This study examined the relationship of organizational structure and job satisfaction in Iranian iron companies. Sixteen of 27 Iranian iron companies were randomly selected for the study, and 195 middle managers in the 16 companies were surveyed with a three part instrument consisting of Likert's (1967) Profile of Organizational Characteristics; Smith, Kendal and Hulin's (1969) Job Description Index; and a short demographic questionnaire.

For each company, responses to the Profile of Organizational Characteristics were tabulated, means were calculated, and an organizational structure was assigned to the company based on Likert's (1967) classification of organizational structures: System 1, Exploitative/Authoritative; System 2, Benevolent/Authoritative; System 3,
Consultive; and System 4, Participative. The mean job satisfaction of middle managers was also calculated from responses to the Job Description Index, and results from the demographic questionnaire were tabulated. These results were statistically analyzed using Analysis of Variance, the Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure, Pearson's r test, and a correlation coefficient test.

The findings revealed no single organizational structure present in Iranian iron companies; however, 14 of the 16 companies had a System 3, Consultive, organizational structure. A positive correlation of job satisfaction with organizational structure was found; as structure changed from more authoritarian/less participative to less authoritarian/more participative, job satisfaction of middle managers increased. No significant relationship was found between organizational structure and organizational size, no significant differences were found in job satisfaction of middle managers in different companies, and no significant relationships were found between job satisfaction and any of the four demographic variables: Type of Work, Education, Job Location, and Marital Status.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

Introduction

This study involved 16 Iranian iron companies (identified as IIC in this research) located in Tehran and in the suburbs of Tehran. The research examined the organizational structure of each company as it related to employee job satisfaction and size of the company. The research focused on 195 middle managers who were employed in the 16 companies.

As will be discussed further, formal inquiry into the organizational structure of Iranian organizations is minimal (Barahini, 1986) compared to more industrialized countries. Therefore, the researcher sought to narrow the gap between the little that is known about Iranian organizations and the large body of literature that focuses on organizations in more industrialized countries. At the same time, it was intended that the study would be useful to the companies involved in the research.

Studying organizations in non-western cultures is also useful for theoretical reasons (Oldham & Hackman, 1981). As will become clear in the Review of Literature, there are a number of theories of organizational structure and job satisfaction. These theories have mostly been developed by
western writers who have been concerned with organizations in highly industrialized nations. It should not be assumed that organizations in less industrialized nations will exhibit the same characteristics and relationships as organizations in highly industrialized nations. In fact, the study of organizations in less industrialized nations can help to provide a larger information base from which theories can be evaluated (Oldham & Hackman, 1981). Therefore, in studying Iranian iron companies, the researcher sought to increase the information base about organizations in less industrialized nations so that those organizations can be considered in the further development of theories about organizational structure and job satisfaction.

**Background of the Problem**

Many researchers hold that the human side of an organization is as important as its tools, machinery, and other hardware, and that the employees' overall sense of well-being is positively correlated with the organization's productivity (Kenter, 1982; Rubin & Berlew, 1984; Gibson, 1984; Hamermesh & White 1984). In particular, Hamermesh and White (1984) claimed that one of the most important elements in an organization is employee job satisfaction. According to Hamermesh and White, lack of job satisfaction can result
in high rates of employee turnover, a consequence which is generally very costly to the organization.

The structure of an organization is one element that has been found to be related to job satisfaction. Korman (1971) stated that when the structure of an organization is contrary to its employees' perceptions, dissatisfaction often results. Moreover, Tabatabai (1980) held that an incompatible combination of organizational elements such as leadership, climate, and environment can create job dissatisfaction, which leads not only to greater employee turnover, but to increased burnout, depression, and materials sabotage by employees.

