

The Relationship Between Worker Satisfaction and Their Perception Of Organizational Effectiveness Among Saudi Workers in The Private Sector*

Dr. Abaid Abdullah Al-Amri
King Saud University
Social Studies Department

In a society where the exchange is organization-employee, organization and
employee are in an exchange relationship. Each party makes
certain demands of the other while providing something return.
(Anglo and Perry, 1981, p.1)

*Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, August
16-20, 1996.

Introduction

Although worker satisfaction has been advocated as a vehicle to improve organizational effectiveness, studies to date on the subject are not yet conclusive. Literature review indicates that little research has been done on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness in western countries. There is an absence of empirical studies of this topic in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The rapid and continuous social and economic change in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia urge the needs for studies looking into the relationship between employee and their organization. Research, therefore, is needed to determine the factors prompting or inhibiting this relation. This study is to explore importance of certain factors to the relationship between worker job satisfaction and their perception of organizational effectiveness for Saudi Arabian Companies' employees.

Theoretical Introduction

The theoretical framework of this study will cover the following three interrelated points. First, Organizational effectiveness theory. Second, job satisfaction theory. The finally, Studies of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.

Organizational Effectiveness Theories

Reviewing the literature on organizational effectiveness, it was found that there were three major approaches which had been used as the framework of analysis in organizational effectiveness.

The first approach is goal model. According to Mumford (1976) this approach is the most popular model which discusses effectiveness in term of goal accomplished. Therefore, this model consist that identifying an organization's goals and assessing how well the organization has accomplished those goals. Thus, this model defines organizational effectiveness as " the degree to which an organization realizes its goal (Etzioni, 1975, p.133). Daft (1989) concluded that this model is " a logical approach because organization do try to accomplish certain levels of output, profit, or client satisfaction. The goal approach measures progress toward attainment of those goals"(p.102). There are two kinds of organizational goals. These are official goals and operative goals. According to Daft (1989) " the important organizational goals to consider are operative goals. Efforts to measure effectiveness have been more productive using operative goal than using official goal. official goals tend to be abstract and difficult to measure. operative goals reflect activities the organization is actually performing " (p.102). The critics of the goal model, who are many, (Geogopoulos and Tannenbaum,

1957, Perrow, 1961, Warner, 1967, Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967, Seashore and Yuchtman, 1967, Katz and Kahn, 1967, Hall, 1970, and Price, 1972) point out that: (a) measures of organizational goals are often not reliable, system relevant, or derived from a common theoretical framework, (b) some organizational goals are quite intangible, (c) organizational goals change as organizational behavior change, and (d) it is suggested that multiple measure of organizational goals to be used whenever possible (Mulford et al., 1976).

A second approach is the System Resource Model. This model was introduced by Yuchtman and Seashore (1967). Daft (1989) pointed out that the system resource model assumes that organization must be effective in obtaining resources inputs and in maintaining the organization system in order to be effective. This model defined organizational effectiveness as "The ability of the organization, in either absolute or relative terms, to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources" (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967, pp. 377-399). Mulford et al. (1976) cited that Price has noted that the research of Yuchtman and Seashore did not consider resource optimization, did not use general measures, and that their measures violated the basic rule of mutual exclusiveness (p.60). Efficiency and effectiveness are not separated under this model (Price, 1972). Moreover, this model is used to assist organizational effectiveness when considering nonprofit organizations (Molnar and Rogers, 1976).

According to Schulz (1986) although the goal and system resource models are similar in their focus on unitary criterion of organizational effectiveness, some theorists have suggested that an integration and extension of the models would provide a more comprehensive assessment of organizational effectiveness (p.61).

The third approach to organizational effectiveness was represented by Parsons (1960). Parsons developed a comprehensive analysis of organizational effectiveness by postulating that every society (or social system) must solve four problems in order to function. These four problems are adoption, goal achievement, integration, and latency. Adaptation is the ability of an organization to control its environment. Goal attainment is the decision-making processes. Integration is the relationships between units and go along with its environment. Finally, latency is the process of developing individual loyalty to organization objectives. Accordingly, Hage (1965) developed an "axiomatic" theory of organization. His theory based on four means and four ends of organization. Through these four means - complexity, centralization, formalization and stratification - an organization achieves the four ends. He adapted the functional problems of Parsons as organizational ends: adoption as adaptiveness, tension management as job satisfaction, integration as efficiency, and goal achievement as production.

