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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 the twentieth century. Organizational behavior specialists recognized the importance of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement for workers and started conducting studies on these topics. 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 spread to other countries, such as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. As a developing country, Saudi Arabia is trying to be an industrial country. It depends on oil as its main economic resource. The increase of oil prices in the 1970's gave Saudi Arabia the opportunity to begin 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 goals as well as the goal of developing indigenous human resources. However, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and job involvements are new concerns in Saudi Arabia and few studies have been conducted.
Statement of the Problem

This study will attempt to investigate the moderating effects of work-related values and other variables on a model of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement among private sector employees in Saudi Arabia.

There have been several studies comparing job satisfaction between Saudi and expatriate managers in Saudi Arabia, Saudi and American managers, and the effect of foreign culture on American managers in Saudi Arabia and on French managers in the U.S (At-twaijri, 1989; Dean and Popp, 1990; Yavas et al., 1990). These studies focused on the satisfaction of foreign managers compared to their Saudi counterparts and on how foreign culture influences managerial effectiveness. However, organizational effectiveness relies not only on the managers, but on the employees as well (Chemers, 1992). There is a scarcity of studies of work-related values, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement, especially in Saudi Arabia.

The purpose of this study is to determine if work-related values and supervision by a foreign manager have any moderating effect on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employees' job involvement among the private sector employees in Saudi Arabia. Another purpose is
to partially test the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) of work motivation and satisfaction. The JCM, a dominant theoretical framework in the literature, includes core job characteristics (CJC); critical psychological states (CPS); and work outcomes (Hackman and Oldham, 1976; 1980). This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. How satisfied and how committed to their organizations and jobs are Saudi employees working under foreign managers in the private sector?
2. How satisfied and how committed to their organizations and jobs are Saudi employees working under Saudi managers in the private sector?
3. To what extent do work-related values and exposure to foreign supervision moderate the relationships between the "Core Job Characteristics" (CJC) and the "Critical Psychological State" (CPS).
4. How valid is the job characteristics model in a different culture?

Definitions

Job Satisfaction

Unfortunately, there is no consensus regarding the definition of job satisfaction. "Job satisfaction [as a term]
lacks adequate definition" (Herezberg et al., 1967, p.1). Al-Adaily (1981) noted that satisfaction resulted when the individual obtained what he/she wanted. Tracy (1985) offered a more comprehensive definition of job satisfaction:

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).

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is defined as the extent to which a worker identifies with and is involved in an organization (Curry et al, 1986).

**Job Involvement**

Job involvement "...refers to the degree of absorption in work activity that an individual experiences" (Morrow, 1993, p.51).

**Private Sector**

Perry and Rainey (1988) differentiated between private and public organizations in terms of ownership and sources of funding. According to them, private organizations are "...those owned,... funded through sales or private donation,... and ... more autonomous from the government
oversight" (p.184-5). The private sector includes organizations which are owned by stockholders, have boards of trustees, and are managed by a management bureau.

Culture

There is considerable concern with regard to the meaning of culture and its transmission. William's definition is useful in that it provides a comprehensive perspective on culture. According to Williams (1970):

...culture is social heredity - the total legacy of past human behavior effective in the present, representing the accumulation, through generations, of the artifacts, knowledge, beliefs, and values by which men deal with their world (p.25).

Hence, human behavior is shaped and affected by culture. Individuals acquire culture and it is manifested in their behavior. Accordingly, the "culture, through the processes of socialization, helps to shape the needs, values, and personality of leaders and followers" (Chemers, 1992, p.478). In the current study, work-related values are the aspect of culture being focused upon.

Supervisory Technique

Supervisory technique refers to "...the effectiveness of [the] supervisor in defining the responsibilities of employees and in providing positive working relationship between supervisors and employees" (Al-hajri, 1990; p.81)
Foreign Manager

Foreign manager refers to American managers working in the private sector in Saudi Arabia.

Native Manager

Native manager refers to Saudi managers working in the private sector in Saudi Arabia.

Exposure to Foreign Management

Exposure to foreign management refers to the number of years a Saudi Arabian employee has worked under a foreign supervisor.

Significance of the Problem

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

Factors such as security, wages, opportunity for advancement, social aspects of work, working conditions, hours, ease of the job, supervision, and satisfaction with
company and management were included in early studies of job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1967). Later, Staw (1984) noted that working conditions, pay, supervision, promotion, recognition, use of skills and abilities were some of the important satisfaction factors examined in studies conducted in large and small firms.

Organizational and job involvement are related to but quite distinct from job satisfaction. Some research has found organizational commitment has been found to be significantly correlated with job satisfaction. Personnel practices, job characteristics, work experiences, leader sanction behavior and centralization of power, group norms, social involvement, and individual/organizational congruence are other variables that have been considered when studying organizational commitment (Odom, Boxx, Dunn; 1990).

The Saudi government recognized the instability of the oil market and decided to find alternative economic sources. 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 begin with the second development plan (1975 - 1980), and has continued to be emphasized in the third (1980 - 1985), fourth (1985 - 1990), and in the fifth development plan (1990 - 1995) (Ministry of Planning, 1990). To accomplish the goals of these development plans, the government hired workers from outside the country to work in the huge projects that needed a skilled and experienced work force. The further development of indigenous human resources is now an important development plan goal.

During the oil boom of the 1970s, the government of Saudi Arabia invested heavily in building up the economic infrastructure base. Due to the absence of a strong private sector at that time, the lack of experienced Saudi manpower, and shortages of a specialized work force, the government turned to foreign firms for help in building up such economic infrastructures.

The decrease in oil prices and the completion of the basic economic infrastructure in the 1980s, together with the large number of educated and well-trained Saudi employees, and the resurgence of the private sector led the government to stop the immigration of foreign workers. The government decided to substitute Saudies for foreign workers, and to give priority to projects' contracts awarded to Saudi firms. The private sector was offered economic and material facilities
(which will be discussed in a separate section of this chapter), and highly encouraged to hire Saudi citizens.

To encourage Saudi employees to join the private sector, the government reduced employment opportunities in the public sector. Nevertheless, there is still resistance from the Saudi employees who prefer not to work for the private sector and reluctance from the private sector to hire Saudi employees. In a pilot study, the Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1989) reported that Saudi employees have negative attitudes 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) is more prestigious, (d) gives more social status, and (e) requires less effort to do the job.

The private sector: (a) demands long working hours - forty five hours a week while the time demand in the public sector is thirty five hours, (b) has tight control over workers and a day-to-day work load schedule, (c) requires direct contact between workers and owners in some organizations, and (d) promotion and advancement is subject to an evaluation of the worker's productivity (Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 1989).

The research by the Riyadh Chamber of Commerce and Industry (RCCI) found that private sector is not very willing to hire Saudies 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 of characteristics that an employer wants are not always available in the Saudi workers.

3. Foreign workers are ready to work in any places the organization might asks them to, while Saudies prefer working in places near their families.

4. Saudi workers are perceived by the private sector as less committed to the organizations they work for because they often are looking for better chances and higher salary.

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

6. It is easier to terminate their contracts and send away the foreign workers in case of disputes or upon project completion.

7. For each Saudi employee, the private sector employer is required to pay 8% of the worker's basic salary to the Saudi Insurance Agency, and must pay the Saudi worker compensation for service termination when a labor contract is broken by the employer.

Recognizing the importance of the RCCI study, Al-Hajri (1990), conducted a study to compare the job satisfaction of public sector and private sector employees. Al-Hajri found that private sector employees were "... less satisfied with
the [supervisory technique] effectiveness of their supervisors in ... providing positive work relationships between supervisors and employees," (p.61). He concluded, that dissatisfaction with supervisory technique might be due to the leadership style of foreign supervisors.

The private sector in Saudi Arabia has recognized that one way to maintain access to technology and secure more market share is through joint-venture with foreign firms. As a result, there is a large number of joint-ventures enterprises in Saudi Arabia today (U.S Department of Commerce, 1986). In the next section, I will give a brief summary of the growth and development of the private sector in Saudi Arabia, the incentives offered by the government to encourage the private sector, and the development of the earliest joint-venture - the Arabian American Oil company (ARAMCO).

Growth and Development of the Private Sector in Saudi Arabia

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

During the period from 1953-1964, the number of the companies increased by 11, with capital of 2.012 billion SR and 20 million SR in stocks. The total number of the limited companies by the end of 1964 was 17 with a capital of 2.955 billion SR (see Table 1)(Al-Braidy, 1987). Ten years later, by 1974, thirty seven limited companies had been established with total capital of 3.554 billion SR and 16 million SR stocks.

Table 1. Growth of Limited Companies in Saudi Arabia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Companies</th>
<th>Capital*</th>
<th>Stock*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.509</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.197</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(billions of SR)
The grand total of the limited companies at the end of 1974 was 54 with capital of 6.509 billion SR and 34 million SR in stock (Al-Braidy, 1987).

During the 1975-1980 period, 34 more limited companies were started, with capital of 27.125 billion SR and 142 million SR in stock. By the end of 1980, there were 98 limited companies, with capital of 34 billion SR and 187 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 numbered 50, with capital of 48 billion SR, and stock of 370 million SR. The number grew to 53 limited companies in 1986, with capital of 40.197 billion SR and stock of 407 million SR. In 1987, the number reached 61 limited companies (Al-Braidy, 1987).

Incentives Offered by the Government to Encourage the Private Sector

The government of Saudi Arabia developed plans to facilitate and open opportunities for investment to organizations in the private sector. The private sector was given the opportunity to invest capital through an open market and free economy. Governmental agencies, including the
Ministries of Trade and Industry and Work Affairs, were assigned the responsibility of providing the needed funds and facilities needed by firms in the private sector. The subsections which follow discuss the various ways the private sector benefits from the government incentives.

**Saudi Industrial Fund (SIF)**

Established in 1974, SIF offers interest free short-and-long term loans to industrial organizations. These loans are arranged in a way to cover from 1% to 50% of a project's cost. Beside the loans, SIF provides economical, technical, and administrative consultation to the industrial organizations when and wherever needed (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

**Encouraging and Protecting National Industries**

There are several actions that have been taken to enable the national industries to prosper:

1. No taxes are required for Saudi companies, whether industrial or nonindustrial.
2. No custom fees are required for imported machinery, tools, materials, crude material, and parts used by the national firms.
3. The private sector was offered discounted land rent rates and industrial zones have been built in most of the major cities like Riyadh, Dammam, Jeddah, Qassim, Najran, and
Jazan. Furthermore, the government has built two large industrial cities, Joubail (in the eastern province) and Yanbou (in the western province).

4. National industries are protected by raising tax rates on imported products identical to products manufactures in Saudi Arabia.

5. There is a free-tax rate for exported products (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

**Foreign Capital Investment**

As noted, the government encourages the private sector to form joint-ventures with foreign corporations to benefit from new technologies and gain greater market shares. The government provides five incentives to the foreign companies: (a) waving custom fees from imported machines, tools, and spare parts, (b) no income tax for ten years, (c) free land for the project construction, (d) free land for the company headquarters and branches, and (e) eligibility for SIF loans (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

**Governmental Supply Security**

The Saudi government gives priority and preferability to local industries' products and services that they sell to agencies. If there is more than one local supplier of the same
products, the Saudi companies are required to participate in open bidding (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

**Joubail and Yanbou Industrial Cities (JYIC)**

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

**Support to the Agricultural Sector**

The government provides direct and indirect support to the agricultural sector. The agricultural sector benefits directly from: dams, roads, electricity, agricultural education, agricultural research and consultation centers, and other services. Indirectly, the government supports agriculture by offering long term and free interest loans to the agricultural sector. These loans are available for companies as well as for individual farmers. The government guarantees profits for the farmers and agricultural companies by buying their products at a high price (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

**Other Incentives**

There are other incentives for Saudi firms, too, such as the discounted electricity rate, where the rate is only 5
halalas/k.w.s and water is only .25 halalas per cubic meter (Ministry of Planning, 1988).

The Earliest Joint-Venture: the Arabian American Oil Company (ARAMCO)

The story of the Arabian American Oil Company, better known as ARAMCO and now renamed as Saudi ARAMCO, dates back to May 29, 1933, when the Saudi Arabian Government signed a basic concession agreement with Standard Oil of California (SOCAL), today's Chevron (Saudi Aramco, 1990a). "The concession was assigned by Socal to a subsidiary, California Arabian Standard Oil Company (Casoc). In 1936, the Texas Company, which today is Texaco, became half owner of Casco. In 1944, Casco changed its name to the Arabian American Oil Company, or Aramco. The original concession agreement was revised through negotiations several times" (Saudi Aramco, 1990a, p. 2).

By 1948, two other major oil companies had acquired an interest in Aramco. These were Standard Oil of New Jersey, which today is Exxon, and Socony Vacuum, which now is Mobil. Under the new arrangement, Socal, Standard Oil of New Jersey and Texaco each held 30%, and Socony Vacuum held 10%. Between 1975 and 1979, Mobil increased its holding to 15% and the
other companies' interests were correspondingly reduced' (Saudi Aramco, 1990a).