A major characteristic of an organization's structure is its authoritarian versus non-authoritarian management style. An organization is defined as more or less autocratic or authoritarian depending on how decisions are made and how responsibility and authority are handled. Likert (1961, 1967, 1976) categorized organizations into four system types with respect to their authoritarian non-authoritarian management style: 1) Exploitative/Authoritative, 2) Benevolent/Authoritative, 3) Consultive, and 4) Participative. Likert identified System 1 and System 2 organizations as more authoritative, and System 3 and System 4 organizations as being less authoritative and more participative.
According to Rubin and Berlew (1984), the degree to which an organization is authoritarian is related to employee job satisfaction. In *The Power Failure in Organizations*, Rubin and Berlew claimed that employees of organizations with an autocratic type of management are generally less satisfied with their jobs than are employees of non-autocratic organizations. Cunningham (1983) maintained that a bureaucratic organizational structure has a negative effect on performance and productivity, decreasing employee motivation and discouraging employee creativity. Cunningham (1983) contrasted humanistic organizations with bureaucratic organizations, claiming that humanistic organizations provide a greater sense of commonality to their members by putting emphasis on human enterprise as well as on the objectives of the organization itself. Scherer (1980) held that individuals in participative organizations show greater productivity and job satisfaction than those in non-participative organizations. Alchian and Demestz (1972) also found that collective decision making provides quantitative and qualitative gains in productivity, as well as job satisfaction.

The studies cited above contribute to an understanding of organizational structure and its effect on job satisfaction. However, like most research on organizational structure, these investigations focused on organizations in
developed nations such as the United States. Relatively few studies have focused on organizational structure in developing nations.

Among the studies that have been done, a few involved Middle Eastern organizations, including Iranian organizations. Although these studies did not deal with industrial organizations, they did concern issues relevant to the proposed study.

Samii's (1984) study investigated management practices at the University of Tehran. Though the study did not concern employees' job satisfaction, it did reveal that management systems at the university were based on a combination of bureaucratic, collegial, and political models.

Ghonaim's (1986) investigation of the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of faculty members among educational organizations in Saudi Arabia found that subjects' educational level and experience did not affect their perception of organizational climate. Administrators perceived both job satisfaction and organizational climate more positively than did teachers, and job satisfaction was positively related to overall climate and to esprit of teachers. The study also found that district size was positively related to job satisfaction and organizational climate for administrators. However, for teachers, school size showed a negative
relationship to job satisfaction. These results are of interest to the proposed study, if one assumes that middle managers in Iranian iron companies have roles more similar to school administrators than to school teachers. On that assumption, the results of Ghonaim's study suggests that there may be a positive correlation between the size of the company and middle managers' job satisfaction.

Barahini (1986) investigated the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction in Iranian middle schools and found, on the basis of 150 completed questionnaires, that the more open the school climate, the greater the teacher job satisfaction. Using terms consistent with the present study, these results suggest that Iranian middle schools with a more participative organizational structure provide greater job satisfaction to teacher employees. In Barahini's research, demographic variables demonstrated no significant relationships with either dependent variable.

Although other investigations have been conducted on Iranian organizational structure, none of the studies were done in an industrial environment. Further research regarding the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction in Iranian industry is therefore needed. Additional research can be useful to industrial organizations by helping them evaluate the effectiveness of their organizational structure.
Statement of the Problem

Research comparing organizational structure and job satisfaction in foreign cultures is very limited (Oldham & Hackman, 1981). Since results gained in studies of organizations in highly-developed nations may not be valid for organizations in less highly-developed nations, additional research is needed.

In Iran, in particular, organizational development and industrial psychology are young fields. There have been few studies in the area of organizational development that have focused on Iranian organizations (Mir-Sepasy, 1987). No studies, for example, have focused on the iron industry in Iran.

Companies that are part of the Iranian iron industry must deal with many of the same types of problems that are faced by companies worldwide, including hiring and retaining effective employees and increasing overall employee productivity. A study which focuses on the Iranian iron industry and the relation of job satisfaction to organizational structure, could provide some direction for companies desiring to become more productive and competitive in the world market.

The problem addressed in the present research, therefore, was to determine the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction among middle
managers of Iranian iron companies (IICs). This research utilized the theory of organizational structure proposed by Likert (1976) and the analysis of job satisfaction set out by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the research was twofold: (a) to determine types of organizational structure in Iranian iron companies (IICs), and (2) to determine the relationship between type of structure and middle management job satisfaction. This study answered the following questions:

1. What type of organizational structure is present in the Iranian iron industry?
2. How satisfied are middle managers with their jobs in the Iranian iron industry?
3. Are there differences in job satisfaction among Iranian iron companies?
4. What is the relationship of organizational structure to job satisfaction among middle managers in the Iranian iron industry?
5. What is the relationship of organizational structure to company size in the Iranian iron industry?
6. What is the relationship of demographic data and middle managers' job satisfaction in the Iranian iron industry?
Research Hypotheses

This study investigated the relationship of organizational structure of 16 Iranian iron companies to job satisfaction of middle managers in those organizations. The statistical hypotheses were as follows:

H1. There is no particular type of organizational structure common to the Iranian iron companies in this study.