According to Mumford (1976) the system model is more inclusive than the other two. the goal model and system resource model do not consider integration between the parts of the organization or the development of latent patterns and tension management for the participants as relevant facets of effectiveness (pp 125-127).

Job Satisfaction Theories

Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of human needs may be related to job satisfaction (Maslow, 1970, p. 3). This hierarchy consists of five levels: (1) Physiological needs, (2) safety needs, (3) social needs, (4) esteem needs, and (5) self-actualization needs. According to Mumford (1973), then, Maslow's theory is dynamic in that humans are seen as inherently unfulfilled beings constantly striving to fulfill needs in an ever-expanding needs system. For Grady (1984):

the organism's behavior is dominated by unsatisfied needs and its behavior organized only by unsatisfied needs. When one need is satisfied, the following proponent need in the hierarchy surfaces and tends to command the individual's attention. Consequently, gratified needs are no longer considered active motivates of behavior since the individual has gone on to striving to fulfill the next unfulfilled need in the hierarchy. (pp. 12-13).

One of the most discussed theories of job satisfaction was developed by Frederick Herzberg (1966), who identified factors related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among 200 accountants and engineers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He found that job dissatisfaction is related to job environment but that job satisfaction is related to work itself. He characterized the first category as hygienes, or extrinsic factors, and the second category as motivators, or intrinsic factors. The former involve salary, organizational policies, supervision, physical working conditions, relationships, status, and job security. The latter involve achievement, recognition, work itself, advancement, and responsibility. In other words, motivators produce job satisfaction, whereas hygienes produce job dissatisfaction.

Studies Of The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness

Depending on the basic assumption of social exchange, job satisfaction is a function of the amount of rewards that the individual receives from his job. Friedlander (1963) identified three types of satisfactions.

the return in the form of monetary rewards and prestige;
intrinsic satisfaction, or the pleasure in a specific activity
and in the accomplishments of specific ends; concomitant

satisfactions, such as derived from working in a particular physical environment or with a particular group (p. 250).

It is believed that "the causes of job satisfaction are not in the job nor solely in the man, but lie in the relationship between them" (Locke, 1969, p. 319). That is why workers and organizations have to "give a little" in order to "profit from each other". According to Argyris (1964) that understandings of "incongruence" between the individual and the organization could form a basis for increased effectiveness both the worker and the system of enterprise.

Workers will join the organization and they will be more satisfied with their job because of rewards derived by joining the organization. The main and the most important benefit which workers are looking for is to meet or to satisfy their needs. Thus, by providing this important benefit and other benefits, workers will participate on the organization and they will be more satisfied with their job. Therefore, each individual tries to join a particular organization that will enhance his personal needs (or goals) to the greatest degree, just as the organizational body tries to recruit new members who will add to the collective worth of the organization. Finally, Etzioni (1964) reported that by knowing the factors that increase worker satisfaction and decrease dissatisfaction and by being sensitive to change, an organization could better choose and place people to meet their goals and satisfy their needs and increase the organizational effectiveness. At the same time it could increase job satisfaction of individual staff members, by encouraging positive social environments in preference to "any deliberate efforts by the organization to shape personalities according to its needs" (p. 110).

According to Merton, the degree of integration in any system is a very important component in explaining the function of the system. This view implies that the various parts of a social system must show a high level of integration (Ritzer, 1988; Turner, 1986). So the satisfaction of the worker is seen to be important influence on the performance of the organization, and thus, it has become accepted that organization should consider the goals of their workers in relationship to the goals of the organization. To Perko (1985) the individual comes to the organization with goals or expectations and needs that may or may not mesh with the goals of the organization. He concluded that the workers affect the system as an individual and as a member of a group and group culture (p.35). On the other hand, the organization or the system influence the workers' attitude and the group culture (Lieberman and Miller, 1978).

