

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Case Study of Five-Star Hotels in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Dhaifallah Obaid Almutairi*, Ebrahim Moradi**, Durrishah Idrus***, Raheleh Emami**** and Talal Ratyan Alanazi*****

High level performance through productivity and efficiency has always been an organization's goals. In order to do that, highly satisfied employees are absolutely necessities in achieving high level performance. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among the employees who are currently working for five-star hotels in Riyadh in Saudi Arabia. Three five-star hotels and 91 employees have been chosen for this study. The results indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. The findings also reveal that job satisfaction affects job performance. This study recommends that the management should pay more attention onto employees' job satisfaction in order to enhance job performance. This study also suggests further works to include different measures and larger sample which could result in better understanding of the relationship between the variables.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Job performance, Five-star Hotels, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Field of Research: Management

1. Introduction

Nowadays, tourism industry plays a significant role in the development of a country's economy. Countries from all over the world are competing for attracting tourists. Tourism is playing a vital role in bringing the foreign currency to the country which in turn boosts the economy. Both developed and developing countries are always trying to implement set of tourist programs to attract tourists. Saudi Arabia is one of these countries who started implementing some tourist programs in a bid to increase tourists number.

In its effort to promote tourism industry, Saudi Council of Ministers on 12/1/1421 AH, corresponding to 16/04/2000, issued, decision No. (9), the decision came to emphasize tourism activity as one of the productive sectors. Hotel industry is the

* Dhaifallah Obaid Almutairi, Ministry of Higher Education, King Abdulaziz Military Academy, Kingdom Of Saudi Arabia.. PhD student at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, E-mail:dalmutairi2002@yahoo.com.

** Ebrahim Moradi Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. E-mail: mhebrahim2@live.utm.my.

*** Durrishah Idrus, KPJ International College of Nursing and Health Sciences, E-mail: durrishah@kpjic.edu.my.

**** Raheleh Emami Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. Email: emraheleh2@live.utm.com.

***** Talal Ratyan Alanazi Ministry of Higher Education, King Abdulaziz Military Academy, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, PhD student at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). E-mail: Talal-r7@hotmail.com.

Almutairi, Moradi, Idrus, Emami & Alanazi

main source to support tourists and visitors who want accommodation during their visit. In 2009, the total number of hotels in Saudi Arabia reached 1140, of which 75 hotels were five-star hotels (Tayeh and Mustafa, 2011). Unfortunately, the service quality provided by Saudi five-star hotels is less than desired. In a recent study conducted by Alotaibi and Housani (2010), on the customers' evaluation of five-star hotel service in Saudi Arabia, it was reported that European customers were not satisfied with the services provided by these hotels. There are many factors affect the quality of service and employees' job performance is one of these factors. It plays an important role in determining an organization performance. The success or failure of any organization relies on individuals job performance (Saetang et al., 2010).

Highly performing individuals will be able to help organization to fulfill its goals (Dessler, 2011). As human capital is the key issue in service process, most of the organizations seek to enhance job performance among their employees in order to achieve high levels of productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. The focus on employees' efforts to improve organization's performance has become stronger as they need to respond rapidly and effectively to market demands (Cho et al., 2006). However, there are several factors that can be attributed to employees' job performance. One factor that affects job performance is job satisfaction. Contented employees are productive or those who are satisfied with their work are likely to be better performers (Fisher, 2003, Saari and Judge, 2004). Job satisfaction has been found to influence job performance (Chen et al., 2006, Spector, 1997). Satisfied workers increase the chance of higher productivity. According to Jain and Triandis (1997), common sense proposed that job satisfaction leads to high productivity.

Many literatures related to job satisfaction have showed that job satisfaction can be one of the main determinants of organizational performance (Angle and Perry, 1981, Riketta, 2002, Spence Laschinger et al., 2001). Levy (2003) has argued that results of satisfaction lead to a better performance, a reduction in turnover, and changing of behaviors. Hence, it can be said that to have better understanding on the link between job satisfaction and job performance has become very important, especially for the service organizations that depend heavily on employees to offer friendly and courteous services to their customers in this competitive market.

Although, many studies were conducted in many countries, recent trend has indicated that there is a lack of research in this area among the employees in Saudi Arabia especially in hotel service industry. Therefore, this study will shed light on the job satisfaction and job performance among employees in five-star hotels in Saudi Arabia. The objective of this study is to examine the impact of job satisfaction on job performance among employees in five-star hotel in Saudi Arabia.