H2. There is no relationship between the organizational structure of the Iranian iron companies in this study and the job satisfaction of the middle managers in those organizations.

H3. There are no differences in job satisfaction among the Iranian iron companies in this study.

H4. There is no relationship between the size of the Iranian iron companies in this study and the type of organizational structure of those companies.

H5. There is no relationship between the demographic variables of the study and the job satisfaction variable.

Scope of the Study

This study was limited to iron companies in Iran. Of the 27 companies belonging to The Iran Industrial Association, 17 were randomly selected and asked to take
part in the study. Sixteen of these companies agreed to participate. A total of 195 middle managers employed by these companies were surveyed by a three-part instrument consisting of the Profile of Organizational Characteristics, the Job Description Index, and a short researcher-developed demographic questionnaire.

**Underlying Assumptions**

The survey was conducted on site at the sixteen participating Iranian iron companies. While the process was carefully monitored, two assumptions were made.

1) The subjects reflected their real attitudes on the questionnaire.
2) There were no uncontrolled factors in the environment that affected the answers to the questions.

**Limitations**

The major limitations of this study were basically those associated with the sample. The limitations were as follows:

1. All of the respondents in this study were male.
2. It is assumed that most of the respondents in this study were Muslim.
3. All of the respondents were at the middle management level in the respected organizations.
4. This research was limited to Iranian iron companies and did not involve other Iranian industrial organizations.

5. No distinctions were made with regard to different levels of training other than formal education.

6. No distinctions were made with regard to years of experience with the company or as middle managers.

**Definition of Terms**

**Organizational Structure:** The relatively fixed relationships that exist among jobs in an organization (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1982, p. 289).

**Organizational Climate:** Employees' perceptions of various conditions that influence the performance of their teams (Kinlaw, 1987, p. 45).

**Decentralized Organization:** An organizational structure that pushes the decision-making point to the lowest managerial level possible. It involves the delegation of decision-making authority (Gibson et al., 1982, p. 637).

**Centralized Organization:** A dimension of organizational structure which refers to the extent to which authority to make decisions is retained by top management (Gibson et al., 1982, p. 630).

**System 1 Organization:** An organization where exploitative autocratic management has been applied. Under this system
it is expected that competency can be reached through harsh supervision and that decisions should be made at the top of organization. Fear, punishment, and threats are usually applied for motivation and control of employees. Communication in this organization is downward (Likert, 1976, p. 20).

**System 2 Organization:** In this system benevolent autocratic management is used. There is some confidence and trust in people at the organization. Employees' motivation is based on reward and some punishment. Decisions are made at the top, with some delegation (Likert, 1976, p. 20).

**System 3 Organization:** An organization whose management system is participative. There is a substantial amount of trust and confidence in subordinates. Motivation is based on reward, punishment, and involvement. In a System 3 organization, general policies are made at the top, but a significant number of decisions are delegated (Likert, 1976, p. 20).

**System 4 Organization:** An organization whose management system is called democratic. In this organization, there is a great deal of trust in subordinates. The process of decision making is integrated throughout the organization, and motivational processes consist of reward and involvement (Likert, 1976, p. 20).

**Middle Manager:** A person in an organization who is in charge of one or more work units, who has a significant
number of people reporting to him or her, and who also reports to upper management.

**Job Satisfaction:** A criterion of effectiveness which refers to the organization's ability to gratify the needs of its participants. Equivalent terms include morale and voluntarism (Gibson *et al.*, 1982, p. 368).
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study focused on the relationships among three aspects of Iranian iron companies: organizational structure, organizational size, and job satisfaction. All three aspects are important in almost any organization (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1982; Ghonaim, 1986; Barahimi, 1986). The following review of literature focuses on three specific purposes:

1) to clarify the concepts of organization, organizational structure, bureaucracy, and job satisfaction;

2) to present some of the main theories pertaining to organizational structure and job satisfaction; and

3) to review recent research concerning the relationships among organizational structure, organizational size, and job satisfaction.