For Perko (1985), Davis (1981) and Childer and Podemski (1982) the interrelationships of influences result in formulated work attitudes and behavior, that are variables to be considered as the organization frames goals, strives to meet them, and

addressed plans for change or potential of the group enterprise. Perko (1985) concluded that organization is to consider how the goals of the worker may be integrated with the goal of the organization in mutual benefit. Similarly, Schuitz (1985) concluded the high or low job satisfaction of teachers is related to their perceptions of the organizational effectiveness of the school.

In their study, alternate work schedules, Dunham, Pierce, and Castameda (1987) found that the characteristics of a work schedules would influence organizational effectiveness only to the extent that the schedule met organizational needs and constraints. Results indicated that factors related to organizational effectiveness were enhanced in cases in which specific organizational needs were met. In addition, interference with personal activities was reduced in situation in which employees had experienced specific difficulties. The most powerful effect was on worker attitudes toward specific work schedules.

Daley (1988) examined the impact of performance appraisal (quality, feedback, importance, and helpfulness) on perception of organizational success (effectiveness, responsiveness, and job satisfaction) He found that a moderate but positive relationship between performance appraisal process and perceptions of organizational success.

Eimani and Stephen (1991) conducted a survey of employees with children under 12 years of age to investigate the child care issue. They concluded that: (1) employer-supported child care programs can improve employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and overall productivity (2) most human resource managers interviewed expressed strong support for employer-supported child care programs and believed that the child care centers in their firms were making a great contribution to their organizational effectiveness.

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and meeting workers' goal by the organization.

Hypothesis 2: Workers with high job satisfaction perceived their organization as more effective than workers with low job satisfaction.

METHODS

The target population for this study was all ARAMCO employees in Riyadh during 1995. The sample selected by means of simple random sampling, 250 employees were randomly selected. On August, 10, 1995, the public relation department and the

researcher distributed the questionnaires. The returned questionnaires were 229. Of these questionnaires, 219 were usable. The rest (21 questionnaires) are not returned.

A questionnaire was designed to address the theoretical concepts identified in this research. The questionnaire format is divided into three sections. The first section includes questions on workers' perceptions of organizational effectiveness. Questions related to job satisfaction are included in the second section. Finally, questions related to individual characteristics are included in the third section.

Organizational Effectiveness:

The dependent variables in the study was the workers' perceptions of organizational effectiveness, measured by the Index of Organizational Perceived Effectiveness (IOPE), whose eight items are listed:

(Production: Quantity)

Thinking now of the various things produced by the people you know in your division, how much are they producing?

1. Their production is very low
2. It is fairly low
3. It is neither high nor low
4. It is fairly high
5. It is very high

(Production: Quality)

How good would you say is the quality of the products or services produced by the people you know in your division?

1. Their products or services are of poor quality
2. Their quality is not too good
3. Fair quality
4. Good quality
5. Excellent quality

(Production: Efficiency)

Do the people in your division seem to get maximum output from the resources (money, people, equipment, etc.) they have available? That is, how efficiently do they do their work?

1. They do not work efficiently at all
2. Not too efficient
3. Fairly efficient
4. They are very efficient
5. They are extremely efficient

(Adaptation: Anticipating Problems and Solving Them Satisfactorily)

How good a job is done by the people in your division in anticipating problems that may come up in the future and preventing them from occurring or minimizing their effects?

1. They do a poor job in anticipating problems
2. Not too good a job
3. A fair job
4. They do a very good job
5. They do an excellent job in anticipating problems

(Adaptation: Awareness of Potential Solutions)

From time to time newer ways are discovered to organize work, and newer equipment and techniques are found with which to do the work. How good a job do the people in your division do at keeping up with those changes that could affect the way they do their work?

1. They do a poor job of keeping up to date
2. Not too good a job
3. A fair job
4. They do a very good job
5. They do an excellent job of keeping up to date

(Adaptation: Propensity of Adjustment)

When changes are made in the routines or equipment, how quickly do the people in your division accept and adjust to these changes?

1. Most people accept and adjust to them very slowly
2. Rather slowly
3. Fairly rapidly
4. They adjust very rapidly, but not immediately
5. Most people accept and adjust to them immediately

(Adaptation: Prevalence of adjustment)

What proportion of the people in your division readily accept and adjust to these change?