'In 1973, the Saudi Arab Government acquired a 25% participation interest in Aramco. That increased to 60% the following year. In 1980, with retroactive payments in effect since 1976, the participation interest increased to 100% when the government paid for substantially all of Aramco's assets. The Saudi Arabian Oil Company (Saudi Aramco) was established by Royal Decree in November 1988 to assume the managerial and operational responsibilities being carried out by Aramco for the government. The company's board of directors is chaired by HE Hisham Nazer, Minister of Petroleum and Mineral Resources. The board is responsible to the Supreme Council of the Saudi Arabian Oil Company, which is chaired by Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Fahd' (Saudi Aramco, 1990a).

Despite full Saudi ownership, Americans are still involved in Aramco management under the terms of special managerial transition contracts and as consultants (Viola, 1986), and three out of the eleven board members are Americans (Saudi Aramco, 1990b). As of 1990, there are 2,656 Americans working in the company (Saudi Aramco, 1990b) with most, if not all, of them holding supervisory positions. In comparison, the Saudis hold nearly 3,404 supervisory positions (Saudi Aramco, 1990b). The total number of other Saudi workers (who do not held supervisory positions or professional jobs is 22,301.
Most of them are supervised by either Saudi or American supervisors.

Summary and Conclusion

Economic diversity and growth are goals of the Saudi Arabian government. One way to accomplish these goals is to have the private sector become more involved in the development process. The government benefited from the oil boom and was able to provide incentives for the private sector. The private sector has recognized that one way to have greater access to high technology and get a larger market share is through joint-ventures. The earliest, highly successful, joint-venture in Saudi Arabia was the giant Aramco. Since supervisors in Aramco includes Saudi as well as American supervisors superiors, then cultural differences and differences in social background, may have moderating affects on job satisfaction as well as on organizational commitment and job involvement.

In this research, individuals are the unit of analysis. As a result of the preceding discussion, this study seeks to identify how satisfied and committed to their organizations are Saudi employees working under American supervisors in comparison to their counterparts working under Saudi managers.
In addition, this study seeks to determine to what degree foreign supervision and work-related variables moderate the relationships in a well known model of job satisfaction and commitment.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has concerned organizational behavior sociologists as well as industrial psychologists since the mid-fifties of this century. Attempts were made to identify job satisfaction. A key question has been, how does job satisfaction/dissatisfaction affect workers' behavior? Evidence such as absences, poor performance, turnover, and accidents were 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. Job satisfaction has been seen as a function of variables such 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); negative affectivity (Levin & Stakes, 1989); job content and context factors (Armstrong, 1971); intrinsic and extrinsic job motivation (Centers & Bugental, 1966); motivator and hygiene factors (Halpern,
1966); and occupational level (Starcench, 1972). It has been studied in relation to 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 computing (Ghani & Al-Meer, 1989); effect of type of organization on job satisfaction in terms of public versus private (Cacioppe & Mock, 1984; Cherniss & Kane, 1987; Newstrom, Reef & Monczka, 1976; Paine, Carroll & Leete, 1966; Porter & Mitchell, 1967; Smith & Nock, 1980; Solomon, 1986, and Al-hajri, 1990); and job characteristics (Hackman and Oldham, 1980).

The essence of job satisfaction is need fulfillment. The need-satisfaction model has been the universal theoretical framework applied to understanding job satisfaction (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977). The underlying assumption of this framework is that persons have basic, stable, relatively unchanging and identifiable attributes, including needs and personalities. Further, the model posits that jobs have stable, identifiable, and relatively unchanging characteristics that are relevant to needs of individuals. Job satisfaction is presumed to result from the match between the needs of the individual and the characteristics of the job. When the characteristics of the job are compatible with the person's needs, then job satisfaction is assumed to happen and
the person will be more likely to perform the job. Jobs that fulfill a person's needs are satisfying and those do not are not satisfying. "If the person is satisfied with his [or her] job, it is presumably because the job has characteristics compatible with his [or her] needs. If the person is unhappy with his [or her] job, it is because the job is presumably not satisfying his [or her] needs" (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977, p.428).

The individual needs fulfillment conceptualization started with Maslow's (1943) formulation of his theory of human needs. According to Maslow, human motives emerge following a hierarchy of five need levels: (a) psychological needs, (b) safety or security needs, (c) social or affiliation needs, (d) achievement and esteem needs, and (e) self-actualization needs. There are three basic premises of Maslow's need hierarchy theory (Callahan, Fleenor, and Knudson, 1986, p. 83). First, a satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior. When a need is satisfied, the next need in the hierarchy takes its place. Second, the needs are arranged in a hierarchal order such that individuals attempt to satisfy some needs before moving to the next ones. Third, there are more ways to satisfy higher-level needs than lower-level needs.
Despite its central position in the literatures, Maslow's theory has received weak or no empirical support (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977; Callahan et al., 1986). Lawler and Suttle (1972) in their study of managers in two different companies report not a hierarchy of five needs but only two levels of needs— a biological level, and a global level covering the higher level needs. In a review of ten factor-analytic and three ranking studies examining Maslow's need hierarchy, Wahba and Bridwell (1976) concluded that the concept of need hierarchy was only partially supported.

Maslow's needs hierarchy has been redefined by Alderfer (1969). Alderfer suggests three broad category of needs: existence, relatedness, and growth. He was less concerned with the hierarchal arrangements of the need categories (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977). Alderfer shares the belief with Maslow that need structures were virtually universal among individuals.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) redefined needs into two categories; "hygiene" and "motivators." For them, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not just the opposite ends of a single continuum. Herzberg et. al., argued that factors that lead to job satisfaction (e.g. motivators) are separate and distinct from those that lead to job dissatisfaction (e.g., hygiene). In general, hygiene factors are extrinsic to the job and assumed to prevent employees from
being dissatisfied or unhappy but their presence does not lead to job satisfaction. On the other hand, motivators, or characteristics of the job (e.g., recognition, responsibility, advancement, personal growth, and the nature of the job itself) are intrinsic factors that when present contribute to employees' job satisfaction. "According to the Herzberg theory, a job will enhance work motivation only to the extent that motivators are designed into the work itself; changes that deal solely with hygiene factors will not generate improvements" (Hackman, 1980, p.447).

In spite of the extensive methodological criticism that has leveled against the Herzberg two-factor theory, it is importance in that it was one of the first attempts to draw the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977). It still enjoys popularity and has become widely known among managers and inspired a number of successful change projects involving the redesign of work (Hackman, 1980; Callahan et al., 1986).

What is common to the aforementioned approaches to job satisfaction, is the assumption of universal human needs. Such assumption, however, was strongly questioned by Turner and Lawrence (1965) who introduced the idea that different individuals may have different needs, or at least different strengths of the same needs (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977). As a result, current research on job satisfaction and job design
relies on the assumption that different persons may have different need strength and, hence, will respond differently to the same job characteristics (Hackman and Lawler, 1971; Hackman and Oldham, 1976; and Hackman and Oldham, 1980). The job characteristics model of work motivation (JCM; Hackman and Oldham, 1976; 1980) has been the dominant theoretical framework for understanding an employee's reaction to the core dimension of the job (Fried and Ferris, 1987; Birnbaum, Farh, and Wong, 1986; Bottger and Chew, 1986; Britt and Teevan, 1989; Johns, Xie, and Fang, 1992; Tieges, Tetrick, and Fried, 1992).

The Job Characteristics Model

The job characteristic model (JCM) specifies five job dimensions that are assumed to be related to specific psychological states which are in turn are associated with personal and work outcomes (see Figure 1). Individual differences and the context of satisfaction are accounted for in the model. The individual differences are conceptualized in terms of knowledge and skills and the growth need strength. Context satisfaction is defined in terms of co-worker relationships, supervision, pay, and job security. Individual differences and context satisfaction are posited to moderate
The relationships in the JMC both at the link between the core job dimensions and the psychological states, and between the outcomes and these states.

The Core Dimensions and their Corresponding Psychological States

The core dimensions and their corresponding psychological states are as follows:

1. Skill variety: This refers to the extent to which...
a job requires a variety of activities to carry out the work and the extent to which a variety of skills are employed for the successful accomplishment of the job.

2. Task Identity: This refers to the extent to which a job requires a completion of a "whole" piece of work, or doing a job from the beginning to the end.

3. Task Significance: This refers to the degree to which a job has an effect on others' lives and activities in and out the organization.

According to the model, each of these three core characteristics contribute to the psychological state of experienced meaningfulness of the job. These three characteristics are thought to be combined in an additive way to underlie workers' experienced meaningfulness of the work as moderated by the employee's knowledge and skills, growth need strength, and context satisfaction.

4. Autonomy: This refers to the degree to which a job provides freedom, independence, and discretion to the worker to carry out the work. It is believed that the more autonomy an employee has in his/her job, the more he/she feels responsibility for that job. Like the preceding variables, autonomy is assumed to be moderated by the same moderators mentioned above.

5. Feedback: This refers to the extent to which a job provides the opportunity for the worker to know about his/her
performance effectiveness. Feedback correspond to the worker's feelings of his/her knowledge of the results of his work. The more feedback the work provides to the worker, the more feelings of knowledge the worker experiences psychologically.

The Motivational Potential Score (MPS)

This is a global measure of the five core job characteristics in the model. It measures the degree to which a job activates the internal motivation of the worker. It is formulated additively and multicatively in order to provide differential weights to some of the characteristics. In the formulation, it is:

\[
MPS = \frac{SV + TI + TS}{3} \times AT \times FB
\]

where:
- MPS = Motivation Potential Score.
- SV = Skill variety.
- TI = Task identity.
- TS = Task significance.
- AT = Autonomy.
- FB = Feedback of the job.

Accordingly, the average of the three dimensions that lead to the experienced meaningfulness of the job is multiplied by the product of autonomy and feedback. In the formula, the three factors (SV, TI, and TS) are given equal weight and interaction between them and AT and FB computed. The assumption behind this formula is that for a job to be high on the MPS, it must be high on several of these
variables. It can be inferred from the formula that these variables contribute unequally to the MPS of each job.

**Moderators**

1. Knowledge and Skills: This refers to the degree that individuals are different with respect to the knowledge and skills needed to perform the job. It is hypothesized that, the more knowledgeable and skillful the worker, the more he/she feels good about his/her performance.

2. Growth Need Strength: This refers to the differences among individuals with regard to their growth needs. The JCM assumes that "individuals with strong needs for growth should respond eagerly to the opportunities provided by enriched work. Individuals with low needs for growth, on the other hand, may not recognize the existence of such opportunities..." (Hackman and Oldham, 1980, p. 85).

3. Context Satisfaction: This refers to the extent to which the worker experiences positive relationships with his or her peers as well as with his or her supervisor. Further, factors such as pay, working conditions, and job security are included in this context. This variable is assumed to influence the link between the core dimensions and the psychological states even if the other moderators, knowledge and skills and growth need strength, are high.
The Outcomes:

These are the dependent variables. They include "High internal work motivation", "High growth satisfaction", "High general job satisfaction", and "High work effectiveness". Since one of the purposes of the current study is to partially test the JCM in a different culture, then it is necessary to review relevant literature.

JCM and Prior Research

The JCM has stimulated a large body of fragmented research (Johns et al., 1992). That is witnessed by the qualitative and quantitative review of more than 200 research studies by Fried and Ferris (1987). The general conclusion they reached is that the total model is supported. The empirical tests of the model centered around four areas: 1. dimensionality of job characteristics, 2. subjective perception vs. objective characteristics of the core dimensions, 3. mediating role of the psychological states, and 4. moderating role of growth need strength and context satisfaction. In the following subsections research relevant for the four areas will be reviewed.
Dimensionality of the Core Characteristics

In their review of the literature on the JCM, Fried and Ferris (1987, p.299) reported that "Eighteen studies have examined the dimensionality of the JDS [Job Diagnostic Survey], and the results indicate inconsistent factor solutions". Specifically, six of the studies reviewed confirmed in their empirical analysis the a priori five scales of the JDS. In contrast, eleven empirical research studies failed to support the a priori scales of the JDS. Only one study revealed mixed results. According to Fried and Ferris (1987), Dunham, Aldage, and Brief (1977- in part of 20 examined samples) found support for the a priori five scales of the JDS, but in the other studies failed to find support for the a priori scales of the JDS.

These mixed findings provide some support to Salancik and Pfeffer's (1978) conception of a "single-factor hypothesis". Salancik and Pfeffer postulated that "the social context provides direct evaluation of the work setting along positive or negative dimensions, leaving it to the individual to construct a rational to make sense of the generally shared affected reactions" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 10). In other words, employees' generalized affective responses to their jobs may account for all other variables in the JCM, that is, a single-factor model may explain JDS data better than JCM (Hogan and Martell, 1987). Hogan and Martell (1987, p.258) in their
confirmatory structural analysis of the JCM found support for the single-factor hypothesis. However, the authors still concluded that "the single-factor model is more parsimonious".