The review is divided into four sections: organizational structure, job satisfaction, the relation of organizational structure to job satisfaction, and the relation of size to job satisfaction.
Organizational Structure

Overview

Before discussing organizational structure, the concept of organization should be clarified. In the earliest definition that this review will be concerned with, Gaus (1936) held that organization referred to the arrangement of personnel for facilitating the accomplishment of some agreed upon purposes through the allocation of functions and responsibility. There are two points of interest in this definition. First, the definition clearly emphasized the goal-directed aspect of organizations. Second, the phrase arrangement of personnel could be taken to indicate a somewhat impersonal attitude toward employees, with the employees considered to be organizational parts that are arranged and used by the organization. Later definitions of the term organization put more emphasis on the importance of people and their relationships in organizations.

This greater emphasis on people was seen in Terry's (1956) definition, which stresses the interrelationship of the parts of the organization, including the people. Terry held that the word organizing has been taken from the word organism, which refers to a structure with integrated parts whose relations to each other are governed by their relations to the whole. The human organization is a social
invention, rather than a biological organism, that consists of component parts and relationships between those parts. Relationships among units arise from the function of each unit in association with the other units in the organization (Terry, 1956).

Relationships were also stressed by Longenecker (1972), who held that a business organization is a type of system which relates people and functions in some meaningful way. The term system was defined by Longenecker as "a group or combination of component parts arranged in such a way as to constitute a unified whole" (Longenecker, 1972, p. 91).

An even stronger emphasis on the relationships among people in an organization was made by Kast and Rosenzweig (1974). These authors defined the term organization as the structuring and integrating of activities, where the relationships of people who work together are interdependent, and where this interrelatedness among people implies a social system. The importance of people to the organization is especially highlighted by the authors' list of four main characteristics of organizations. An organization is: (1) goal oriented (has a people purpose); (2) a psychological system (involves people working in groups); (3) a technological system (consists of people using knowledge and techniques); and (4) an integration of structural activities (involves people working together). It is worth noting that the goal-directed aspect of
organizations which was emphasized by Gaus's (1936) definition is only one of the four main characteristics of organizations listed by Kast and Rosenzweig.

Another interesting aspect of the definition presented by Kast and Rosenzweig is its reference to the structuring of activities in organizations, which implies that an organization has an organizational structure. In fact, all of the definitions of the term organization presented above imply an organizational structure. Blau and Scott (1962) maintained that both formal and informal organizations have an organizational structure. Those with a formal structure are formed with specific organizational policies, rules, and procedures, whereas informal organizations have a structure consisting of relationships that are not included in formal organizations but that are vital for their effective functioning. In order to understand the nature of a formal organization it is not enough to investigate the formal hierarchy of authority and the official body of rules of the organization (Blau & Scott, 1962). One must also investigate the networks of informal relations and the unofficial norms of the organization (Maier, 1973), because the formally instituted patterns of an organization are inextricably intertwined with its informally emerging patterns (Scott, 1962).

In a more concise definition of the term organizational structure, Gibson et al., (1982) defined it
as "relatively fixed relationships that exist among the jobs in the organization" (289). Gibson et al., (1982) went on to distinguish between organizational structures that tend to the left and those that tend to the right: "Structures tending to the left are characterized by a number of terms including formalistic, structured, bureaucratic, system 1, and mechanistic. Structures tending to the right are termed informalistic, non-bureaucratic, system 4, and organic" (p. 291).

In making the distinction between these two types of organizational structure, Gibson et al., (1982) dealt with an aspect of organizations which is of great interest to the present study, i.e., the distinction between more and less authoritarian and more and less participative organizations. By following the development of theories of organizational structure, it can be seen that the importance of this distinction has only been recognized during the last several decades (Edgar, 1980). Gibson et al., (1982) divided theories of organizational structure into four general categories: classical, bureaucratic, non-classical, and contingency or universal theories. A common characteristic among the first three categories is a belief that there is only one best way to design an organization, while in universal or contingency theory, it is believed that the optimal organizational model can vary from one situation to another.
Classical Theories

The history of management development goes back thousands of years, but the development of scientific management started in the nineteenth century after the industrial revolution (Huse, 1980). In 1947, Frederick Taylor created what is now called the Classical Theory. Taylor (1947) held that there is one way to do a job which is the most beneficial for both workers and management. With this in mind, he investigated the efficiency of both workers and managers by studying actual working conditions.