1. Considerably less than half of the people accept and adjust to these changes readily
2. Slightly less than half do
3. The majority do
4. Considerably more than half do
5. Practically everyone accepts and adjusts to these changes readily

(Flexibility)

From time to time emergencies arise, such as crash programs, schedules moved ahead, or a breakdown in the flow of work occurs. When these emergencies occur, they cause work overloads for many people. Some work groups cope with these emergencies more readily and successfully than other. How good a job do the people in your division do at coping with these situations?

1. They do a poor job of handling emergencies situations
2. They do not do very well
3. They do a fair job
4. They do a good job
5. They do an excellent job of handling these situations (Mott, 1972, pp. 23-24)

The Index of Organizational Effectiveness was developed by Mott (1972) to measure subjective evaluations of organizational effectiveness. Mott integrated the concepts of productivity, efficiency, adaptability, and flexibility to determine the composite score of the effectiveness of the organization. Potential scores range from a low of 8 (connoting low organizational effectiveness) to high of 40 (connoting high organizational effectiveness). According to Mott (1972), the validity of the perception of organizational effectiveness scale was encouraging enough to warrant continued use. Moreover, Mott reported a preponderance of research data on indicators of the validity of the perception of organizational effectiveness scale in various settings (Schulz, 1986). The reliability

coefficients (Cronbach's alphas) of the present sample were .84 for the perception of organizational effectiveness scale.

Job Satisfaction:

The independent variables in the study was workers' job satisfaction, as measured by Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). In 1963 the University of Minnesota developed its satisfaction questionnaire according to Work Adjustment Theory. This theory holds that job satisfaction is a function of individual vocational needs and of work environment reinforcement (Weiss et al., 1967). Potential scores range from a low of 20 (connoting low job satisfaction) to high of 100 (connoting high job satisfaction). This study used the short form of the MSQ, whose twenty items are listed:

1. Ability utilization. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. Achievement. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
3. Activity. Being able to keep busy all the time.
4. Advancement. The chances for advancement on this job.
5. Authority. The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company policy and practices. The way the company policies are put into practice.
7. Compensation. My pay and the amount of work I do.
8. Co-workers. The way co-workers get along with each other.
9. Creativity. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
10. Independence. The chance to work alone on the job.
11. Moral values. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. Recognition. The praise I get for doing a good job.
13. Responsibility. The freedom to use my own judgment.
14. Security. The way my job provides for steady employment.
15. Social service. The chance to do things for other people.
16. Social status. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
17. Supervision-human relations. The way my boss handles his employees.
18. Supervision-technical. The competency of my supervisor in making decisions.
19. Variety. The chance to do different things from time to time.
20. Working conditions (Weiss, pp. 1-2).

Each item or statement requires that the respondent indicate satisfaction with a work reinforcer by means of a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied. A general satisfaction score was obtained by summing responses to all twenty items. Weiss et al (1967) reported that "since the short form of MSQ is based on a subset of the long form items, validity for the short form may in part be inferred from validity of the long form" (p. 24). Reliability coefficients for general job satisfaction range from .87 to .92. The reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas) of the present sample were .92 for the general job satisfaction scale.

Because of the Index of Organizational Perceived Effectiveness (IOPE) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) were developed in a highly industrialized society (USA), a pilot study was conducted to test the suitability of these measure to Saudi Arabia society. Therefore, the reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas) of the pilot study were .82 for the perception of organizational effectiveness scale and .93 for the general job satisfaction scale. Moreover, By using Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Al-Amri (1994) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among Saudi workers. He reported that the reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas) of his sample were .93 for the general job satisfaction scale.

The study also used personal goals question, which asks employees to respond to this question: Did you meet your personal goals in this organization? (yes, no) Moreover, Respondents were asked to provide information about their age, working experience, salary, educational level, marital status. The statistical methods chosen for testing the correlative relation and analyzing the data in this study were the standardized regression, crosstablation, Pearson correlation and t-test

FINDING

Findings of this study will be discussed in two sections. The first section presents the means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions of respondents. The second section reports results pertaining to hypothesis.

Descriptive findings:

Most respondents (68.4 %) were younger than 39 years (table 1). The smallest age group was the group (2.8 %) of 50 years or older, and the group (12.7 %) of 30 years or younger. Only 16 % of respondents were in the group of 40-49 years.