This study is divided into five sections. Section one is the introduction, section two is the literature review, section three is the research methodology, section four is the findings, and section five is conclusion.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an interesting topic among practitioners and researchers (Lu et al., 2005). This is due to its effects on increasing productivity (McNeese-Smith, 1997), enhancing customers' satisfaction (Burke et al., 2005), encouraging better performance and efficiency (Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000). Locke has defined job satisfaction as a positive emotional feelings resulting from acceptable evaluation of his/her experience towards the job (Locke, 1976). Kalleberg (1977) has suggested that job satisfaction consists of two components. They are intrinsic and extrinsic.

According to Hirschfield (2000), intrinsic job satisfaction refers to how people feel toward the nature of the job tasks while extrinsic job satisfaction how they feel about aspects of the work situation that are external to the job tasks. Several theories have been developed to explain the nature of job satisfaction. Since the late 1950s, many researchers have theorized the nature of job satisfaction, developed models, and carried out studies to test their models (Lacy and Sheehan, 1997). Job satisfaction theories are classified by researchers into content theories and process theories (Coomber and Louise Barriball, 2007). According to Lunenburg et al (2008), content theories focus on the needs and factors that motivate behaviors, whereas process theories concentrate on the source of behaviors and the factors that affect the strength and direction of the behaviors. The two popular contents theories are Herzberg theory and Maslow theory.

Herzberg theory was developed by Herzberg et el. (1959). This theory which is also called Herzberg's Two Factors is based on two types of needs, which they are the need for psychological growth or motivating factors and the need to avoid pain or hygiene factors. Motivating factors are related to work itself, for example, achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, and work itself. The hygiene factors are related to the work environment such as pay, working condition, supervision, company policy, and interpersonal relationship.

Herzberg and his colleagues have claimed that hygiene factors will not make people satisfied, instead they will only prevent them from being dissatisfied whereas motivating factors contribute towards job satisfaction and motivation. Another better-known theory is Maslow's (1954) hierarchical need theory. Maslow's theory consists of five levels of individual needs: physiological needs, social needs, safety, esteem, and self-actualization. Esteem and self-actualization needs are at the top level while safety, social, and physiological needs are at the bottom level. Maslow believed that when a given level of need is satisfied, it is no longer act to motivate, thus, the next higher level of need has to be activated in order to motivate person.

2.2 Job Performance

Job performance is one of the significant indicators in assessing organizational performance (Wall et al., 2004). Schermerhorn(1989) has defined job performance as quality and quantity achieved by individuals or group after fulfilling a task. Munchinsky (2003) has suggested that job performance is the set of employee's behaviors that can be measured, monitored, and evaluated achievement at

Almutairi, Moradi, Idrus, Emami & Alanazi

individual's level. Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) have described job performance as " behaviors and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals". Historically, job performance was viewed as a single construct but researchers now agree that job performance is multidimensional factor (Austin and Villanova, 1992). To support this, Motowidlo and Scotter (1994) have suggested that job performance should comprise of task performance and contextual performance.

Campbell (1990) has proposed eight dimensions of job performance which are job-specific task proficiency, non-job-specific task proficiency, written and oral communication, effort, maintaining personal discipline, maintaining peer and team performance, supervision/leadership, and management/administration. Robbins (1998) has categorized the measurement of job performance into job result, job behavior, and personal traits. Lee et al. (1999) has divided it into quality, efficiency, and effectiveness. According to Lee et al. (1999) efficiency refers to the workers' output rate and the ability to achieve tasks before deadline, effectiveness refers to the workers' goal accomplishment, and quality refers to workers' error and complaint rate, managers' satisfaction, customers' satisfaction, and colleagues' satisfaction. Based on the views by Lee et al. (1999), this study has divided job performance into efficiency, effectiveness, and quality.

2.3 Link between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

Vroom (1964) has reviewed 20 studies that were carried out between the year 1949 and 1963 that examined the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance and reported a median correlation of $r = .14$. Since the publication of Vroom's results, others have attempted to replicate his findings.