Taylor's theory emphasized the role of management in an organization, holding that proper management is crucial to the organization's success. Management should provide guidelines for workers' performance by taking more responsibility for planning, standardizing, and improving human effort, in order to maximize output and minimize input (Mankin, Ames, & Nilton, 1980). In particular, it is the role of management to use scientific methods to establish standard times for all jobs in the organization, to determine the methods to be used for performing the jobs, and to train the workers to use those methods (Villers & Raymond, 1960). Taylor rejected the idea of employees planning, organizing, and controlling in an organization, claiming that when employees are in charge of both planning and performance, they decrease productivity and increase
inefficiency (Taylor, 1947). He believed that if workers followed the requirements of specialists in management, they would increase productivity and so would be rewarded more in the long run.

While Taylor spoke mostly about micro-organizational design, which is the design of jobs in the organization, Fayol, who was another main proponent of the Classical Theory, was concerned with macro-organizational design, which is the design of the structure of organizations (Gibson et al., 1982). Fayol (1949), is known as the founder of Management Science theory. He emphasized establishing broad administrative principles applicable to higher organizational levels and defined the administrative management role as planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control. Organizational design can be defined as dividing a task into smaller sub-tasks, regrouping these tasks into related departments, appointing a manager for each department and delegating authority to that manager, and finally, linking the department to a chain of command (Fayol, 1949). Emphasis is placed on the chain of command, the authority of managers over workers, and the principle that each person in the organization should stay in his or her own place (Fayol, 1949).

There are other main proponents of the Classical Theory, including Mooney (1939), Urwick (1976), and Barnard (1938), who all share an important common link with Taylor.
and Fayol. This link is the idea that in organizations, it is the managers' role to manage, and it is the workers' role to follow the managers' directions. Little consideration is given to the idea of workers participating in management decisions or in controlling their own work environments. The relevance of this view for the present study lies in the fact that there are many organizations today whose attitude towards workers seems to exhibit the principles of Classical Theory (Likert, 1976). In fact, one objective of the present study was to determine whether any of the companies studied exhibit such principles in the perception of their employees, and if so, what is the degree of job satisfaction of those employees.

**Bureaucratic Theory**

Bureaucratic Theory emphasizes the concept of bureaucracy and its role in the organization. Owens (1970) defined the term bureaucracy as an adaptive administration system for responding to the needs of a large organization, and Georgopouls and Mann (1962) added that a bureaucratic organization is based on job specialization and a high degree of professionalization. A more extensive definition of the term was provided by Stroup (1962):

"Bureaucracy is a large scale organization with a complex but definite social function. This concept consists, moreover, of specialized personnel and is guided by a system of rules and procedures. In
addition, a carefully contrived hierarchy is carried out impersonally" (p. 14).

Max Weber as the founder of the Bureaucratic Organization Theory, emphasized the importance of mechanisms of control in bureaucracy and held that bureaucracy is formally the most rational known way of carrying out necessary control of human beings (Henderson & Parsons, 1947).

According to the Weberian view, in a bureaucratic organization one has to adopt certain strategies in his/her management policies (Burger, 1976). A general orientation towards rationality is emphasized, along with specialization of roles and tasks, the setting of specific goals, and the use of rational rules in achieving the goals (Eisenstadt, 1959).

In some important ways, Bureaucratic Theory is similar to Classical Theory. This similarity is exhibited by several principles that Blau and Scott (1962) claimed should be followed in order to achieve the maximum benefits from a bureaucratic organization:

1. All jobs should be highly specialized, with every employee responsible for the effectiveness of the job.
2. Every task should be accomplished according to written rules and policies.
3. Each employee should be supervised by one superior.

This authority is based on expert knowledge and is
delegated from the top of the hierarchy. This is called chain of command.

4. The relationships in the organization should be of an impersonal and formalistic form. Maintaining a social distance with subordinates and clients assures that personalities do not interfere with the efficient accomplishment of the organizational goal.

5. Employment in the organization should be based on technical qualifications. It is viewed as a lifelong career, and a high degree of loyalty is engendered. Promotion is based on seniority and achievement.

These principles place great emphasis on the hierarchy of an organization. The idea of workers participating in management or of helping to set the goals of the organization is not addressed (Sredl & Rothwell, 1987). With respect to the rigidity of employee roles and of management-worker relations, Bureaucratic Theory seems to have a great deal of similarity to Classical Theory (Mankin, Ames Jr. & Grodsky, 1980).