In their meta-analysis of the JCM, Fried and Ferris (1987) found only partial support for the model with regard to the relationships between the core job characteristics and the critical psychological states. Recently, Johns et al. (1992) tested the correspondence between the five core variables (task variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) and the psychological states (meaningfulness, responsibility, and knowledge of results). They found that, when other factors controlled, the five core dimension contributed significantly to their corresponding psychological states. According to Johns et al. (1992, p.658) "... the five-factor solution was appropriate, resulting in a clear and fair test of the JCM".

Subjective Perception vs. Objective Characteristics of the Core Dimensions

Two of the major criticisms of the JCM are that: 1.) it fails to distinguish between the objective characteristics of jobs and the incumbent's cognitions about these characteristics (Roberts and Click, 1981), and 2.) the usual dependent variable has been employees' job satisfaction, typically measured in the same questionnaire used to collect
task perceptions. "These perception-to-perception correlations are subject to unknown levels of common method variance" (Birnbaum et al., 1986, p.598). These criticisms have elicited numerous research studies devoted to further examining the relationship between objective and perceived job characteristics.

After their review of literatures on the JCM, Fried and Ferris (1987) reported that in laboratory experiments, field studies, and several quasi-experimental studies that have investigated the correlation between manipulation of jobs and changes in the perception of job characteristics results indicated a significant correlation between the objective and perceived job characteristics. Another way to evaluate the level of accuracy of incumbents' job ratings is to compare their ratings with those of peers, supervisors, or observers. Fried and Ferris investigated the comparison of job ratings made by incumbents and others. The authors concluded that the comparisons reveal "moderate to good overlap between ratings of job characteristics made by incumbents and those made by others"(p. 296). Birnbaum et al. (1986) analyzed the perceptions of different employees performing the same job in 37 different organizations in Hong Kong using the Job Diagnostic Survey. They found that "...the job incumbents
performing the same job do share some common perceptions about the attributes of their jobs and their affective responses to them." (p.600).

Fried and Ferris (1987) reviewed the literature examining differences in job characteristics and work outcomes when tasks are rated by incumbents, peers, or supervisors. They conclude that "Overall, [those] studies demonstrate a trend toward similarity in the relationships of incumbents' job ratings and others' job ratings to potential criterion variables" (Fried and Ferris, 1987, p. 298). Further, Fried and Ferris reviewed the studies that have compared the effects of the manipulation of objective job characteristics vs. perceived job characteristics on attitudinal outcomes. Again the authors failed to find significant differences and argued that "The analysis...suggests that the problems potentially associated with self-rated data are less serious than initially believed." (p. 299). Finally Johns et al. (1992) reported that in a meta-analysis "...that compared 'percept-percept' correlations with 'multisource' correlations in various organizational behavior, assuming that higher percept-percept associations would be indicative of method variance... job design emerged as one of the least tainted research areas." (p. 658).
Mediating Role of the Psychological States

There are not many studies that have addressed the role of the psychological states as mediators between job dimensions and employee responses. Only a few studies have focused directly on the issue of whether or not the psychological states mediate the relationships between the job dimensions and criterion variables. Nevertheless, those who have investigated the role of the psychological states have reported findings that support the JCM proposition that the psychological states mediate between the job dimensions and employee responses (Fried and Ferris, 1987, Hogan and Martell, 1987; Johns et al., 1992).

Hackman and Oldham (1976) compared partial correlations between core dimensions and outcomes after controlling for psychological state, separately for each outcome and for each psychological state. They found that psychological states contribute significantly to the variance explained, above and beyond job characteristics alone.

Hogan and Martell (1987) compared the basic model of the JCM (without the psychological states) with the same model (with the psychological states) using the "adjusted goodness of fit, AGFI" as a criteria for their comparison. They found that the model with the psychological states fits the data better than the basic model. In their meta-analysis of studies on JCM, Fried and Ferris (1987, p. 306) concluded that "The
results...support the idea that the relationships between the psychological states and psychological 'personal' outcomes are stronger than the relationships between the core job dimensions and those outcome". This indicated the important mediator role of the psychological states have between the core dimension and the outcomes.

Johns et al. (1992) examined the role of the psychological states as mediators. They used three regression equations for each outcome variable, one using the three psychological states as predictors, the second using the five core characteristics, and the third using all eight predictors together. Johns et al. (1992, p.664) reported that "there is good evidence that the psychological states mediate the relationship between the core characteristics and both general satisfaction and internal motivation".

**Moderating Role of Growth Need Strength and Context Satisfaction**

According to Hogan and Martell (1987), there is a scarcity of research studying the moderating effects of growth needs strength (GNS) at both places in the model, i.e., both before and after the mediating psychological states. Further, few studies have examined the moderating effect of contextual satisfaction (CS) on the relationship between core dimensions
and outcomes (Fried and Ferris, 1987). In the following, some of the studies that have addressed the moderator effect of GNS and CS will be discussed.

Several literature reviews conclude that empirical support for the moderating effects of GNS and context satisfaction is weak and inconsistent (Bottger and Chew, 1986; Tiegs et al., 1992). Hackman and Oldham (1976) found some evidence that GNS and CS moderate both the task dimension-psychological state and psychological state-outcomes. Hogan and Martell (1987) found some support for the interaction effect of the core dimensions and GNS, and the psychological states and the GNS. However, when they compare the basic model of JCM, without the moderators, with the model of JCM including the moderators, they found that the basic model fit the data better.

Tiegs et al. (1992) conducted a study to assess the extent to which GNS and CS moderate the relations between the core dimensions and associated psychological states and the relations between each psychological state and the three work outcomes: overall job satisfaction, growth satisfaction, and internal motivation. The authors failed to find support for the hypothesized moderator effects of GNS neither CS. They concluded that the data of their study "...generally did not support either the individual moderating effects of GNS and
context satisfaction or the joint moderating effect of GNS and each context satisfaction on the relations among job characteristics, psychological states, and motivational and affective outcomes" (Tiegs et al, 1992, p. 590).

JCM and Cross-Cultural Studies

The JCM has been criticized for being culturally bounded. According to Birnbaum et al. (1986) "most of the job characteristics research has been conducted in the United States and other Western societies; the relations between situational attributes and incumbent cognitions of attributes may differ in non-Western societies and cultures" (p. 598). There is only one study, found in the literature, that utilizes the JCM in a different culture. Birnbaum et al. (1986) conduct a study in Hong Kong to assess the relations between job incumbents' job descriptions and supervisors' job ratings. Their study was limited to that comparison. The total JCM was not tested. The test of job satisfaction did not include either the mediating effect of the psychological states or the moderators.

Since the purpose of this study is to explore the mediating effects of culture on job satisfaction and organizational commitment and job involvement in the private
sector in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the literature review will focus next on the relation between cultural differences and job satisfaction.

Review of the Literature on Cultural Differences

Organizational climate, or culture, has been the concern of some scholars. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) noted that scholars try to explore the influence of organization climate, such as the interaction between members of the organization, autonomy to make decisions, pressure, and directing activity on job satisfaction. 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).

The organizational culture is believed to be affected most by the host country's characteristics, or culture (Hall, 1991). Al-Adaily (1981) conducted a study to measure public employees' satisfaction in Saudi Arabia. He found that the public employees were satisfied in general. Al-Adaily found
the public employees were very satisfied with the responsibility, recognition, working conditions, and supervisory techniques. On the other hand, the Saudi employees in the public sector were less satisfied with salary and security, organizational policies, personal recognition, time demands and requirements of the job (Al-Adaily, 1981).

Al-hajri (1990) conducted a study to compare job satisfaction among public employees with their counterparts in the private sector in Saudi Arabia. He found that the private sector employees were less satisfied with supervisory technique than their counterparts in the public sector. Supervisory technique, or leadership style, is based on in part or reflects a culture's values (Hofstede, 1980).

In an impressive work, Hofstede (1980, 1984) assembled information concerning cultural differences in work-related value. His theory is based on the assumption that people carry "mental programs" that are developed during childhood and reinforced by society. In order to explore the principle values of different cultures, Hofstede used a sample of 116,000 employees of a large multinational business organization with units in 40 countries. Through theoretical reasoning and statistical analysis, he identified four dimensions along which dominant value systems of culture can be arranged: power distance (PDI), uncertainty avoidance (UAI), individualism-collectivism (IDV), and masculinity
(MAS). PDI refers to the degree to which the culture emphasizes that institutional and organizational power should be distributed unequally. UAI denotes the extent to which the people feel threatened by ambiguous situations and try to avoid uncertainty by establishing more structure. IDV describes the degree to which a culture emphasizes the individual or the group. Finally, MAS indicates the degree to which a culture values "masculine" behaviors such as assertiveness and the acquisition of wealth or "feminine" behaviors such as caring for others and the quality of life. These four work-related values are believed to effect supervisors' effectiveness if supervisors' work-related values differ from those workers whom they supervise.

Dean and Popp (1990) reported that the American managers working in Saudi Arabia face difficulties in their adjustment to the Saudi culture. The authors concluded:

... American managers felt that to adjust success fully to life in Saudi Arabia, you need to be able to deal with the unknown, the unfamiliar, and all kinds of unexpected situations because the Saudi culture is extremely different from the U.S culture (p.415).

They added, "... Saudi culture contrasts so much with the U.S culture, and communication misunderstandings could be expected" (p.416).

Cultural differences result in differences in leadership style. The later is believed to effect group communication. According to Lusting and Cassotta (1989):
Leadership differences are based, in part, on a culture's values... and the group members responsiveness to a particular leadership style. Leadership style means the dominant set of behaviors that typically characterize a leader's activities (p.395).

Cultural differences have been found to effect social interaction. At-twaijri (1989) found that American managers working in Saudi Arabia were less satisfied with the opportunities for friendship than managers in the U.S.

At-twaijri, Al-dkhayyil, and Al-Muhaiza (1993, p.13) investigated the attitudes of Saudi workers toward American and Saudi supervisory styles. The researchers found that "Saudi subordinates working for Saudi supervisors feel more comfortable than Saudi subordinates working for American supervisors" (p.13). They attributed this finding to be function of the shared culture. In other words, the mere salience of cultural category (e.g American vs. Saudis) is believed to contribute to the employees' feeling of discomfort. The authors did not discuss whether the length of exposure (e.g., working for a long period of time under an American supervisor) has any effect on the job satisfaction. According to Allport (1954), a longer contact between people from different groups is likely to increase understanding, reduce tensions and misinterpretations of others behavior.

According to Hofstede (1980), the American culture is characterized by lower PDI, lower UAI, higher IDV, and higher
MAS. While the Saudi culture was not included in Hofstede's study, the characteristics of the Saudi culture is found in a study by At-twaitri et. al.(1993). They indicated that the Saudi supervisors' decision-making behavior was autocratic (high PDI), emphasized mutual dependence (low IDV), emphasized care for their subordinates, as if they were members of their extended family (high MAS), and they were more positively oriented to rules and regulations (high UAI). When comparing the descriptions of Hofstede and At-twaitri et al., a sharp difference between the two cultures is suggested. This conclusion reinforces the arguments, made earlier, by Dean and Popp (1990, p. 416) that the "...Saudi culture contrasts so much with the U.S culture...."

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment exists to the extent that a worker identifies with and is involved in an organization. Scholl (1981, p.593) stated that commitment is "the stabilizing force that acts to maintain behavioral direction when expectancy or equity conditions are not met and do not function". According to Williams and Anderson (1991, p.604), Weiner viewed commitment "...as the totality of those
internalized beliefs and is responsible for behavior that: a) reflect personal sacrifice made for the sake of the organization, b) do not depend primarily on reinforcement or punishment, c) and indicate a personal preoccupation with the organization." Curry, et.al (1986) maintained that organizational commitment has three components. Those components are similar to those specified by Weiner. Strong beliefs in an organization's values and goals is the first component. Second is a willingness to extend considerable efforts for the organization. Finally, a strong intent or desire to remain employed by the organization is the third.

Organizational commitment is defined either as an attitudinal or as a behavioral component. Alpander (1990, p.53) argues that "the behavioral approach views commitment as the state of being bound to the organization by personal investment". On the other hand, "the attitudinal approach views commitment as an internal state". It is the feeling of belongingness and the beliefs in the organization that lead the worker to identify with it and the degree to which the worker wishes to maintain a membership in it.

Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

There is a consensus among the organizational behaviorists that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are correlated variables. However, differences
and disagreement erupt with regard to the question of what variable determines the other. There are at least three different arguments regarding the cause and effect of organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

One widely held assumption is that job satisfaction precedes organizational commitment and causes it. The advocates of this assumption are: Angoland and Perry, Buchanan, Herbiniak and Aluttto, Koch and Streets, Reichers, Steers, Wakefield (Curry et.al;1986). The second assumption is just the opposite of the first one. Batman and Strasser (1984) argued that despite the highly collinearity between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, its the former who effects the later. That is the worker's identification with the organization and his/her beliefs in its' goals effect his/her feelings of satisfaction. Curry and his associates (1986) challenged these two assumptions. They replicated Batman and Strasser's study and concluded that no causal effect between the two variables was found. According to them "...our results provide no basis for asserting that commitment has a causal effect on satisfaction. However,... we found no support for the widely held tenet that satisfaction influences commitment" (p.852).