Petty and his colleagues(1984) used meta-analysis techniques to replicate Vroom's finding. They analyzed 20 studies published between 1967 and 1982, as well as 15 studies used by Vroom which utilized individual-level measure of job performance and job satisfaction, when they excluded the studies included by Vroom (1964), they calculated an average effect size of .23 based on the remaining studies. Further, in a comprehensive meta-analysis conducted by Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) and consisting 74 studies showed a considerable variation in correlations between job satisfaction and job performance across different aspects of job satisfaction, ranging between 0.6 for pay satisfaction and 0.29 for overall job satisfaction. A recent meta-analysis performed by Judge and his colleagues (2001) found a mean corrected correlation of .30 between job satisfaction and job performance.

In discussion about the previous studies on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, Moorman (1993) attributed a weak and modest link which has been found between job satisfaction and job performance was due to the measuring the wrong kind of performance.

According to Judge et al. (2001) the problems and limitations in previous research was due to lack of an assimilation and integration of the different models in the literature. Unlike previous studies, Fisher (2003) summarized two of his study, in his first study on the opinions of managers, supervisors, and employees, he found that the majority believed feelings of satisfaction to be related to job performance. In the second study he found that a majority of the participants in his study on

Almutairi, Moradi, Idrus, Emami & Alanazi

inexperienced undergraduates agrees that employees who are satisfied with their work are usually do good performance. However, later several studies conducted on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance found a positive relationship between two variables. For example, a study conducted by Gu and Siu (2009) on relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among the employees working in Macao casino hotels found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

Nimalathan and Brabete (2010) carried out a study on job satisfaction and job performance . The findings revealed that there is a positive relationship between two variables, that high level of fair promotion, reasonable salary system, appropriate work itself, and good working condition lead to high level of employees' performance. In the study conducted by Prasanga and Gamage (2012) the findings indicates that job satisfaction is one of the most important factors in determining job performance, and leads to high performance. Based on the above evidences, it could be concluded that job satisfaction is shown to be positively associated with job performance. Therefore, hypotheses are formulated as the following:

H1: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

H2: Job satisfaction influences job performance.

3. Research Methodology

Population, Sample, Sampling Technique

The target population of this study was the employees of five-star hotels in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. When this study was conducted, there were nine five-star hotels in Riyadh. Three hotels were chosen for this study. They are Intercontinental hotel, Marriott hotel, and Sheraton hotel. These hotels were chosen because they are the oldest hotels in Riyadh and have branches across the country which allow results to be generalized to the whole population. 120 questionnaires were distributed among the employees of those hotels. The sampling procedure employed was simple random sampling technique and 91 questionnaires were returned with a response rate of 75.8 %. The researchers went to each hotel and distributed the questionnaire personally. The respondents were briefed on the study objectives and they were given the guidelines in answering the questionnaires. The respondents' demographic data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Respondents Characteristics

Variable	frequency	percentage
Age		
18- 28	42	46.2 %
29- 39	31	34 %
40- 50	11	12 %
51-61	7	7.7 %
Gender		
Male	71	78 %
Female	20	22 %
Years of service		
1-5	25	27.4 %
6-10	39	42.8 %
11-15	14	15.4 %
16-20	8	8.7 %
21-25	5	5.5 %
Level of education		
Secondary school	13	14.2 %
Diploma	42	46.2 %
Degree	36	39.5 %

Instruments

The questionnaire had three sections. Section one asked about the demographic data of the respondents such as age, level of education, number of years of service. Section two had questions on job satisfaction and section three had questions on job performance.

In order to measure job satisfaction (independent variable), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire(MSQ) developed by Weiss et al. (1967) was used. It consisted of three scales which were intrinsic satisfaction (12 items), extrinsic satisfaction(6 items) and general satisfaction(2 items). Overall satisfaction was identified by measuring all 20 items. Questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= very dissatisfied, 2= dissatisfied, 3= I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not, 4= satisfied, to 5= very satisfied.

Job performance (dependent variable) was measured with six items that were created in Turkish (Şahin, 2011). The items were derived from job performance literature (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994). These items were as the following: 1- I find effective solutions to problems, 2- I adapt easily to changing situations, 3- I assume a sense of ownership and responsibility in the quality of personal performance, 4- I strive to meet deadlines, 5- I encourage colleagues to do more than what is expected, 6- I create effective work relationship with others. Questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= poor to 5= excellent.

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to evaluate the internal consistency of instrument. The cronbach's alpha coefficient of job satisfaction was 0.87 and job performance was .84 which indicated that the instrument had sufficient internal reliability.

