.25		
Downtown	33	3.53	1.18		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	2.50	.70		

*at .05 level

Table 34 presents group comparisons of demographic variables on the social status factor.

Table 34
Group Comparison of Social Status

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	2	3.50	1.65		
1001-3000	47	2.62	1.07		
3001-6000	119	2.97	.92		
6001-9000	95	3.06	.88	.004	Significant
9001-1200	27	3.01	.85		
12001-15000	10	3.5	1.08		
More than 15000	8	3.21	.56		
Age					
18-25 years	65	2.75	1.03		
26-35	174	3.02	.92		
36-45	52	3.02	.91	.105	NS
More than 45	16	3.25	.71		

*at .05 level

Table 34--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than one year	45	3.19	.94		
1-5 years	135	2.87	.91		
6-10 years	86	3.02	.93	.495	NS
11- 15 years	21	3.10	1.02		
More than 15 years	18	2.83	.99		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	36	2.97	.95		
1-5 years	97	2.92	1.03		
6-10 years	77	3.02	.88	.868	NS
11-15 years	37	2.95	.91		
More than 15 years	35	3.00	.85		
*at .05 level					

Table 34--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
<u>Level of Education</u>					
Elementary	9	3.22	1.01		
Intermediate	46	3.07	.93		
Secondary	90	2.83	.95	.140	NS
University	118	3.06	.93		
Higher education	25	2.76	.95		
<u>Place Where Degree was Obtained</u>					
Only in Saudi Arabia	206	2.91	.91		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.51	.65		
Partly in Arab country	9	3.22	1.13	.026	NS
Only in foreign country	23	3.12	1.04		
Partly in foreign country	5	2.60	.95		
<u>Effect of Education and Training in Foreign Country</u>					
Not at all	46	2.98	.85		
Quite a bit	27	2.79	.90	.026	Significant
Don't know	16	3.06	.82		
Completely changed	61	3.21	1.01		
*at .05 level					

Table 34--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	31	3.69	1.09		
Assistant unit manager	48	2.98	.75	.405	NS
Clerk	169	2.86	.95		
Other	23	2.87	.91		
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	122	2.96	.99		
Private employee	15	2.91	.90	.792	NS
Businessman	72	2.97	.93		
Other	32	3.16	.83		
Marital Status					
Married	199	3.00	.93		
Single	84	2.84	.93		
Divorced, no children	15	3.37	1.07	.144	NS
Divorced, children	4	3.41	.50		
Widower	1	3.00	.00		

*at .05 level

Table 34--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	65	2.95	.95		
Rented villa	14	3.05	1.23		
Owned villa	107	3.05	.90	.814	NS
Rented floor	38	2.80	.90		
Live with family	73	2.94	1.03		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	80	3.03	.89		
South side	54	2.91	.98		
East side	83	2.94	.98	.020	Significant
West side	45	2.64	1.01		
Downtown	33	3.42	.76		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	3.00	.47		
*at .05 level					

Table 35 presents group comparisons of demographic variables of responsibility, recognition and relations with peers and subordinated factor.

Table 35

Group Comparison of Responsibility, Recognition and Relationships with Peers and Subordinates

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	1	4.63	.000		
1001-3000 SR	46	3.43	.74		
3001-6000 SR	103	3.71	.69		
6001-9000 SR	83	3.71	.67	.065	NS
9001-12000 SR	28	3.75	.80		
12001-15000 SR	10	3.84	.75		
More than 15000 SR	7	4.25	.31		
Age					
18-25 years	57	3.47	.69		
26-35	156	3.74	.69		
36-45	48	3.65	.73	.060	NS
More than 45	16	4.12	.71		

Table 35--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
<u>Length of Employment</u>					
Less than 1 year	43	3.61	.75		
1-5 years	118	3.65	.64		
6-10 years	78	3.76	.77	.717	NS
11-15 years	19	3.69	.71		
More than 15 years	17	3.84	.86		
<u>Work Experience</u>					
Less than 1 year	31	3.63	.67		
1-5 years	89	3.71	.70		
6-10 years	67	3.67	.77	.513	NS
11-15 years	33	3.55	.67		
More than 15 years	34	3.89	.76		