Table 1. Age of the respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
Less than 30	27	12.7
30-39	145	68.4
40-49	34	16.0
50 or more	6	2.8
Total	212	100.0

Missing cases =7

Table 2 indicates that more than half the respondents (60.1%) had worked for 5 to 15 years, 23% for 5 years or fewer, 11.7% for 15-20 years and 5.2% for more than 20 years

Table 3 shows respondent frequencies according to salary. About 68 percent of the respondent of employees had monthly salaries of SR 5,000-9,999, 11.9% had salaries of SR 10,000-14,999, 10% had salaries of less than SR 5,000 and 10% had salaries of more than SR 15,000

Table 2. Working experience of the respondents

Working Experience	Frequency	Percent
Less than 5 years	49	23.0
5 years -10 years	47	22.1
11 years -15 years	81	38.0
16 years - 20 years	25	11.7
21 years or more	11	5.2
Total	213	100.0

Missing cases = 6

Table 3. Salary of the respondents

Salary	Frequency	Percent
Less than SR 5,000	22	10.0
5,000 - 9,999	149	68.0
10,000 - 14,999	26	11.9
15,000 or more	22	10.0
Total	219	100.0

Table 4 shows respondents frequencies according to educational background. About 52% of participants had pre-high school degree. Only 13.7% had bachelor's degree. Finally, the second largest category (29.7%) is those who had high school degree

Table 4. Educational background of the respondents

Educational degree	Frequency	Percent
Pre-high school degree	115	52.5
High school degree	65	29.7
Bachelor's degree	30	13.7
Master's degree	2	.9
Others	7	3.2
Total	219	100.0

Table 5 shows respondent frequencies according to marital status. Greater than 87 percent of participants were married, whereas approximately 26 participants (11.9%) were single. Only .5 % were widowed.

Table 5. Marital status of the respondents

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Married	191	87.6
Single	26	11.9
widowed	1	.5
Total	218	100.0

Missing cases = 1

Table 6 shows means and standard deviations for the organizational effectiveness and for the 8 IOPE subscores. Production quality, production quantity, and awareness of potential solutions scores were high, ranging from 3.80 to 4.04. Flexibility, anticipating problems and solving them satisfactorily, and production efficiency scores were moderate, ranging from 3.69 to 3.77. Prevalence of adjustment, and promptness of adjustment scores were low, ranging from 2.94 to 3.25.

Table 6. Rating for the organizational effectiveness scale

Variables	Means	Std. Dev.	range
Production quantity	3.96	.96	
Production quality	4.04	.72	
Production efficiency	3.77	.91	
Adaptation: anticipating problems and solving them satisfactorily	3.74	.81	
Adaptation: Awareness of potential solutions	3.80	.64	
Adaptation: promptness of adjustment	3.26	.82	
Adaptation: prevalence of adjustment	2.94	1.22	
Flexibility	3.69	.93	
General Organizational Effectiveness	29.19	4.99	25.00

Table 7 presents means and standard deviations for the general job satisfaction scale and for the 20 MSQ subscores. Compensation, co-workers, supervision-human relation, moral values, supervision-technical, independence, and activity scores were high, ranging from 3.46 to 3.63. Ability utilization, social status, variety, company policy and practices, authority, achievement, social service, and security scores were moderate, ranging from 3.03 to 3.26. Advancement, recognition, working condition, creativity, and responsibility scores were low, ranging from 2.58 to 2.97. General job satisfaction scores were moderate (64.18).

Table 7. Rating for the general job satisfaction scale

Variable	Means	Std. dev.	Range
Advancement	2.58	1.30	
Recognition	2.88	1.35	
Working conditions	2.96	1.29	
Creativity	2.96	1.07	
Responsibility	2.97	1.07	
Ability Utilization	3.03	1.28	
Social Status	3.04	1.26	
Variety	3.12	1.14	
Company Policy and practices	3.12	1.41	
Authority	3.13	1.25	
Achievement	3.21	1.20	
Social Service	3.26	1.21	
Security	3.26	1.24	
Activity	3.46	1.32	
Independence	3.48	1.18	
Supervision-technical	3.49	1.24	
Moral Values	3.49	1.16	
Supervision-human relation	3.53	1.17	
Co-workers	3.58	1.17	
Compensation	3.63	1.32	
General Satisfaction	64.18	15.49	71.00

Table 8 presents crosstabulation between organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction. It shows that there is a positive relationship between organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction over 26 % of those with high job satisfaction also indicated high perception of organizational effectiveness ($R = .40$, $P = .000$).