Organizational commitment has been treated as an independent and as dependent variable. Those advocates of the
notion that commitment is a result of job satisfaction looked at commitment as a dependent variable. In his study of nurses' commitment to hospital goals, Alpander (1990) treated commitment as dependent variable determined by the intrinsic motivation. Odom et al. (1990), studied the effect of structural variables on commitment. In contrast, Williams and Anderson (1990) used commitment as an independent variable that influences the degree of organizational citizenship. Curry et al. (1986) studied organizational commitment as a predictor of job satisfaction.

Commitment and Culture

There is a scarcity of cross-cultural studies in the area of organizational commitment and culture. Nevertheless, in terms of corporate culture, a subculture of society culture, Odom et al. (1990) found a positive correlation between an organizational supportive culture and organizational commitment. They concluded "Respondents who work in a supportive environment ... have a greater degree of commitment than other respondents" (p.166).
The concepts of organizational commitment and job involvement may overlap. The confusion results from viewing job involvement as a subset of organizational commitment (Morrow, 1993). Job involvement is conceptualized differently from organizational commitment. Thus, while the organizational commitment is defined as the attachment and identification of the worker with the organization, in general, job involvement is defined as "...the degree of absorption in work activity that an individual experiences" (Morrow, 1993, p.51).

There are a number of approaches to conceptualize job involvement but few have received as much recognition as Lodahl and Kejner's, Kanungo's, and Ferrel and Rusbult's (Morrow, 1993). Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement in terms of a job performance-self-esteem relationship and personal identification with work. Job involvement was defined by Kanungo (1982) as a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with one's job in particular or work in general. Finally, Farrell and Rusbult (1981) defined job commitment "as the extent to which an employee perceives he/she is connected to a job" (p.80). What these approaches have in common is that job involvement viewed as a psychological identification with and attachment to one's job.
Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction

Several studies have reported a correlation between job involvement and job satisfaction. For example, studies that utilized Lodahl and Kejner's approach reported correlation between the constructs as large as .50. Studies applying Kanungo's approach found correlations as large as .57. However, the strongest correlation between job involvement and job satisfaction was that reported by Farrell and Rusbult (1981), .67. After her extensive review of the literature, Morrow (1993) concluded that job involvement is more often seen as a function of job satisfaction.

Job Involvement and Culture

There is shortages of studies of job involvement and cultural differences. In the literature, only one study was found that considered the effect of culture on job involvement. Gomez-Mejia Luis and Balkin (1984), from their cross-cultural study, reported that one's occupation has some effect on job involvement and that effect varies from culture to another.
The research model in this study is an extension on the "Job Characteristic Model". As noted, the job characteristic model was developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1979 and has become a dominant paradigm in the organizational behavior literature (Evans, Kiggundu, and House, 1979). The research model is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. The Research Model
Modification of the Job Characteristics Model

In this study, two moderator variables and two dependent variables were added to the JCM. As moderator variables, Work-Related Values and Exposure to Foreign Management are hypothesized to have a moderating effect on the relationship between the CJC and CPS and between the CPS and the outcomes.

As we have noted, empirical tests of the original moderators (GNS and context satisfaction) in the JCM have resulted in inconsistent, weak, and no support. Other investigators utilized alternative moderator variables with mixed results. These variables included: the location of work place (city vs town), alienation from middle class norms, intrinsic and extrinsic values, need for achievement (Evans et al., 1979), and fear of failure (Britt and Teevan, 1989). Bottger and Chew (1986) suggest that one possible explanation for the lack of support of the GNS is that it does not measure the most relevant values. For them, "it seems likely that a GNS-type variable would have stronger effect on the job scop/outcome relationship if the variable actually measured the degree to which each characteristic was valued by the subject" (p.577). Accordingly, work-related values are hypothesized to be moderators in the JCM. Specifically, congruence between the supervisor's and the subordinate's work-related values is believed to moderate the job
dimension/outcome relationship. That is, the social context of any work is influenced by the relationship between the worker's and the supervisor's work-related values. If there is a congruence in the work-related values (i.e., both superior and subordinate from the same culture and share the same work-related values), then the relationship is assumed to be supportive and the employee will feel satisfaction with the context and that will influence the relation between the core dimensions and the psychological states. On the other hand, if the relationship is negative job satisfaction and outcomes will suffer.

Unfortunately, no direct measure of the degree of congruence of work-related values between Saudi workers and their supervisors was possible in this research. The degree to which Saudi workers identified with work-related values was determined. Saudi workers who have had no previous contact with foreign supervisors, could very well experience cultural differences in work-related values when supervised by foreigners. However, the relationships between Saudis and foreigners in the oil industry have been extensive and have occurred since the 1930s. I know from the literature, too, that foreign supervisors in Saudi Arabia have tried to learn about Saudi culture and improve their communication with Saudi workers. Therefore, in the specific case of Saudi workers at ARAMCO, I expect that work-related values that are consistent
with Saudi Arabian culture will interact positively with variables in the model.

Negative and frustrated relationships can result from misunderstandings and misinterpretations which can result from weak communication between individuals. Mullin (1979) has argued that communication is facilitated by the "shared stock of knowledge". According to Turner (1991):

All humans... carry in their minds rules, social recipes, conception of appropriate conduct, and other information that allows them to act in their social world... Schutz views the sum of these rules, recipes, conceptions, and information as the individuals' "stock of knowledge at hand". Such stock of knowledge gives people a frame of reference or orientation with which they can interpret events as the pragmatically act on the world around them (p.388).

One's stock of knowledge is learned and acquired through socialization (Berger and Luchman, 1967; Chemers, 1992, and Turner, 1991), and influenced by the culture. Hall (1991) argued that "...actors define reality in terms of their own background and values" (p.280). This definition of reality becomes the basis for "social categorization", a cognitive process of assigning people to categories based on their similarities and differences (Tajfel, 1981). Social categorization is associated with stereotyping —"the attribution to all or most members of a category various traits, which may be positive, negative, or neutral" (Brown, 1987, p.231).
Stereotyping underlies interaction between people from different groups. That is, people interact with each other based on the stereotypes associated with the other category. For example, stereotypes like "secular", "liberal", and "modernization" may be associated with the American culture while "religious", "conservative", and "Bedouin" may be associated with the Saudi culture. Such attributions lead to difficulties in communication and misunderstanding which is believed to lessen satisfaction, especially in the work domain. However, longer contact between people from different categories is assumed to facilitate more understanding and, hence, smooth communication (Allport, 1954).

Stephan and Stephan (1984) argued that contact between people from different groups leads to the discovery of information that might contradict the stereotype. Discovery of such information is believed to lead to more cooperation and coordination between ingroup and outgroup (Brown, 1987). On the basis of this argument, it seems reasonable to argue that the psychological states in the JCM will vary by the length of contact (exposure) between a supervisor from different culture and employees from another culture. In other words, the length of exposure is hypothesized to positively moderate the effects of the core job characteristics on psychological states.

As a result of the discussion presented herein, I expect that people from different cultural backgrounds will
experience difficulty when communicating and, therefore, misunderstandings which will result in a frustrated and negative work relationship that leads to low job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement.

The dependent variables are organizational commitment and job involvement. As we have seen, the review of literature indicates that organizational commitment and job involvement are seen as function of job satisfaction. In our study, these two constructs will be used as dependent variables that are determined by job satisfaction.

Hypotheses

There are seven hypotheses to be tested in this study.

1. Saudi workers supervised by foreigners will have lower job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement than their counterparts supervised by Saudis.
2. Core Job Characteristics are significantly related to the Critical Psychological State.
3. Critical Psychological States mediate the association between the Core Characteristics and the Outcomes.
4. Work-related values and exposure to foreign management will moderate the relationships in the Job Characteristics Model.

5. Work Outcomes are significantly related to job involvement and organizational commitment.

6. The higher the job satisfaction the higher the organizational commitment.

7. The higher the job satisfaction the higher the job involvement.
CHAPTER III. METHODS

This chapter consists of three subsections: a) description and selection of the sample, b) administration of the mailed questionnaire, and c) a description of items on the questionnaire.

Description and Selection of the Sample

The sample for this study was drawn, utilizing convenience sampling, from the private sector in Saudi Arabia. Male employees from ARAMCO company were selected in the sample for this study. Those employees who were attending training sessions, or seeking their undergraduate, or graduate degrees in the United States had a minimum of at least one year in their jobs before coming to the U.S. The reader should keep in mind that the sample is not representative of all Saudi Arabian. All persons studied were currently residing in the U.S. and receiving training sponsored by one Saudi Arabian corporation.

The mailed questionnaire, which was sent to the employees in 1993, contained items to measure demographic and study variables. The demographic variables included: age, number of years working for the company, their supervisor's nationality,
number of years working under that supervisor, number of years supervised by a foreign supervisor, level of education, kind of job, and number of years spent in the United States. The distribution of respondents on these items are presented in chapter IV. The questionnaire was approved by the Human Subject Committee at Iowa State University.

The sample included middle managers, assistant managers, and clerks. Studies indicate people in a high ranking positions are more satisfied than people in middle management or lower level positions (Pain et al., 1966; Porter & Michell, 1967; Starcevich, 1972). Therefore, the researcher asked ARAMCO officials not to mail the questionnaire to people in high level positions, such as general managers or decision makers. None of the returned questionnaires were completed by people in higher positions.

Administration of the Questionnaire

Contact was made with ARAMCO officials in 1993 in the company's office in Houston, Texas, to obtain the number of Saudi employees in training in the U.S., along with their names and addresses. The officials indicated that there are 400 Saudi employees in training in the U.S., however, ARAMCO indicated that it is the company's policy not to release any
information about the employees. An alternative research plan was agreed upon. The officials had this researcher send 400 copies of the questionnaire to the company's Houston office. The company agreed to mail the questionnaires to the employees who had, at least, one year's experience or more on the job before they came to the United States for training and education. However, the researcher was then told that there were only 180 employees who met the experience criteria. The subjects were instructed in the questionnaire to complete it and mail it to the researcher. A copy of the instrument is placed in appendix A: Mailed Questionnaire and a letter explaining the purpose of the study were sent to each employee on October 1993. The letter included the assurance that information will be kept confidential and used only for my research purposes.

Two follow-ups efforts were taken to encourage the employees to fill out and return the questionnaire to the researcher. These follow-up letters were sent to the company office in order to be mailed to all 180 employees since the researcher had no way of knowing which persons had not returned these questionnaires (a copy of these reminders are in Appendix B). The first follow-up was sent two weeks after the questionnaire had been mailed to the respondents to remind them why they were selected for this study and to encourage them to complete and return the questionnaires to the
researcher. The second follow-up was sent four weeks later to inform the respondents that the researcher had still not received their returned questionnaires. Included in that letter was a footnote asking the subjects to disregard this follow-up if the respondents have already mailed the questionnaires.

The researcher received 97 (53%) responses from the 180 employees. Among the returned questionnaires, only one was not completed which resulted in 96 usable questionnaires. Despite the satisfactory response rate (53%), there are some limitations associated with this research. First, in the absences of names and addresses of the subjects, the researcher lacked information about who had been mailed a questionnaire and who had returned it. The normal procedures is to code the mailed questionnaires in order to track the subjects and to know who has and who has not responded. Second, there was no direct contact with the subjects. Contacts had to go through the ARAMCO officials which resulted in delays in terms of mailing the questionnaires and the follow-ups. Mailing the questionnaires and the follow-ups was not their first priority.
Description of the Instrument

The mailed questionnaire used in this research consisted of four parts: 1) Job Diagnostic Survey, 2) Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement items, 3) Work-related Values Items, and 4) Demographic Information.

The Job Diagnostic Survey

The Job Diagnostics Survey (JDS) is the most frequently used instrument for the measurement of job characteristics (Fried and Ferris, 1987). JDS was developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1980. It contains seven sections, plus a demographic section, and was designed to measure five core job dimensions, three psychological states, several outcomes variables (general satisfaction, internal motivation, and growth satisfaction; Johns, Xie, and Fang, 1992), context satisfaction, and individual growth needs strength (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). All the items in the JDS are expressed on a 7-point Likert type scale with the exception of items in Section VII, Part I, where the items are expressed on a 5-point Likert scale. The five core job dimensions on the mailed questionnaire are as follows:

A. Skill Variety measured by 3 items: #4 from Section I, #1 and #5 from Section II.
B. Task Identity measured by 3 items: #3 from Section I, #11 and #3 from Section II.

C. Task Significance measured by 3 items: #5 from Section I, #8 and #14 from Section II.

D. Feedback:
   I. Feedback from the Job itself measured by 3 items: #7 from Section I, #4 and #12 from Section II.
   II. Feedback from Agents measured by 3 items: #6 from Section I, #10 and #7 from Section II.
   III. Dealing with Others measured by 3 items: #1 from Section I, #2 and #6 from Section II.