*at .05 level

Table 35--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Level of Education					
Elementary	8	4.14	.40		
Intermediate	41	3.79	.76		
Secondary	79	3.71	.71	.293	NS
University	110	3.67	.66		
Higher education	23	3.54	.82		
Place Where Degree was Obtained					
Only in Saudi Arabia	186	3.63	.70		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.89	.72		
Partly in Arab country	7	3.50	.83	.158	NS
Only in foreign country	21	3.80	.82		
Partly in foreign country	3	3.38	1.08		
Effect of Education and Training in Foreign Country					
Not at all	46	3.64	.75		
Quite a bit	26	3.55	.81	.116	NS
Don't know	15	3.52	.90		
Completely	54	3.90	.68		
*at .05 level					

Table 35--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	27	3.69	.92		
Assistant unit manager	44	3.86	.60	.144	NS
Clerk	150	3.61	.68		
Other	21	3.57	.74		
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	113	3.74	.69		
Private employee	11	3.33	.79	.086	NS
Businessman	64	3.66	.65		
Other	28	3.86	.76		
Marital Status					
Married	182	3.77	.72		
Single	73	3.51	.66		
Divorced, no children	14	3.85	.64	.081	NS
Divorced, children	3	3.00	.98		
Widower	1	4.00	.000		

*at .05 level

Table 35--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	60	3.69	.66		
Rented villa	12	4.20	.66		
Owned villa	99	3.63	.70	.237	NS
Rented floor	29	3.59	.69		
Live with family	67	3.73	.75		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	73	3.70	.76		
South side	49	3.71	.68		
East side	77	3.82	.61	.122	NS
West side	38	3.63	.80		
Downtown	30	3.95	.52		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	2.75	.53		
*at .05 level					

Table 36 presents group comparisons of demographic variables of the "opportunity for advancement and making own decisions" factor.

Table 36
Group Comparison of Opportunity for Advancement
Making Own Decisions

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	2	2.25	.35		
1001-3000 SR	48	2.53	1.11		
3001-6000 SR	116	2.84	1.11		
6001-9000 SR	94	2.94	1.15	.330	NS
9001-12000 SR	29	3.09	1.00		
12001-15000 SR	9	3.17	1.15		
More than 15000 SR	7	3.21	1.22		
Age					
18-25 years	64	2.70	1.04		
26-35 years	174	2.86	1.16	.125	NS
36-45 years	49	2.92	1.15		
More than 45 years	17	3.38	.83		
*at .05 level					

Table 36--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than 1 year	46	3.02	1.04		
1-5 years	134	2.80	1.03		
6-10 years	84	2.80	1.26	.257	NS
11-15 years	21	2.83	1.24		
More than 15 years	17	3.37	1.06		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	36	2.76	1.02		
1-5 years	96	2.97	1.18		
6-10 years	75	2.71	1.10	.287	NS
11-15 years	36	2.71	1.11		
More than 15 years	35	3.03	1.13		

*at .05 level

Table 36--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Level of Education					
Elementary	9	2.72	.98		
Intermediate	46	2.74	1.35		
Secondary	89	2.87	1.09	.817	NS
University	118	2.94	1.09		
Higher Education	23	2.70	1.09		
Place Where Degree was Obtained					
Only in Saudi Arabia	205	2.82	1.08		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.18	1.10		
Partly in Arab country	9	2.81	1.47	.392	NS
Only in foreign country	22	3.14	.96		
Partly in foreign country	4	3.31	.99		
Effect of Education and Training in a Foreign Country					
Not at all	49	3.01	1.09		
Quite a bit	27	2.66	1.03		
Don't know	15	2.72	1.10	.019	Significant
Completely changed	57	3.26	1.12		
*at .05 level					