Data analysis

Once the data is collected and entered to computer using SPSS version 19. The following statistics were used: descriptive statistics consisted mean and standard deviation in order to have clear picture of study variables. Pearson correlation (r) was performed to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. According to Sekaran (2003) the correlation between two variables is considered a perfect positive correlation when it is close to +1, or perfect negative correlation when it close to -1. Regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of job satisfaction on job performance. Regression analysis is a statistical tool for the investigation of relationship between variables. Usually, the researcher seeks to ascertain the causal effect of one variable upon another.

4. Findings

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 represents the mean value of job satisfaction and job performance. The 3.67 mean value for overall job satisfaction indicates the employees are satisfaction with their jobs. The aggregate mean value of 3.53 for job performance indicates that employees perform highly. Standard deviations for both variables are close to 1 which is at an acceptable level.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics on variables studied

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation
Job satisfaction	3.67	.81
Job performance	3.53	.67

Correlation

Table 3: Correlation between job satisfaction and job performance

		Correlations	
		Job satisfaction	Job performance
JS	Pearson Correlation	1	.562**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	91	91
JP	Pearson Correlation	.562**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	91	91

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

JS = Job satisfaction

JP = Job performance

The Pearson correlation in Table 3 shows that job satisfaction is positively related with job performance (r = 0.562, p < .01). Therefore, the research hypothesis 1 that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is accepted and proven to be true.

Regression analysis

Table 4: Regression analysis of variables studied

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.562 ^a	.316	.309	11.07111

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5048.089	1	5048.089	41.186	.000 ^a
	Residual	10908.687	89	122.570		
	Total	15956.777	90			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction

b. Dependent Variable: job performance

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	21.081	6.635		3.177	.002
	Job satisfaction	.580	.090	.562	6.418	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job performance

Regression analysis in Table 4 shows that R value = .562 represents the correlation between job satisfaction and job performance. R Square = .316 indicates that 31.6 % change in job performance is due to job satisfaction. F = 41.186, is significant at the 0.000 level, shows that there is a model fit between job satisfaction and job performance, thus research hypothesis 2 is substantiated. Regression coefficient (B) of job satisfaction as .58 shows that 1 unit change in job satisfaction will bring .58 unit change in job performance.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among employees who are working at three five-star hotels in Saudi Arabia. The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. It also found that job satisfaction influences job performance. The findings of this study supported previous studies (Gu and Siu, 2009, Nimalathan and Brabete, 2010, Prasanga and Gamage, 2012) which revealed that there were a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. The results of this study, however, are not matched with the arguments given by (Judge et al., 2001, Petty et al., 1984, Vroom, 1964).

This study makes a contribution to the literature by demonstrating that job satisfaction can play an important role in enhancing job performance. However,

Almutairi, Moradi, Idrus, Emami & Alanazi

compared with recent studies which claimed that job satisfaction influences job performance, the current studies validates the results obtained by these studies and generalized it to employees in Saudi Arabia. It is believed this study will help managers in hotel industry. Based on the findings of this study managers should pay more attention to employees job satisfaction as a way to increase employees job performance. Although, this study contributes to the limited body of knowledge on job satisfaction and job performance in Saudi Arabia, there are, of course, a number of limitations. First, the study selects the most commonly studied variables and there are others variables such as leadership style, conflict and ambiguity role, organizational commitment, and culture which should be considered in future researches. Second, data has been collect via questionnaire which may not capture the true responses from the participants. In order to overcome these limitations further researches are recommended to explain the link between two variables, using different measures and include big sample.

References

- Angle, HL & Perry, JL 1981, 'An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness', *Administrative science quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Austin, JT & Villanova, P 1992, 'The criterion problem:1917–1992', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 77, no. 6, pp 836-874.
- Burke, RJ. Graham, J. & Smith, F. J 2005, 'Putting the customer second' , *the TQM Magazine*, vol.17, no. 1, pp 85-91.
- Campbell, JP 1990, *Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizationalpsychology*, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Chen, SH, Yang, CC, Shiau, JY. & Wang, HH 2006, 'The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education', *the TQM Magazine*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 484-500.
- Cho, S, Woods, RH, Jang, SC & Erdem, M 2006, 'Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms' performances', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol.25, no. 2, pp. 262-277.
- Coomber, B & Louise Barriball, K 2007, 'Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital-based nurses: A review of the research literature', *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 297-314.
- Dessler, G 2011, *Human Resource Management*, Prentic-Hall, USA.
- Fisher, CD 2003, 'Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 24, 753-777.
- Gu, Z & Siu, RC 2009, 'Drivers of job satisfaction as related to work performance in Macao casino hotels: An investigation based on employee survey', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 561-578.
- Herzberg, F, Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B 1959, *The Motivation to Work*, Wiley, New York.
- Hirschfeld, RR 2000, 'Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form make a difference?', *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 255-270.
- Iaffaldano, MT & Muchinsky, PM 1985, 'Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis', *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 251-273.