Although, Feedback from agents and Dealing with others are measured in the JDS, they are considered to be supplementary concepts. They were not included in the original motivational theory. According to Hackman and Oldham (1980), "...the knowledge of results derives from the work activities themselves, rather from some other person (such as a co-worker or a supervisor) who collect data or makes a judgement about how well the work is being done. [T]he focus...is on feedback mechanisms that are designed into the work itself" (p.80). Accordingly, those two items (feedback from agents and dealing with others) are excluded from the analysis in this study.

The three psychological states are:
A. Experienced Meaningfulness of the work measured by 4 items: #7 and #4 from Section III, and #6 and #3 from Section V.

B. Experienced Responsibility for the work measured by 6 items: #8, #12, #15, and #1 from Section III, and #4, #7 from section V.

C. Knowledge of Results measured by 4 items: #5 and #11 from Section III, and #5 and #10 from Section V.

The affective outcomes contains three constructs:
A. General Satisfaction measured by items #3, #13, and #9 from Section III, and #2 and #8 from Section V.

B. Internal Work Motivation measured by items #2, #6, #10, and #14 from Section III, and #1 and #9 from Section V.

C. Growth Satisfaction measured by items #3, #6, #10, and #13 from Section IV.

The context satisfaction (CS) consists of four variables. These are:
A. Satisfaction with Job Security measured by items #1 and #11 from Section IV.

B. Satisfaction with Compensation (pay) measured by items #2 and #9 of Section IV.

C. Satisfaction with Co-Workers measured by items #4, #7, and #12 of Section IV.

D. Satisfaction with supervision measured by items #5, #8, and #14 of Section IV.
The individual growth need strength (GNS) is measured by items #2,3,6,8,10, and 11 from section six and items #1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 from Section VII.

Although context satisfaction and growth need strength are discussed because they were part of the original JDS, they were not used in this study. As we have noted in chapter II, these moderators have received inconsistent and weak support in the previous literature. Alternative moderator variables were used.

In the discussion that follows, the reliabilities of the scales will be reviewed, but first a discussion of the standard reliability is presented. There is no clear classification of "high", "moderate", or "low" reliability found in the literature. However, there are scholars like Nunnally (1978, p.245) who thinks that a "modest reliability of .70 or higher will...suffice" in the early stages of research. While Nunnally views the reliability of .70 as modest, Landy (1989) argues that the reliability of .70 should be seen as in the high category. Others such as Carmines and Zeller (1979) contend that "As a general rule, we believe that reliabilities should not be below .80 for widely used scales" (p.51). Recently, Murphy and Davidshofer (1991) reviewed reported reliabilities on rating scales and concluded that .70 to .80 was considered moderate to high, above .80 was considered high, .70 to .65 was assumed moderate to low, and
below .65 was seen as low reliability. Accordingly, herein we will consider the reliability of .70 as at the modest level and below it low, while above it is high.

A relatively high reliability results in better prediction and has implications for hypothesis testing (Landy, 1989). We should be careful not to blame low reliabilities to items in the scale alone. It is possible that items in scales can be interpreted differently by persons in other cultures. In this study, some of the variables do not have high reliability. However, due to the lack of any means of correcting the reliabilities, those scales are utilized. the reliabilities are reported below.

Reliability coefficients, based upon the internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) of the core dimensions, have been described in the literature. In their original test of the JDS, Hackman and Oldham (1975) presented Alpha coefficients of .71 for skill variety (SV), .59 for task identity (TI), .66 for task significance(TS), .66 for autonomy(AT), and .71 for feedback(FB). In their review of the reliability of the core dimensions, Cook et al. (1981) reported that Alpha coefficients ranged from .47 to .80 for SV, .47 to .78 for TI, .50 to .79 for TS, .53 to .73 for AT, and .30 to .75 for FB. In the current study, the reliability coefficients of the core dimensions were computed. Results herein included Alpha
coefficient of: .67, .56, .57, .63, and .32 for the core variables respectively. The reliabilities are relatively low.

The internal reliability coefficients of the psychological states have been found to be satisfactory in previous research. Hackman and Oldham (1975) reported Alpha coefficient of .74 for experienced meaningfulness of work, .72 for the experienced responsibility for work, and .76 for knowledge of results. Hackman, Oldham, and Stepina (1978) presented Alpha coefficients of .71, .67, and .71 for the three psychological states respectively. In this study, the computed Alpha coefficients are .51, .52, and .56 for the three psychological states. The computed reliability for experienced responsibility has been corrected by dropping three items: #22, 33, and 36. The reliabilities are relatively low.

The reliability coefficients for the outcome variables have been reported in previous studies and have generally been satisfactory. Hackman and Oldham (1975) reported Alpha coefficients of .76 for general satisfaction, .76 for internal work motivation, and .84 for growth satisfaction. After their review of literature on JDS, Cook et al. (1981) reported Alpha coefficients of .74 to .80 for general satisfaction, .58 to 79 for internal motivation, and .84 for growth satisfaction. In the current study, I found an Alpha coefficient of .75 for the general satisfaction, .53 for the internal motivation, and .71
for the growth satisfaction. Two of these reliabilities are relatively high and one relatively low. Reliabilities for the internal motivation (IM) and general satisfaction (GS) have been corrected. Three items: #31, 35, and 59 were dropped from the IM and three items: #30, 52, and 58 were dropped from the GS.

The Work-Related Values

Part II of the questionnaire contained three sections dealing with the Work-Related Values items. These items were adapted from Hofstede (1980) who identified four dimensions of work-related values: 1) Power Distance (PDI), 2) Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI), 3) Individualism (IDV), and 4) Masculinity (MAS).

In Hofstede's study, the power distance dimension (PDI) is measured by the three items (A, B, and C) of Section I, in Part II. The section on PDI begins with a description of four decision-making styles: 1) autocratic ("tells"), 2) persuasive/paternalistic ("sells"), 3) consultative ("consults"), and 4) democratic (majority vote, "joins") (Hofstede, 1980, p. 74). Each employee was asked to classify, preferably, his or her current supervisor in item A and perceptually in item B. Item A asks what type of behavior does an employee prefer his/her supervisor to display while item B asks how does the, same, employee perceive his/her
supervisor's actual behavior. Items B and C are perception questions but item A is a preference (value) question. Item B pertains to the subordinate's perception of his or her supervisor's actual behavior, while item C is a projective question related to how an employee perceives her or his fellow employee's behavior in terms of expressing his/her disagreement with the superior. Hofstede (1980) reported that "The statistical analysis shows that...the percentages of employees preferring a certain type of manager are correlated with the perceptions both of employees being afraid and managers being autocratic or persuasive/paternalistic" (p. 74).

Since item A represents the preferred type of supervisor, it was used alone in this study as an indicator of the management style that Saudi employees prefer.

Because PDI is a categorical variable, it was treated as a dummy (D) variable. A dummy scheme was developed and three Ds representing three categories resulted while the fourth category (manager 4) was used as a reference group. According to Aiken and West (1991) the designation of a reference group in a dummy scheme could "...be arbitrary, based on theory, or because of special interest in comparing the other groups with [a] baseline" (p. 117). The reference group in the dummy variables scheme in this study is an arbitrary one.

The Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) dimension is measured by the three items in Section II of Part Two. These items pertain
to 'stress level' (item A), 'employment stability' (item B), and 'rule orientation' (item C). Hofstede argues that higher stress level, adherence to rules, and employment stability are indicators of high uncertainty avoidance. He reports (1980, p.121) that "...higher means stress goes together with stronger rule orientation and greater employment stability, and vice versa". In this study, items A and B were used as measures of UAI. Item C was dropped for reliability correction. Since item A is presented on a 5-point Likert scale and item B is measured on a 4-point Likert scale and since the reliability of these two items was relatively low (Alpha= .35), it was decided to measure the UAI by computing the mean of each one of these items. That results in two variables measuring uncertainty avoidance, UAA and UAB.

The Individualism and Masculinity dimensions are measured by items of Section III in Part Two. Individualism is measured by items # 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, and 14. On the other, Masculinity is measured by items #2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, and 11.

The reliability coefficients of the WRVs have been computed. The reliability analysis reveals Alpha coefficients of: .35 for the UAI, .81 for IDV, and .82 for MAS. The reliability of UAI has been corrected by dropping item C. Two reliabilities are relatively high and one relatively low.
Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement

Organizational commitment is measured by the nine items of Section V in Part Two. These items were adapted from the Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) organizational commitment scale. The reliability of this scale has received considerable attention in the literature. It is the most used scale of organizational commitment. Morrow (1993) has reviewed 44 studies using Porter's scale and found that the Cronbach Alpha estimates have ranged between .74 to .93. In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha of the organizational commitment was found to be .81.

Job involvement was measured by ten items in Section IV in Part Two. These items were adapted from the Kanungo Job Involvement measure (JI-K, 1982). The reliability of JI-K has received considerable scrutiny in the literature, too. Morrow (1993) reported that "In 11 studies, with only one exception, Cronbach Alpha estimates have met or exceeded .70." In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha was found to be .88.
CHAPTER IV. TREATMENT OF THE DATA AND RESULTS

Statistical analysis for this study was completed utilizing statistical software (SPSS, 4.1), available at Iowa State University's Computation Center in Ames. Responses on each questionnaire were entered into a computer file. First, Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was computed for each of the composite variables in the research model. The values of corrected Alpha were all above .50 (with the exception of feedback and uncertainty avoidance) in the basic model (see Table 2). Feedback and uncertainty avoidance have reliabilities of .30, .35 respectively and three other variables (meaningfulness, responsibility, and internal motivation) have reliabilities of .51, .52, and .55 respectively.

These relatively low reliabilities are consistent with previous research on the JCM model. On the other hand, the reliabilities of other variables all are higher than .60. These include organizational commitment and job involvement which are above .80. The reliabilities for two of the work-related values (individualism and masculinity) are .81 and .82 respectively. The somewhat low reliabilities for several of the JCM variables may have resulted from the small number of items used to measure them. The low reliabilities for some JCM variables will make it more difficult to find
support for the model because the low reliabilities are evidence of measurement errors. Please refer to Table 2 for more information about the reliability tests in this study.

Descriptive statistics were generated for each item in the questionnaire and the extent of missing data noted. Data skewness did not appear to be a problem. There was almost no missing data. Frequency distributions were generated for the demographic items and used to describe the research subjects.

This study used regression analysis and the t-test when testing the hypotheses about mean differences under Saudi and American supervision. First, the Job Characteristics Model was tested in its basic form (without moderators). This was done by testing the correspondence between psychological states and their specified job characteristics, and by assessing the mediating role of psychological states between job characteristics and work outcomes. The model was only partially tested. The original moderators were not included in testing the model in this study. Instead, the hypothesized moderating effects of the WRVs and exposure to foreign supervision were tested in [the front part of the model] only (between the job characteristics and the psychological states) but no moderating effect was tested between the psychological states and the outcomes). Dr. Frederick Lorenz, who provided statistic consulting for this analysis, stated that moderating effect should only be determined for part of the model. The
Table 2. Cronbach Alpha Reliability for Scales of the Research Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>#items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STT**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General satisfaction</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal motivation</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth satisfaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational comm.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111.21</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* corrected reliability. Often item(s) was (were) dropped.
** composite of skill variety, task identity, and task significance
ratio of the number of interaction terms computed to the sample size would be too large if all possible interaction terms were computed.

The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and job involvement was assessed. This was done in two steps. First, each one of the outcomes variables in the JCM was regressed against both organizational commitment and job involvement. Second, because job satisfaction could encompasses internal motivation, growth satisfaction, and general satisfaction (Tracy, 1985), the summation of these variables was regressed against organizational commitment and job involvement. Finally, a t-test was computed to see if there were any significant differences between Saudi employees working under Saudi supervisors and their counterparts working under American supervisors with regard to their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement.

Frequency Distributions of Demographic Items

A description of the sample characteristics appears in Tables 3 through 10. Because of the relatively small sample size, the frequency distributions should be interpreted cautiously. First, consider the age of the subjects.
Age

Table 3 presents a distribution of the subjects' ages, showing that most employees of the sample (43.8%) were between ages 26-30, and the lowest number (2.1%) were between 41 ages and more. Furthermore, it appears that most employees of the sample (81.3%) were between 26-35. The majority of the sample are young employees. This result supports Abdulwahab's findings (1979) about Saudi managers who stated that "most Saudi managers in government agencies and organizations were young" (cited in Al-Adaily, 1981, p.97). Also, the result is consistent with Al-Adaily's (1981) findings and Al-Hajri's (1990) where, in both studies, the highest percentages of the sample were young employees and the lowest were old employees (Al-Hajri, 1990, p.28).