Table 9 presents crosstabulation between meeting worker's goal by the organization and job satisfaction. It shows that there is a positive relationship between meeting worker's goal by the organization and job satisfaction over 40 % of those meet their goals also indicated high job satisfaction ($R = .37$, $P = .000$).

Table 8. Crosstabulation between organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction

Organizational Effectiveness	Job Satisfaction			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Low	1.4	4.1	0.0	5.5
Middle	18.7	21.0	14.2	53.9
High	4.1	9.6	26.9	40.6
Total	24.2	34.7	41.1	100.0

Table 9. Crosstabulation between workers' goal and job satisfaction

Worker's goals	Job Satisfaction			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
They meet their goals	15.1	21.9	40.2	77.2
They not meet their goal	9.1	12.8	9	22.8
Total	24.2	34.7	41.1	100.0

Results:

Hypothesis 1: The more the organization meet its workers' goal, the more satisfied the workers with their job.

Data in table 10 illustrate the relation between job satisfaction and workers' goal. Mean score for worker who meet their goal was 67.21 and that for worker who not meet their goal 53.94. The hypothesis was therefor supported ($F = 32.42$, $P = .000$).

Table 10. Job satisfaction by workers' goal

worker's goals	Mean	SD	N
They meet their goals	67.21	9.27	169
They not meet their goals	53.94	15.68	50

Hypothesis 2: Workers with high job satisfaction perceived their organization as more effective than workers with low job satisfaction.

The F-test ($F = 67.075$, $P = .000$) indicates that job satisfaction has a statistically significant positive effect on organization effectiveness ($t = 8.190$, $P = .000$). For each one unit increase in job satisfaction, the expected value of organization effectiveness increase .15652 unit. The standardized regression coefficient indicates that, for each standard deviation increase in job satisfaction the expected value of organizational effectiveness increases .4859 standard deviations. Job satisfaction is observed to have a moderate positive effective on organizational effectiveness. These empirical results are consistent with the stated research hypothesis.

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis was that the more the organization meet its workers' goal, the more satisfied the workers with their job. The second hypothesis was that workers with high job satisfaction perceived their organization as more effective than workers with low job satisfaction. The data supported these hypotheses, and results agree with those of previous studies.

The direction of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness was identified. Thus, improving the quality of life in the work place affects not only job satisfaction but also workers' perception of organizational effectiveness. Results imply that when the organization meets the needs of the workers, the workers' subjective evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the organization, in terms of a composite view of the organization productivity, efficiency, adaptability and flexibility, may be enhanced. Therefore, programs such as job redesign that attempt to enhance job satisfaction will improve not only the quality of work life but also the overall the quality of organization life in general.

This finding lend further credibility to the research of both Barnard (1968) who posited that the individual is always the basic strategic factor in any organization, and Ezioni (1964) who reported that by knowing the factors that increase satisfaction and decrease dissatisfaction and by being sensitive to change or need for change, an organization could better select and place personnel to meet its goal and increase its effectiveness. The results of this study imply that administrators who seek to implement change within their organization may direct their energies at improving conditions which promote the job satisfaction of workers. Moreover, understanding of "incongruence" between the workers and organization could form a basis for increased effectiveness both

the worker and the organization (Argyris, 1964). Therefore, worker tries to join the particular organization that will enhance his personal goals to the greater degree, just as the organizational body tries to recruit new member who will increase the organizational effectiveness. Thus the integration of the worker goals and the organizational goals is the fundamental challenge . . . "as conflicting goals are a source of job stress" (Davis, 1981). An employee's satisfaction and organizational effectiveness are largely determined by the degree to which the worker's expectations match the organization (Chlder and Podemski, 1982).