Almutairi, Moradi, Idrus, Emami & Alanazi

- Jain, R.K & Triandis, HC 1997, *Management of research and development organizations: managing the unmanageable*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Judge, TA, Thoresen, CJ & Bono, JE 2001, 'Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 80-92.
- Kalleberg, A.L 1977, 'Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction', *American sociological review*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 124-143.
- Lacy, FJ & Sheehan, BA 1997, 'Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective', *Higher education*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 305-322.
- Lee, YD, Lain, JW & Chen, CY 1999, 'A study on the measurement of productivity for white-collar employees-A case of electronic industry in Taiwan', *The Chinese Military Academy Journal*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 14, 345-361.
- Levy, PL 2003, *Industrial/organizational psychology: Understanding the workplace*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
- Locke, EA 1976, *The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Lu, H, While, AE & Louise Barriball, K 2005, 'Job satisfaction among nurses: a literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*', vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 211-227.
- Lunenburg, F, Ornstein, A & Zhou, Z 2008, *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*, Wadsworth, Stamford, CT.
- Maslow, AH 1954, *Motivation and Personality*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Mcneese-Smith, DK 1997, 'The influence of manager behavior on nurses' job satisfaction, productivity, and commitment', *Journal of Nursing Administration*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 47-55.
- Moorman, RH 1993, 'The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior', *Human Relations*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 759-776.
- Motowidlo, SJ & Van Scotter, JR 1994, 'Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 475-480.
- Muchinsky, PM 2003, *Psychology Applied to Work*, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.
- Nimalathasan, B & Brabete, V 2010, 'Job satisfaction and employees' work performance: A case study of people's bank in Jaffna Peninsula, Sri Lanka', *Management and Marketing Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 43-47.
- Petty, MM, Mcgee, GW & Cavender, JW 1984, 'A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance', *Academy of management Review*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 712-721.
- Prasanga, AP & Gamage, AS 2012, 'Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of the Sailors in Rapid Action Boat Squadron of Sri Lanka Navy', *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 49-54.
- Riketta, M 2002, 'Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 257-266.
- Robbins, SP 1998, *Organizational behavior*, Prentice Hall International, Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Saari, LM & Judge, TA 2004, 'Employee attitudes and job satisfaction', *Human resource management*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 395-407.

Almutairi, Moradi, Idrus, Emami & Alanazi

- Saetang, J, Sulumnad, K, Thampitak, P & Sungkaew, T 2010, 'Factors Affecting Perceived Job Performance among Staff: A Case Study of Ban Karuna Juvenile Vocational Training Centre for Boys', *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, vol. 5, no. 1. pp. 33-43.
- Şahin, F 2011, 'The interaction of self-leadership and psychological climate on job performance', *African Journal of Business Management*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 1787-1794.
- Schermerhorn, JR 1989, *Management for productivity*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Sekaran, U 2003, *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*, John Willey&Sons, New Jersey.
- Sousa-Poza, A & Sousa-Poza, AA 2000, 'Well-being at work: a cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction', *Journal of Socio-economics*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 517-538.
- Spector, PE 1997, *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Spence Laschinger, HK., Finegan, J & Shamian, J 2001, 'The impact of workplace empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment', *Health Care Management Review*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 7-23.
- Tayeh, SN & Mustafa, MH 2011, 'Toward Empowering the Labor Saudization of Tourism Sector in Saudi Arabia', *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 1, no. 1. pp. 80-84.
- Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, DS 2000, 'Perspectives on models of job performance'. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 216-226.
- Vroom, VH 1964, *Work and motivation*, Wiley, New York.
- Wall, TD, Michie, J, Patterson, M, Wood, SJ, Sheehan, M, Clegg, CW. & West, M 2004, 'On the validity of subjective measures of company performance', *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 95-118.
- Weiss, DJ, Dawis, RV. & England, GW 1967, *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis MN.