Table 36--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	31	2.83	1.34		
Assistant unit manager	45	2.87	1.10		
Clerk	168	2.83	1.10	.887	NS
Other	21	2.67	1.03		
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	117	2.87	1.11		
Private employee	16	2.39	1.15		
Businessman	74	2.81	1.11	.330	NS
Other	33	2.96	1.19		
Marital Status					
Married	194	2.95	1.13		
Single	85	2.63	1.07		
Divorced, no children	16	2.81	1.36	.293	NS
Divorced, children	4	3.31	.55		
Widower	1	3.25	.00		

*at .05 level

Table 36--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	64	2.82	1.12		
Rented villa	14	3.36	1.28		
Owned villa	107	2.87	1.14	.130	NS
Rented floor	37	2.81	.98		
Live with family	72	2.83	1.12		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	81	2.91	1.11		
South side	55	2.71	1.12		
East side	80	2.83	1.13		
West side	43	2.78	1.22	.717	NS
Downtown	32	3.08	1.10		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	3.00	.35		

*at .05 level

Table 37 presents group comparisons of demographic variables on the time demands and requirements of the job factor.

Table 37

Group Comparison of Time Demands and Requirements of the Job

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	2	3.31	1.33		
1001-3000 SR	42	2.78	.80		
3001-6000 SR	106	3.07	.78		
6001-9000 SR	86	3.08	.76	.005	Significant
9001-12000 SR	26	3.11	.83		
12001-15000 SR	9	3.65	.89		
More than 15000 SR	7	3.48	.46		
Age					
18-25 years	61	2.85	.81		
26-35 years	155	3.10	.76	.046	Significant
36-45 years	49	3.09	.85		
More than 45 years	12	3.52	.65		

*at .05 level

Table 37--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than 1 year	38	3.21	.80		
1-5 years	117	2.99	.71		
6-10 years	82	3.10	.85	.481	NS
11-15 years	20	3.01	.86		
More than 15 years	18	3.10	.93		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	32	3.01	.71		
1-5 years	83	3.05	.85		
6-10 years	73	3.12	.76	.439	NS
11-15 years	35	3.89	.73		
More than 15 years	32	3.20	.82		

*at .05 level

Table 37--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Level of Education					
Elementary	8	3.28	.94		
Intermediate	43	3.11	.79		
Secondary	83	2.97	.83	.411	NS
University	105	3.14	.73		
Higher education	23	2.91	.82		
Place Where Degree was Obtained					
Only in Saudi Arabia	183	3.00	.73		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.63	.7		
Partly in Arab country	9	3.17	1.09	.186	NS
Only in foreign country	22	3.22	.86		
Partly in foreign country	5	3.08	.96		
Effect of Education and Training in a Foreign Country					
Not at all	40	3.04	.74		
Quite a bit	24	2.82	.78	.031	Significant
Don't know	16	3.00	.78		
Completely changed	55	3.34	.87		

*at .05 level

Table 37--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	27	3.12	.92		
Assistant unit manager	44	3.11	.74		
Clerk	152	3.01	.79	.474	NS
Other	23	2.85	.70		
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	114	3.09	.82		
Private employee	14	2.91	.88	.298	NS
Businessman	64	2.96	.77		
Other	27	3.25	.75		
Marital Status					
Married	179	3.12	.80		
Single	77	2.88	.75		
Divorced, no children	14	3.32	.90	.031	Significant
Divorced, children	2	3.63	.88		
Widower	1	3.25	.00		

*at .05 level

Table 37--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	56	2.00	.80		
Rented villa	13	3.37	.75		
Owned villa	98	3.03	.82	.718	NS
Rented floor	32	3.09	.64		
Live with family	70	3.08	.86		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	70	3.14	.79		
South side	49	3.06	.75		
East side	79	3.02	.80	.107	NS
West side	41	2.78	.88		
Downtown	29	3.33	.67		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	2.94	.09		
*at .05 level					

Table 38 presents that group comparison of demographic variables on the organizational policies and personal recognition factor.