Therefore, and based on the findings, administrators of ARAMCO should examine the summary of this study to become aware of the factors influencing job satisfaction in order to improve employees' satisfaction and organization effectiveness. In order to enhance job satisfaction in this organization, they need to improve advancement, recognition, working condition, creativity, and responsibility. Finally, students preparing for careers should examine the summary of this study to become aware of the factors influencing employees' job satisfaction and their perceptions of organizational effectiveness.

Replication of the study with various organization or various groups may provide additional insights on the subject. What other job or personal factors may affect the job satisfaction of the employees and effectiveness of the organization? And what would be found if different measures of job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness were used? Future research should attempt to answer these questions.

In summary, the overall conclusion of the present study indicates that a significant positive relationship was found between workers' goals and job satisfaction and between worker job satisfaction and their perceptions of the organizational effectiveness. This conclusion supports the credibility of the complex interdependencies in the organization setting.

REFERENCES

- Agie, H., and James, Perry
1981 "An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness." *Administrative science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.
- Al-zmri, Abed
1994 *The relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among saudi airline employees in the Jeddah Area of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.* Unpublish dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

- Argyris, C.
1964 *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*. New York: Wiley
- Blau, Peter M.
1964 *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Chicago: John Wiley and sons, Inc
- Childers, J. H. and Podemski, R. S.
1982 "Confronting idealistic teacher expectations: Strategies for training." *Teacher Educator*, 18, 2-10.
- Daft, Richard L.
1989 *Organization Theory and Design*. 3rd ed. West Publishing Company, St. Paul, MN.
- Daley, D.
1988 "Performance Appraisal and organizational success" *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 9,(1), 17-27.
- Davis, F. W.
1981 "Job satisfaction and stress." *Journal of Physical Education—Recreation and Dance*, 37-38.
- Dunham, R., Price, Jan, and Castaneda, M.
1987 "Alternate work schedules: Two field quasi-experiments" *Personnel Psychology*, 40,(2), 215-242.
- Elmudi, D., Payne, S.
1991 "Are employer-supported child care programs worth the effort?" *Business Form*, 16,(2), 22-27.
- Etzioni, Amitai.
1975 *Complex Organizations*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 2nd ed.
-
- 1964 *Modern Organization*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Friedlander, F.
1963 "Underlying sources of job satisfaction." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 246-250.
- Hage, Jerald
1963 "An axiomatic theory of organization." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10, 289-320.

- Herzberg, F.
1966 *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York: World.
- Lieberman, A., and Miller, I.
1978 "The social realities of teaching" *Teacher College Recorder*, 80, (1), 54-68
- Lock, E. A.
1969 "What is job satisfaction?" *Human Performance*, 4, (4), 309-336.
- Maslow, Abraham
1970 *Motivation and Personality*, (2nd ed). New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- Molnar, Joseph J., and David C. Rogers
1976 "organizational effectiveness: an empirical comparison of the goal and system resource approaches." *Sociological Quarterly*, 17: 401-413.
- Mulford Charles L., Gerald Klomlan, Richard Warren, and Janet Padgirt.
1976 "A Multidimensional Evaluation of Effectiveness in a Non-Economic Organization". *Organization & Administrative Sciences* vol. 7, no. 4:125-43.
- Mumford, E.
1973 *Job Satisfaction*. London: Longman Group Press
- Parsons, T.
1960 *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*. New York: Free press.
- Perko, L. L.
1985 *Job Satisfaction of Teachers in the Portland Metropolitan Area*. Ed.D. dissertation. Portland State University and University of Oregon
- Poibma, Margret
1979 *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co
- Price, James L.
1972 "The study of organizational effectiveness" *Sociological Quarterly*, 13: 3-13
- Ritzer, George
1988 *Sociological Theory* (2nd ed.) New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc

Schulz, Irene D.,

1986 **A Study Of The Relationship of Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Their Perception of Principals' Use of Power and Organizational Effectiveness.** Ph.D. dissertation University of New Orleans

Turner, Jonathan H.

1986 **The Structure of Sociological Theory** (4th ed.) Chicago The Dorsey press

Weiss, D. , Davis, R. V , and England, G. W

1967 **Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.** Minneapolis Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota

Yuchtman, Ephraim, and Stanley E. Seashore

1967 "A System Resource Approach to Organizational Effectiveness." **American Sociological Review**, 32. 891-903.