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25-25 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (33.3%) had been working between 11-15 years, and the lowest percentage (6.3%) between 16 years and more. Above 60% had been working for the company for ten years or less. This findings is not consistent with Al-Hajri's (1990) study where he found the highest percentages of employees in the private sector had been working between 1-5 years. Table 4, also, shows that (29.2%) of the sample had been working between 1-5 years, (31.3%) between 6-10 years.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Employment at the Present Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 Years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 16 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisor's Nationality

Table 5 indicates the nationality of the employees' supervisors. The highest percentages of persons in the sample (57.3%) are supervised by American supervisors compared to (34.4%) supervised by Saudi supervisors. Only 3.1% of the sample is supervised by European supervisors and the same percentage is supervised by Asian supervisors. It is clear from the table that American and Saudi supervisors supervise a large proportion of the sample.

Table 5. Distribution of Respondents by Supervisor's Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exposure to Supervision

Table 6 indicates the number of years an employee had been working under his current supervisor. The highest percentage (57.3%) of the sample had been working between 1-2 years under their current supervisors. The lowest percentage (1.0%) had been working 9 years or more under their current supervisor. Furthermore, 25.0% of the sample had been working between 3-5 years under their current supervisors and 16.7% had been working between 6-8 years under their current supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years and more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Length of Exposure to Foreign Supervision

Table 7 presents the total length of exposure to foreign supervision in years. The highest percentages (25.0%) had been exposed to foreign supervision more than 12 years. The lowest percentages (13.5%) had been exposed to foreign supervision between 9-11 years. Furthermore, (20.8%) had been exposed to foreign supervision between 1-2 years and the same percentage has been exposed to foreign supervision between 6-8 years. Finally, (19.8%) percentages of the sample had been exposed to foreign management between 3-5 years.

Table 7. Distribution of Respondents by Exposure to Foreign Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Exposure Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 11 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Education

Table 8 shows subjects' level of education. The highest percentage of the sample (77.1%) have graduated from a university while the lowest percentage (4.2%) have only a secondary school education. The Table also indicates that (17.7%) of the sample have a graduate college degree (Master or PhD).

This results are generally consistent with the literature on the level of education among the Saudi work force. Al-Adaily (1981) found that the lowest percentage of Saudi employees had only an elementary education. Al-Hajri (1990) found that the highest percentage of Saudi employees had graduated from a university.

Table 8. Distribution of Respondents by Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of Job

Table 9 indicates the distribution of respondents by types of job. It shows that the highest percentage of the sample (53.1%) have jobs that are not specified in the questionnaire. This indicates that the items on the questionnaire should have included more types of jobs. However, (34.4%) of the sample are engineers, (11.5%) are supervisors, and (1.0%) accountants. The lack of information about jobs was not crucial because this variable was not used in the analysis.

Table 9. Distribution of Respondents by the Type of Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Years in the U.S.A.

Some respondents have visited the U.S. before this current visit for training. The total number of years respondents had been in the United States is presented in Table 10. Results indicate that the highest percentage (51.0%) had been in the U.S. for a year or less, and the lowest percentage (6.3%) had spent 8 years or more in the U.S. The next highest percentage (21.9%) had been in the U.S. between 5–7 years. Finally, being in the U.S. between 2–4 years is represented by (20.8%) percentage of the sample.

Table 10. Distribution of Respondents by the Number of Years spent in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year or less</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 7 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correspondence Between Psychological States and Specified Job Characteristics

The JCM proposes that specified job characteristics should account for substantial variance in their corresponding psychological states and that, controlling for this, other job characteristics should not account for substantial additional variance. For example, in a regression equation using autonomy to successfully predict responsibility, the addition of feedback and the composite of skill variety, task identity, and task significance should not have a significant effect.

The first regression analysis is shown in Table 11. The results indicate that 27% of the variance in meaningfulness is accounted for by skill variety, task identity, and task significance. Less than 10% of the variance in responsibility and knowledge of results is accounted for. Only experienced meaningfulness seems to correspond uniquely to its specified core characteristic, composite of: skill variety, task identity, and task significance (STT). For responsibility and knowledge of results in this study, the addition of other job characteristics to the respective equations results in 3% and 2% increments in explained variance. However, these increments are not statistically significant.
A slightly different perspective is provided in Table 12, where standardized regression coefficients for the full three variable equations for each psychological state are given. Note: STT is a composite that includes: skill variety, task identity, and task significance. The clearest case of model-specified correspondence is that between meaningfulness and STT. The associations between responsibility and autonomy, and knowledge of results and feedback are not significant. Further, STT contributes significantly to the unspecified psychological state, experienced responsibility.

Standardized regression coefficient results for the single variable equations, with model-specified coefficients for each state bracketed for clarity, are presented in Table 13. When used in a single equation with each psychological state independently, STT contributes significantly to meaningfulness (B= .52, p=.000 level), responsibility (B= .30 p=. 0.01 level), and knowledge of results (B= .24, p=0.05). Similarly, feedback contributes significantly to its corresponding state, knowledge of results (B=.30, p=0.01) and to meaningfulness (B=.23, p=0.05). Autonomy contributes significantly to meaningfulness (B=.27, p=0.01) and knowledge of results (B=.22, p=0.05) but not to its corresponding state, responsibility.

These results from this study are not consistent with the findings of Johns et al (1992) who found evidence of the
correspondence between knowledge of results and feedback, while meaningfulness and responsibility were found not to correspond clearly to their core dimensions (autonomy and STT). Further, the overlap among the core characteristics in this study may provide, to some extent, support for Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) conception of the "single-factor hypothesis" discussed in Chapter II.

Table 11. Hierarchical Regression Predicting Psychological States from Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>KR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R for model-specified job Characteristics</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R for full three characteristics equation</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in R by adding non specified Job</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EM= Experienced meaningfulness
ER= Experienced responsibility
KR= Knowledge of results
Table 12. Standardized Regression Coefficients for Job Characteristics (three-variables equation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>KR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STT</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Standardized Coefficients for Job Characteristics (single-variable equation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>KR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STT</td>
<td>[.52***]</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>[.04]</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[.30**]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.000  
** p<0.01  
* p<0.05  
EM= Experienced meaningfulness  
ER= Experienced responsibility  
KR= knowledge of results  
STT= Composite of skill variety, task identity, and task significance.
Test of the Mediating Role of Psychological States

The JCM posits that the three psychological states mediate between the job characteristics and the outcome variables. Wall, Clegg and Jackson (1978) have proposed rigorous criteria for testing this mediating effect:

(a) the critical psychological states should account for sizable proportions of variance in each of the dependent [work outcome] variables; (b) the core job dimensions should add little to this when considered in the same analysis; (c) the core job dimensions alone should account for relatively little of the dependent [work outcomes] variable variance; and (d) the critical psychological states should add considerably to this when considered in the same analysis (p.188).

Based on the above criteria, Johns et al (1992) argue that the mediating role of psychological states should be examined using three regression equations for each outcome variable, one using the psychological states as predictors, the second using the core dimensions, and third using all eight predictors together. However, Wall et al's criteria should be taken in a comparative rather than absolute sense (John et al, 1992).

Table 14 presents the R square for each equation. There is good evidence that the psychological states mediate the relationship between the core dimensions and the work outcome variables. That is, by adding the three psychological states to the core dimensions equations, R square values increased by 119% increments for general satisfaction and 126% for internal motivation, however, these increases are not
Table 14. Hierarchical Regression Predicting Outcomes from Psychological States and Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>GR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for three variables (Psychological states only).</td>
<td>0.201*</td>
<td>0.186*</td>
<td>0.204*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for the six variables equation (all predictors)</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
<td>0.215*</td>
<td>0.374*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for three variables equation (core dimension)</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.213*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in $R^2$ by adding three job characteristics to the three variables equation.</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in $R^2$ by adding three Psychological states to the three (core) equation</td>
<td>0.119*</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.00$. GS = general satisfaction, IM = internal motivation, GR = growth satisfaction

significant. The only significant increases in $R$ square value (161%) is for growth satisfaction. On the other hand, adding the core job characteristics to the psychological states adds little to the $R$ square values. These results are not consistent with Johns et al (1992) findings who reported mediating effect for psychological states between the core dimensions and both general satisfaction and internal
motivation but not between the core characteristics and growth satisfaction.

**Moderating Effect of Work-Related Values and Exposure to Foreign Management**

One essential hypothesis in this study is that the work-related values (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, and individualism) and exposure to foreign management will have moderating effects on the psychological states. Table 15 presents the results of hierarchical regression results used to assess the moderating effects. Two variables, individualism and exposure to foreign management, significantly moderate the association between MPS and experienced responsibility in positive direction but not between the MPS and meaningfulness and knowledge of results. Individualism and MPS interacted in a positive way on responsibility and exposure, too. Since Saudi workers have been described as typically being low on individualism, this result was not expected. No significant moderating effects of the PDI, MAS, IDV, UAA, UAB, and exposure to foreign supervision were found with regard to meaningfulness or knowledge of results. Furthermore, no significant moderating effects of PDI, UAI, and MAS, was found with regard to knowledge of results or experienced responsibility.
Work Outcomes and Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement

The relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and job involvement was tested using regression analysis. As Table 16 shows, there is good evidence that there is a relationship between the work outcomes (general satisfaction, internal motivation, and growth satisfaction) and organizational commitment (F=5.01,

Table 15. Hierarchical Regression for Psychological States from interaction between Job Characteristics (MPS) and Moderators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological States</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>UAA</th>
<th>UAB</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>EXP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>8.12***</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>6.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of results</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.000    *p<0.05
PDI= power distance. UAA= uncertainty avoidance measured by A. IND= individualism. UAB= uncertainty avoidance measured by B. MAS= masculinity. EXP= exposure to foreign supervision.
p<.01). That means, at least one of the three outcome variables contributes significantly to the dependent variable. Please consider the coefficients of the independent variables. The coefficient of general satisfaction is the only one that has significant coefficient (B=1.38, p=0.04). Table 17 indicates a significant relationship between the work outcomes and the job involvement (F=4.37, p<.01). Internal motivation seems to contribute significantly (B=1.01, p=0.01) to the job involvement.

Table 16. ANOVA for Organizational Commitment from Work Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Table 16. (continue) Regression Coefficients for Organizational Commitment from Work Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Satisfaction</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Motivation</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

Table 17. Regression Results for Job Involvement from Work Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. (continue) Regression Coefficients for Job Involvement from Work Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Satisfaction</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Motivation</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01
Differences between Saudi and American Supervisory Style

Effect of Supervisory Style: American vs. Saudi

Table 18 presents the result of t-tests for differences between two employee groups. One group is supervised by Saudies and the other group is supervised by Americans. These two groups are compared with regard to their job satisfaction, general satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement. As can be noted from Table 18, no significant differences between the two groups' means were found with regard to the independent variables. This means that a worker's supervisor (American or Saudi) has not have a significant impact on his work outcomes.

Table 18. Mean and t-test for Differences between Saudi and American Supervisory Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>51.88</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NS= Not significant.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter four topics are presented: 1. Discussion of the hypotheses, 2. The validity of the JCM in different cultures, 3. Implications for using the JCM, and 4. Recommendation for future research.

Discussion of the Hypotheses

Five hypotheses will be discussed. Hypotheses #6 and #7 will be included in the discussion of hypothesis #5.

The first hypothesis was that Saudi workers supervised by American will have lower job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement than their counterparts supervised by Saudies. Previous research provided the rational for this hypothesis. The data did not support this hypothesis. When comparing the group of Saudi employees supervised by Saudies with their counterparts working under American supervision, no significant differences were found with regard to their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement.

There are several factors that might explain why supervision is not related to work outcomes. First, Saudi employees have been exposed to the Americans for more than 60
years. ARAMCO, including American workers, has an impact on the Saudi culture through the role it plays in offering medical care, providing training centers and scholarships, helping to construct highways, and arranging to construct homes for employees and elementary schools in their respective provinces (At-twaijry, 1989, and Viola, 1986). This long period of contact is believed to lessen cultural differences. Since the sample of this study is from ARAMCO, then it is not surprising to have the above result. Another factor that might has contributed is the leadership structure of the company. According to Hall (1991, p. 281)

...people are screened and filtered as they move to the top of the organizations. The screening and filtering is done by people already at the top of the organization, and they are likely to select people who are like themselves (p. 281).

Therefore, those Saudies in supervisory and management positions may not to be different from the Americans in terms of their supervisory styles. Still another factor might be due to the characteristics of the sample.

As has been noted, a high percentage of those employees (96%) have a university degree or higher education. Most of them (49%) have been in the U.S between 2 to 8 years, a high percentage of them (79.1%) has been exposed to foreign supervision between 3 to more than 12 years, and 67.7% of them has been working for the company between 6 to more than 16 years. These variables may diminish the extent of cultural
differences between Saudies and American. It is also likely that American supervisors who are successful, and maintain their ARAMCO positions, are knowledgeable about Saudi Arabian culture.