Table 38

Group Comparisons of Organizational Policies and
Personal Recognition

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F*</u>	Probability
Income					
Less than 1000 SR	2	3.30	1.27		
1001-3000 SR	48	3.88	.92		
3001-6000 SR	110	3.08	.84		
6001-9000 SR	92	2.95	.86	.163	NS
9001-12000 SR	27	3.02	.78		
12001-15000 SR	10	3.40	.91		
More than 15000 SR	7	3.34	.54		
Age					
18-25 years	63	2.90	.88		
26-35 years	166	3.02	.86		
36-45 years	51	3.05	.86	.337	NS
More than 45 years	15	3.33	.61		
*at .05 level					

Table 38--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Length of Employment					
Less than 1 year	43	3.18	.85		
1-5 years	129	2.98	.78		
6-10 years	83	2.99	.93	.391	NS
11-15 years	20	3.85	.92		
More than 15 years	18	3.08	.91		
Work Experience					
Less than 1 year	37	3.02	.83		
1-5 years	91	3.06	.89		
6-10 years	74	2.99	.86	.401	NS
11-15 years	35	2.79	.75		
More than 15 years	35	3.15	.82		

*at .05 level

Table 38--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
<u>Level of Education</u>					
Elementary	9	3.40	.80		
Intermediate	45	3.07	.87		
Secondary	85	3.01	.91	.591	NS
University	116	3.02	.82		
Higher education	23	2.87	.82		
<u>Place Where Degree was Obtained</u>					
Only in Saudi Arabia	198	2.95	.80		
Partly in Saudi Arabia	7	3.49	.99		
Partly in Arab country	10	3.26	.98	.380	NS
Only in foreign country	22	3.17	.84		
Partly in foreign country	5	3.08	1.03		
<u>Effect of Education and Training in Foreign Country</u>					
Not at all	44	3.12	.81		
Quite a bit	27	2.89	.78	.149	NS
Don't know	16	2.95	.81		
Completely changed	59	3.15	1.01		
*at .05 level					

Table 38--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Position					
Assistant dept. manager	31	3.00	1.04		
Assistant unit manager	45	2.92	.83	.622	NS
Clerk	165	3.05	.85		
Other	23	2.77	.64		
Father's Occupation					
Public employee	119	3.03	.92		
Private employee	15	2.89	.85	.257	NS
Businessman	69	2.86	.85		
Other	29	3.14	.80		
Marital Status					
Marries	188	3.08	.85		
Single	84	2.85	.83		
Divorced, no children	14	3.17	1.03	.210	NS
Divorced, children	4	2.70	1.11		
Widower	1	3.09	.90		

*at .05 level

Table 38--continued

Subgroup	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>p</u>	Significance
Type of Residence					
Rented apartment	63	2.99	.88		
Rented villa	14	3.41	.85		
Owned villa	101	2.93	.83	.814	NS
Rented floor	35	3.01	.78		
Live with family	72	3.09	.99		
Location of Residence in Riyadh					
North side	77	3.06	.85		
South side	59	2.96	.88		
East side	80	2.95	.88	.632	NS
West side	43	2.89	.89		
Downtown	32	3.26	.75		
Don't live in Riyadh	2	3.10	.14		

*at .05 level

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdul Ghani, J. & Al-Meer, A. R. (1989). Effect of end-user computing on job satisfaction: An exploratory study. Information and Management, 17, 191-195.
- Al-Adaily, N. (1981). Study of job satisfaction among Saudi government employees (managers and workers) in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Unpublished master's thesis, Humboldt State University, California.
- Al-Awwad, K. (1988). The effect of control on public service employees: An exploratory study for clients' attitudes toward Saudi Arabia public service employees. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Al-Braidy, A. (1987). Growth and development of limited companies in Saudi Arabia. Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. (In Arabic).
- Alexander, E. R., Helms, M. M., & Wilkins, R. D. (1989). The relation between supervisors communication and subordinate performance and satisfaction among professionals. Public Personnel Management, 18(4), 415-429.
- The American Heritage Dictionary of English Language, (Second College Edition) (1985). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Armstrong, T. B. (1971). Job content and context factors related to satisfaction for different occupational levels. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55(1), 57-65.
- Bluen, S. D., Barling, J., & Burns, W. (1990). Predicting sales performance, job satisfaction, and depression by using the achievement striving and impatience-irritability dimensions of type A behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75(2), 212-216.
- Cacioppe, R. & Mock, P. (1984). A comparison of the quality of work experience in government and private organizations. Human Relations, 37(11), 923-940.
- Centers, R. & Bugental, D. E. (1966). Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivation among different segments of the working population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50(3), 193-197.