The second hypothesis was that the core characteristics in the JCM are significantly related to the critical psychological states. This hypothesis was partially supported. In simple regression equations containing the core characteristics variables and its model-specified psychological state (e.g. autonomy and experienced responsibility), it was found that those model-specified relationships were significantly related. However, when the three core variables were used in a multiple regression equation to predict any of the psychological states, only experienced meaningfulness corresponded clearly and significantly to its core characteristic, STT. Furthermore, STT significantly predicts experienced responsibility, too. These results are not consistent with Johns et al (1992) findings who only found a significant relationship between knowledge of results and feedback. On the other hand, the results in this study provide supports for the findings of Fried and Ferris (1987) who found a stronger relationship between experienced meaningfulness and two of its correspondents, skill variety and task significance than with the other two psychological states while experienced
responsibility was significantly associated with task identity. It might be argued that the strong relationship between the experienced meaningfulness and STT is because the latter includes more than one variable. However, the studies of Johns et al and Fried and Ferris did not use the composite variable; nevertheless, their findings were inconsistent.

Since the JDS was used to collect the data for this study, common method variance might have affected the results. Another useful consideration would be to supplement subjective perception of JDS with objective characteristics as specified by Griffin, Bateman, Wayne, and Head (1987). In the ideal research, the importance of subjective and objective characteristics would be determined.

The third hypothesis in this study was that psychological states mediate the association between the core characteristics and the work outcomes in the JCM. The data in this study supports this hypothesis. Adding the psychological states to a multiple regression equation containing the core characteristics variables results in a substantial increase in the explained variance. Although the increase in R square is high for the three outcomes, only one variable, growth satisfaction, resulted in significantly more explained variance. This results support the findings of Hackman and Oldham (1976) and Fried and Ferris (1987). The former found that the psychological states mediate the relationships
between the core dimension characteristics and the outcomes. The later study found a stronger relationship between the psychological states and the outcomes than between the core characteristics and the outcomes. In contrast, the result in this study contradicts the results of Johns et al (1992) who reported a significant increase in the explained variance for internal motivation and general satisfaction but not for growth satisfaction.

The fourth proposition in this study was that the work-related values and exposure to foreign management should moderate the relationships between the core characteristics variables and the psychological states. The data partially supports this hypothesis. Results indicate that individualism and exposure to foreign supervision had significant moderating effect on the relationship between the MPS and experienced responsibility. One possible explanation for such findings is that the long period of exposure to foreign supervision had created an orientation that favor individualism and autonomy among Saudi workers, at ARAMCO.

The results in this study are consistent with the general trend in the literature with regard to moderating effects and the JCM. As we have noted in chapter II, neither the original moderators in the JCM (GNS and CS) nor the alternative moderators (e.g. location of work place, need for achievement, etc) used by other researchers had received consistent
empirical support. However, the strong and highly significant interaction effects between MPS and individualism and exposure to foreign supervision on experienced responsibility provides strong support for the moderating effects proposition in the JCM and deserves further investigations.

The fifth, and final, hypothesis in this study was that work outcomes are significantly related to organizational commitment and job involvement. The data in this study confirm this hypothesis. With job satisfaction including three outcome variables (internal motivation, growth satisfaction, and general satisfaction) in this study, job satisfaction is significantly associated with both organizational commitment and job involvement. However, when the three outcomes were considered independently, general job satisfaction was a better predictor of organizational commitment while job involvement was predicted better from internal motivation. Having organizational commitment predicted significantly from general satisfaction provides support to the widely held assumption that job satisfaction precedes and may causes organizational commitment. The results of the current study is not consistent with Curry et al (1986) who reported no causal effects between the two variables.

The significant associations between job satisfaction, as composite of the three outcome variables, and job involvement in this study is consistent with the research literature.
Specifically, the findings in this study provide support to Morrow's (1993) conclusion that job involvement is seen as a function of job satisfaction. However, readers should be cautioned not to generalize from this conclusion to other sample. The findings in this study indicate that job involvement is a function of specific aspect of job satisfaction, internal motivation.

Validity of the JCM in a Different Culture

The JCM, as partially tested in the current study, received modest support. The lack of correspondence between the core characteristics and their model-specified psychological states is not consistent with the findings of some empirical studies utilizing American samples. However, the possibility of overlap between the core variables is recognized in those studies. In their review and meta-analysis of 200 empirical studies, Fried and Ferris (1987) reported only mixed results with regard to the dimensionality of the job characteristics in the JCM.

There may be other non-model factors that influence the core characteristics in the JCM. Fried and Ferris (1986) found that one's position in the hierarchy, age and level of education correlated significantly with the dimensionality of
the job characteristics. In other words, the authors suggest that only managements and staff, young workers, and educated workers produce the five-factors as the model predicts. However, the Fried and Ferris suggestion can be questioned. Despite the consistency of the demographic variables of the sample in this study with those suggested by Fried and Ferris, there is overlap between the core variables in the JCM.

In conclusion, even with the sampling method used in this study, the small size sample, and the somewhat low reliability of some of the variables, the JCM received modest support in the current study. It should be cautioned, however, not to generalize this findings to other samples. Further research should be conducted utilizing larger sample and in different cultures.

Implication of the JCM

The JCM is a motivational theory proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980). The main assumption of the JCM is that workers can be motivated by manipulation of their objective job characteristics. The JCM includes five job characteristics through which workers can be motivated. These characteristics are: skill variety, task identity, task significant, autonomy, and feedback from the job. These characteristics are assumed
to contribute to four work outcomes: internal motivation, growth satisfaction, general satisfaction, and performance.

The association between the job characteristics and the work outcomes is thought to be mediated by three psychological states: experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results. The relationships between the core dimensions and the psychological states as well as between the psychological states and the work items are believed to be moderated by knowledge and skills, growth need strength, and context satisfaction.

The JCM became a dominant theoretical framework in the organizational literature and has motivated considerable empirical research. The general trend in the findings of previous empirical research is that the importance of the specified moderators is not supported and, hence, they should be excluded from the model. The been JCM has criticized for being culturally bounded. To the best knowledge of this researcher, the current study is the first to test the model using a sample from the Saudi society. The findings of the current study suggest that the model has some validity across cultures. Furthermore, the current study has shown the importance of alternative moderators, work-related values and exposure to foreign supervision, some of which proved to significantly moderate the relationship between the core dimensions and the psychological states.
These results suggest two things to be considered theoretically and practically. First, I believe that there are factors that moderate the job characteristics-psychological-work outcomes relationships. The significant moderator effects of individualism and exposure to foreign supervision in this study provide evidence of this. Second, work-related variables and other social context variables, both inside and outside the organization, should be taken into considerations when designing or redesigning a job.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following research is recommended:

1. The sample of the current study was drawn from a single organization in the private sector. The researcher recommends replicating this study using a larger sample that represent the private sector work force in Saudi Arabia.

2. The data for this study was collected from employees who are away from their jobs temporarily attending training sessions or seeking their higher education. A further study should use data from on-job employees or workers.

3. The data for the work-related values in this study was collected using items that were developed to collect data on a macro level, country. A further study should be conducted
to further variables the measures of WRV's used herein.

4. The JCM is criticized for using an instrument, JDS, that measures all the variables in the model which might result in common method variance. Conducting research that uses items from different questionnaires (e.g., measures of the core characteristics, the psychological states, and the work outcomes) to measure the variables in the JCM is recommended. Further, the reliability of the alternative measurement should be considered. The reliability of some of the JDS variables in the previous research and herein was fairly low.

5. In the current study, the JCM was only partially tested (only the interaction effect between the core characteristics and the moderators on the psychological states was tested). Further research testing the complete model using data from the Saudi society is recommended.

6. Job involvement in the literature often is assumed to be a function of job satisfaction. The results of this study indicate that assumption is limited to one aspect of job satisfaction. Further research is required to investigate which aspect(s) of job satisfaction influences job involvement.

In closing, there were a number of contributions that this study made, which are mentioned in the implication section of this chapter. However, the points that render this dissertation truly unique are that it represents to the best
of the researcher's knowledge the first research to empirically test the Job Characteristics Model using data drawn from Saudi sample and investigating the moderator effects of work-related values and exposure to foreign supervision.
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APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE
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 PhD degree in Sociology at Iowa State University in Ames, United State of America.

My PhD dissertation is about (motivation and job satisfaction and its relation to work-related values among Saudi employees working at the private sector) as compared to some of the studies in the United States. The information from this questionnaire will be used to give me some information I need to complete my PhD's degree.

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

The questionnaire is in three parts. The first part asks for your description and your personal feelings about your job. The second part consists of work-related value questions (what things you think should be and should not be about your job). The third part contains background questions. Each part has instructions at the beginning. If you need help in understanding how to complete the questionnaire, please feel free to call me collect at (515) 233 6694.

The approximate length to complete the questionnaire is 25 to 30 minutes. Your response is kindly requested; it is essential for the completion of my dissertation. I have submitted a returned addressed and prepaid posted envelop for your convenient. Please send the completed questionnaire to the following address, as it appears on the envelop:

Saeid Al-Hajri
2310 Prairie View West
Dr#101
Ames IA 50010

Finally, please remember that the information from this questionnaire is highly needed and valuable to me. It will be kept confidential and will be used for my research's purposes only. Therefore, please be serious and help me to finish my PhD.

Thank you for your cooperation and response.

Cordially

Saeid Al-Hajri
Questionnaire About
Job Characteristics, Satisfaction, and Work-related
Values Among ARAMCO Saudi Employees

By
Saeid Al-Hajri
Part One

Section I. Description of Your Job

This part of the questionnaire asks you to describe your job, as objectively as you can. Please do not use this part of the questionnaire to show how much you like or dislike your job. Questions about that will come later. Instead, try to make your description as accurate and as objective as you possibly can.

Below are questions about your job, you are to circle the number which is the most accurate description of your job.

1. To what extent does your job require you to work closely with other people (either "client," people in related jobs in your own organization)?

- Very little; dealing with other people is not at all necessary in doing the job.
- Moderately; some dealing with others is necessary.
- Very much; dealing with other people is an absolutely essential and crucial part of doing the job.

2. How much autonomy is there in your job? That is, to what extent does your job permit you to decide on your own how to go about doing the work?

- Very little; the job gives me almost no personal "say" about how and when the work is done.
- Moderate autonomy; many things are standardized and not under my control, but I can make some decisions about the work.
- Very much; the job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done.

3. To what extent does your job involve doing "whole" and identified piece of work? That is, is the job a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end? Or is it only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines?

- My job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service.
- My job is a moderate-sized "chunk" of the overall piece of work; my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome.
- My job involves doing the whole piece of work, from start to finish; the result of my activities are easily seen in the final product service.

4. How much variety is there in your job? That is, to what extent does the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

- Very little; the job requires me to do the same routine things over and over again.
- Moderate variety
- Very much; the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of different skills and talents.

5. In general, how significant or important is your job? That is, are the results of your work likely to significantly effect the lives or well-being of other people?
Not very significant; the outcomes of my work are not likely to have important effects on other people.

Moderately significant.

Highly significant; the outcomes of my work can affect other people in very important ways.

6. To what extent do managers or co-workers let you know how well you are doing your job?

Very little; people almost never let me know how well I am doing. Moderately; sometimes people may give me "feedback"; other times they may not. Very much; manager or co-workers provide me with almost constant "feedback" about how well I am doing.

7. To what extent does the job itself provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does the actual work itself provide clues about how well you are doing-aside from any "feedback" co-workers or supervisors may provide?

Very little; the job itself is set up so I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing. Moderately; sometimes doing the job provides "feedback" to me; sometimes it does not. Very much; the job is set up so that I get almost constant "feedback" as I work about how well I am doing.

Section II

In this section you will find a number of statement which could be used to describe a job. You are to indicate whether each statement is an accurate or an inaccurate description of your job. Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement describing your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Mostly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Slightly Accurate</th>
<th>Mostly Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The job requires me to use a number of complex or high level skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The job is quite simple and repetitive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The job can be done adequately by a person working alone-without talking or checking with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The supervisors and co-workers on this job almost never give any &quot;feedback&quot; about how well I am doing in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. _______ The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.

10. _______ Supervisors often let me know how well they think I am performing the job.

11. _______ The job provides me the chance to completely finish the piece of work I begin.

12. _______ The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.

13. _______ The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.

14. _______ The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.

Section III. Personal feelings about job

Listed below are a number of statements that represent feelings that individuals might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own feelings about your job by making how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write a number in the blank for each statement, based on this scale: How much do you agree with the statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _______ It's hard, on this job, for me to care very much about whether or not the work gets done right.

2. _______ My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job.

3. _______ Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.

4. _______ Most of the things I have to do on this job seem useless or trivial.

5. _______ I usually know whether or not my work is satisfactory on this job.

6. _______ I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.

7. _______ The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.

8. _______ I feel a very high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job.

9. _______ I frequently think of quitting this job.

10. _______ I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.

11. _______ I often have trouble figuring out whether I'm doing well or poorly on this job.

12. _______ I feel I should personally take the credit or blame for the results of my work on this job.

13. _______ I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.
14._______ My own feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job.

15._______ Whether or not this job gets done right is clearly my responsibility.