- Cherniss, C. & Kane, J. S. (1987). Public sector professionals: Job characteristics, satisfaction, and aspirations for intrinsic fulfillment through work. Human Relations, 40(3), 125-136.
- Farrell, D. & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchanges variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. Organizational Behavior and Performance, 27(28), 78-95.
- Halpern, G. (1966). Relative contributions of motivator and hygiene factors to overall job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50(3), 198-200.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R., & Capwell, D. (1967). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychology Service of Pittsburgh.
- Johns, G. (1978). Attitudinal and nonattitudinal predictors of two forms of absence from work. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 431-444.
- Levin, I. & Stokes, J. P. (1989). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(5), 752-758.
- Mathieu, J. E. & Kohlar, S. (1990). A cross-level examination of group absence influences on individual absence. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75(2), 217-220.
- Ministry of Planning. (1985). The fourth development plan (1985-1990). Ministry of Planning, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. (In Arabic).
- Ministry of Planning. (1987). Achievements of the development plans (1970-1987). Facts and Figures. Ministry of Planning, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. (In Arabic).
- Ministry of Planning. (1988). Private sector's role in development. (Seminar). Ministry of Planning, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. (In Arabic).
- Ministry of Planning. (1990). The fifth development plan strategy. Ministry of Planning, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
- Newman, J. E. (1975). Understanding the organizational structure: Job attitude relationship through perception of the work environment. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 14, 371-397.
- Newstrom, J. W., Reif, W. E. & Monczka, R. M. (1976, January-February). Motivating the public employee: Fact vs. fiction. Public Personnel Management, pp. 67-72.

- Paine, F. T., Carroll, S. J., Jr., & Leete, B. A. (1966). Need satisfaction of managerial level personnel in a government agency. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50(3), 247-249.
- Perry, J. & Rainey, H. (1988). The public-private distinction in organization theory: A critique and research strategy. Academy of Management Review, 13(2), 182-201.
- Porter, L. W. & Mitchell, V. F. (1967). Comparative study of need satisfaction in military and business hierarchies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51(2), 139-144.
- Pritchard, R. D. & Karasick, B. W. (1973). The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9, 126-146.
- Rice, R. W., McFarlin, D. B., & Bennett, D. E. (1989). Standard comparison and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(4), 591-598.
- Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry. (1989, May). Toward perfect ways to increase Saudi workforce participation in the private sector. A paper presented to the annual Fourth Businessmen's Conference, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. (In Arabic).
- Robinson, J. Athanasiou, R., & Head, K. (1969). Measures of occupational attitudes and occupational characteristics. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Ross, B. H. (1988). Public and private sectors: The underlying differences. Management Review. New York: American Management Association.
- Schuler, R. S. (1975). Role perceptions, satisfaction, and performance: A partial reconciliation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(6), 683-687.
- Smith, M. P. & Nock, S. L. (1980). Social class and the quality of work life in public and private organizations. Journal of Social Issues, 36(4), 59-75.
- Smith P., Kendall, L., and Hulin, C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Solomon, E. E. (1986). Private and public sector managers: An empirical investigation of job characterization and organizational climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(2), 247-259.
- SPSS-X (1988). User's Guide (3rd edition). Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

- Starcevich, M. M. (1972). Job factor importance for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction across different occupational levels. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56(6), 467-471.
- Staw, B. (1984). Organizational behavior: A review and reformation of the field's outcome variables. Annual Review of Psychology, 36, 627-666.
- Tracy, W. R. (1985). Human resources management and development handbook. New York: American Management Association.
- Waters, L. K. & Roach, D. (1979). Job satisfaction, behavioral intention and absenteeism as predictors of turnover. Personnel Psychology, 32, 393-397.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. U., England, G. W. and Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.