Section IV. Attitudes toward your job

In this section, we would like to know how satisfied you are with each aspect of your job listed below.

Once again, write the appropriate number in the blank beside each statement, based on this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with this aspect of your job?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied Slightly Dissatisfied Slightly Neutral Neutral Slightly Satisfied Satisfied Extremely Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _______ The amount of job security I have.
2. _______ The amount of pay and fringe benefits I receive.
3. _______ The amount of personal growth and development I get in doing my job.
4. _______ The people I talk to and work with on my job.
5. _______ The degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my boss.
6. _______ The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from doing my job.
7. _______ The chance to get to know other people while on the job.
8. _______ The amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor.
9. _______ The degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to this organization.
10._______ The amount of independent thought and action I can exercise in my job.
11._______ How secure things look for me in the future in this organization.
12._______ The chance to help other people while at work.
13._______ The amount of challenge in my job.
14._______ The overall quality of the supervision I receive in my work.

Section V Perception of co-workers

Now please think of the other people in ARAMCO who hold the same job you do. If no one has exactly the same job as you, think of the job which is similar to yours. Please think about how accurately each of the statements describes the feelings of those people about the job. It is quite all right if your answers here are different from when you described your own reactions to the job. Often different people feel quite differently about the same job.

*please turn the page*
Once again, write a number in the blank for each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ______ Most people on this job feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when they do the job well.
2. ______ Most people on this job are very satisfied with the job.
3. ______ Most people on this job feel that the work is useless or trivial.
4. ______ Most people on this job feel a great deal of personal responsibility for the work they do.
5. ______ Most people on this job have a pretty good idea of how well they are performing their work.
6. ______ Most people on this job find the work very meaningful.
7. ______ Most people on this job feel that whether or not the job gets done right is clearly their own responsibility.
8. ______ People on this job often think of quitting.
9. ______ Most people on this job feel bad or unhappy when they find that they have performed the work poorly.
10. ______ Most people on this job have trouble figuring out whether they are doing a good or bad job.

Section VI. Opinion about job characteristics

Listed below are a number of characteristics which could be present on any job. People differ about how much they would like to have each one present in their own jobs. We are interested in learning how much you personally would like to have each one present in your job.

Using the scale below, please indicate the degree to which you would like to have each characteristic present in your job. Write the appropriate number in the blank beside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Would like having this only a moderate amount (or less).</td>
<td>Would like having this very much</td>
<td>Would like having this extremely much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ______ High respect and fair treatment from my supervisor.
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2. _______ Stimulating and challenging work.
3. _______ Chances to exercise independent thought and action in my job.
4. _______ Great job security.
5. _______ Very friendly co-workers.
6. _______ Opportunities to learn new things from my work.
7. _______ High salary and good fringe benefits.
8. _______ Opportunities to be creative and imaginative in my work.
9. _______ Quick promotions.
10. _______ Opportunities for personal growth and development in my job.
11. _______ A sense of worthwhile accomplishment in my work.

Section VII Perception about the preferred job

People differ in the kinds of jobs they would most like to hold. The questions in this section give you a chance to say just what it is about a job that is most important to you. For each question, two different kinds of jobs are briefly described. You are to indicate which of the jobs you personally would prefer if you had to make choice between them.

In answering each question, assume that everything else about the jobs is the same. Pay attention only to the characteristics actually listed.

Two examples are given below.

**JOB A**
A job requiring work with mechanical equipment most of the day

1. Strongly Prefer A
2. Slightly Prefer A
3. Neutral
4. Slightly Prefer B
5. Strongly Prefer B

**JOB B**
A job requiring work with other people most of the day.

If you like working with people and working with equipment equally well, you would circle the number 3, as has been done in the example.

Here is another example. This one asks for a harder choice - between two jobs which both have some undesirable features.

**JOB A**
A job requiring you to expose yourself to considerable physical danger.

1. Strongly Prefer A
2. Slightly Prefer A
3. Neutral
4. Slightly Prefer B
5. Strongly Prefer B

**JOB B**
A job located 200 miles from home and family.

If you would slightly prefer risking physical danger to working far from home, you would circle number 2, as has been done in the example.

please turn the page
Please ask for assistance if you do not understand exactly how to do these questions.

**JOB A**

1. A job where the pay is very good.
   
   Strongly Prefer A
   Slightly Prefer A
   Neutral
   Slightly Prefer B
   Strongly Prefer B

2. A job where you are often required to make important decisions.
   
   Strongly Prefer A
   Slightly Prefer A
   Neutral
   Slightly Prefer B
   Strongly Prefer B

3. A job in which greater responsibility is given to those who do the best work.
   
   Strongly Prefer A
   Slightly Prefer A
   Neutral
   Slightly Prefer B
   Strongly Prefer B

4. A job in an organization which is in financial trouble and might have to close down within the year.
   
   Strongly Prefer A
   Slightly Prefer A
   Neutral
   Slightly Prefer B
   Strongly Prefer B

5. A very routine job.
   
   Strongly Prefer A
   Slightly Prefer A
   Neutral
   Slightly Prefer B
   Strongly Prefer B

6. A job with supervisor who is often very critical of you and your work in front of other people.
   
   Strongly Prefer A
   Slightly Prefer A
   Neutral
   Slightly Prefer B
   Strongly Prefer B

**JOB B**

A job where there is considerable opportunity to be creative and innovative.

A job with many pleasant people to work with.

A job in which greater responsibility is given to loyal employees who have the most seniority.

A job in which you are not allowed to have any say whatever in how your work is scheduled, or in the procedures to be used in carrying it out.

A job where your coworkers are not very friendly.

A job which prevents you from using a number of skills that you worked hard to develop.
**JOB A**

7. A job with a supervisor who respects you and treats you fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. A job where there is a real chance you could be laid off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. A job in which there is a real chance for you to develop new skills and advance in the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. A job with little freedom and independence to do your work in the way you think best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. A job with very satisfying teamwork.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. A job which offers little or no challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**JOB B**

A job which provides constant opportunities for you to learn new and interesting things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A job with very little chance to do challenging work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A job which provides lots of vacation time and an excellent fringe benefit package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A job where the working conditions are poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A job which allows you to use your skills and abilities to the fullest extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A job which requires you to be completely isolated from co-workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Prefer A</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer A</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Prefer B</th>
<th>Strongly Prefer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section I. Opinions about management

The descriptions below apply to different types of managers. First, please read through the descriptions:

Manager 1 Usually makes his/her decisions promptly and communicates them to his subordinates clearly and firmly. Expects them to carry out decisions loyally and without raising difficulties.

Manager 2 Usually makes his/her decision promptly, but, before going ahead, tries to explain them fully to his/her subordinates. Gives them the reasons for the decision and answers whatever questions they may have.

Manager 3 Usually consults with his subordinates before he/she reaches his/her decisions. Listens to their advice, considers it, and then announces his/her decision. He/she then expects all to work loyally to implement it whether or not it is in accordance with the advice they gave.

Manager 4 Usually calls a meeting of his/her subordinates when there is an important decision to be made. Puts the problem before the group and tries to obtain consensus. If he or she obtains consensus, he/she accepts this as the decision. If impossible, he or she usually makes the decision himself/herself.

A. Now for the above types of a manager, please mark the one which you would prefer to work under.

( ) Manager 1 ( ) Manager 2 ( ) Manager 3 ( ) Manager 4

B. To which one of the above four types of managers would you say your own manager most closely corresponds?

( ) Manager 1 ( ) Manager 2 ( ) Manager 3 ( ) Manager 4

( ) He does not correspond closely to any of them.

C. How frequently, in your experience, do the following problems occur? Employees being afraid to express disagreement with their managers (please circle one choice only).


Section II. Feelings about work environment

Listed below are questions about your feelings about your work environment. Please circle the number that best represent your feeling (one choice only).

A. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?

1. I always feel this way 2. Usually 3. Sometimes 4. Seldom 5. I never feel this way
How long do you think you will continue working for this company?

1. Two years at the most  
2. From two to five years  
3. More than five years (but I probably will leave before I retire)  
4. Until I retire

Please indicate the extent to which you personally agree or disagree with the following statement (circle one choice only).

Company rules should not be broken even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interests.

1. Strongly disagree  
2. Disagree  
3. Undecided  
4. Agree  
5. Strongly agree

Section III. Goal’s priority

People differ in what is important to them in a job. In this section, we have listed a number of factors which people might want in their work. We are asking you to indicate how important each of these is to you.

In completing the following section, try to think of these factors which would be important to you in an ideal job; disregard the extent to which they are contained in your present job.

PLEASE NOTE: Although you may consider many of the factors listed as important, you should use rating "of utmost important" only for those items which are of the most importance to you.

With regard to each item, you will be answering the general question: "HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO YOU...”

(Choose one answer for each line across)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of utmost importance to me</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Of moderate importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Of very little or no importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important is it to you to:

Have challenging work to do—work from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment?

1  2  3  4  5

Live in an area desirable to you and your family?

1  2  3  4  5

Have an opportunity for high earnings?

1  2  3  4  5

Work with people who cooperate well with one another?

1  2  3  4  5

Have training opportunities (to improve your skills or to learn new skills)?

1  2  3  4  5
Have good fringe benefits?
1 2 3 4 5

Get recognition you deserve when you do a good job?
1 2 3 4 5

Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc)?
1 2 3 4 5

Have considerable freedom to adopt your own approach to the job?
1 2 3 4 5

Have the security that you will be able to work for your company as long as you want to?
1 2 3 4 5

Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs?
1 2 3 4 5

Have a good working relationship with your manager?
1 2 3 4 5

Fully use your skills and abilities on the job?
1 2 3 4 5

Have a job which leaves you sufficient time for your personal or your family life?
1 2 3 4 5

Section IV. Opinions about your job

Listed below are statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about work and the job they do. Please indicate in the space provided the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by noting the number that best corresponds to your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ____ I am very much personally involved in my job.

2. ____ Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented

3. ____ Most of my interests are centered around my job.

4. ____ I consider my job to be very central to my existence.

5. ____ I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.

6. ____ The most important things that happen to me involve my job.

7. ____ To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.

8. ____ Usually I feel detached from my job.

9. ____ I live, eat and breath my job.
10. ___ I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.

Section V: Opinions about ARAMCO

Listed below are a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the organization they work for. With respect to ARAMCO, please indicate how you feel about each statement by drawing a circle around one of the seven numbers below each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the ARAMCO successful.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. I talk up the ARAMCO to my friends as a great organization to work for.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for ARAMCO.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4. I find that my values and the ARAMCO's values are very similar.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. I am proud to tell others that I am part of ARAMCO.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. ARAMCO really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. I am extremely glad that I chose ARAMCO to work for, over other organizations, I was considering at the time I joined ARAMCO.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

8. I really care about the fate of ARAMCO.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

9. For me, ARAMCO is the best of all possible organizations to work for.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Instructions:

This part consists of some background information. Please fill in the blank or circle the number that corresponds to your choice.

A. What is your age?  

B. How many years have worked for your current employer?  

C. What is your supervisor's nationality? (please circle one choice only)
   1. Saudi
   2. American
   3. European
   4. Asian
   5. Others (specify)  

D. How many years have you worked under this supervisor?  

E. How many previous years have you been supervised by a foreign supervisor?  

F. What level of education have you completed? (please circle one choice only)
   1. Elementary school
   2. Intermediate school
   3. Secondary school
   4. University degree
   5. Higher degree
   5. Others (specify)  

G. What kind of job do you do? (please circle one choice)
   1. Supervisor
   2. Clerk
   3. Accountant
   4. Engineer
   5. Secretary
   6. Other (specify)  

H. How many years have you been in the United State?  

Thank you very much for your time and response.
Two weeks ago a questionnaire seeking your opinions about your job characteristics and job satisfaction was mailed to you. Your name was selected to participate in the survey because you are an ARAMCO employee in the US.

If you have already completed and returned the survey to me please accept my sincere thanks. Because I am interested in your opinion about your job, for my PhD dissertation purpose, it is extremely important that yours is also included in the study so that the results accurately represent the opinions of ARAMCO employees.

If by any chance you did not understand some of the questions, please call me collect at (515-233-6694) and I will be more than happy to answer your questions.

Sincerely,

Saeid Al-Hajri
Dec. 28, 1993

Dear sir,

About four weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your opinion on the kind of job you do and how satisfy you are with your job. As of today I have not received the expected number of completed questionnaires.*

My research unit has undertaken this study because of the belief that employees opinions should be taken into account in the formation of organization policies for the planning and development of the organization in which employees will work.

I am writing to you because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. Your name was selected on the bases of being an ARAMCO employee on job assignment or attending training session in the USA. This means only four hundred of the company's employee are being asked to complete this questionnaire. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the opinions of the ARAMCO company employees it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, please call me collect at (515-233 6694) so I can arraign for replacement.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Saeid Al-Hajri
2310 Prairie View West
Dr. #101
Ames IA 50010

*If you already completed and mailed the questionnaire please disregard this letter.