Cunningham (1983) criticizes the Weberian view, claiming that it is a mistake for managers in an organization to not consider human choices and individual differences among employees. In fact, Cunningham speculates that the uncertain economic state and the discouraging productivity figures in the United States at the time of his
writing were created by bureaucratic organizational structures. The greater emphasis on individual employees that Cunningham calls for can be seen in the next development of theories on organizational structure, the Non-Classic theories.

**Non Classic Theories**

The appearance of behavioral science theory in the field of psychology had an important impact on theories of management and organizational development (Mankin et al., 1980). Early researchers in organizational behavior, like Roethlisberrger (1941) and Natemeyer (1978), illustrated the effect of psychological and sociological factors on employees' perception and behavior in relation to productivity. Applying such findings to Weber's Bureaucratic Theory, Morton (1977) held that bureaucratic organizations are also influenced by behavioral factors, and that failing to recognize this can prevent workers from achieving organizational goals.

As a result of this interest and research in behavioral science, a set of theories called Non-Classic theories were devised by various scholars. A feature common to these theories was an emphasis on less rigid, more democratic organizational structures. In fact, according to Mankin et al., (1980) almost every scientist who practices
behavioral science, insofar as it relates to organizations, puts emphasis on more democratic, more participative, and less hierarchical organizational structures. Although the work of many scholars contributed to these Non-Classic theories, this section will concentrate on the work of two, McGregor and Likert.

McGregor (1960) held that authoritarian management should be replaced by a more democratic, participative management. These opposing beliefs of managers about people take place in what McGregor called authoritative (theory X) and participative (theory Y) organizations. In organizations where managers held to theory X, workers are perceived by management as slothful, bad, lazy, and unreliable, and thus management believes that employees should be closely supervised, highly controlled, and precisely directed (McGregor, 1960). This is in contrast to organizations where managers held to theory Y in which management believes workers enjoy work, are trustworthy and faithful, are not passive, and do not resist organizational goals (Davis & Newstrom, 1981). In organizations with this mentality, management has a high level of confidence in their subordinates' abilities and judgment (McGregor, 1960). While McGregor's theory makes two distinctions on the scale of the attitude of managers toward their employees, Likert (1967) makes four distinguished types of management systems.
Likert's theory was an extension of Cartwright and Zander's (1960) Group Dynamic Theory and distinguished four management systems, called Systems 1, 2, 3, and 4. As characterized by Likert, System 1 organizations are equivalent to those favored by the Classical Theory (Gibson et al., 1974). Likert, however, held that System 1 organizations are exploitative, authoritative systems that are ineffective and do not reflect environmental changes. They are characterized as static and conservative (Likert, 1974).

Systems 2 and 3 organizations as defined by Likert (1976) share several common characteristics with System 1 organizations:

1. motivational effort is based on economic rewards and emphasis is put on punitive motivation procedures;
2. competition and conflict is stimulated among subordinates looking for recognition and reward;
3. it is believed that each person should have only one boss; and
4. managers cannot use motivational forces required to achieve cooperative attitudes.

In System 4 organizations, on the other hand, management is encouraged to decentralize the decision making, controlling, and goal setting process (Sreld & Rothwell, 1987). Decision making is done through group
participation, and the organization itself uses an overlapping group form of structure with each work group linked to the rest of the groups (Sreld & Rothwell, 1987). This form of group decision making is one of three major principles that Likert (1979) lists for System 4 organizations, with the other two being the principle of participative relationships and the establishment of high performance goals.

Likert (1967) lists five characteristics of System 4 organizations:

1. Motivation is based on supportive treatment and involvement.
2. There is a high level of cooperative behavior among individuals and among groups.
3. Management has skills to solve differences and conflicts and attain creative solutions.
4. Management can create motivation and coordination without referring to old forms of line authority.
5. Decision making is participative throughout the organization, with subordinates able to perform their jobs under two or more supervisors.

Characteristics not seen in System 4 organizations include development of standard ways to perform tasks, training specialists to perform those tasks, ensuring that the workers employ only the accepted methods, and using only
monetary motivations (Likert, 1972). Such characteristics are typical of System 1 organizations, but in comparison with System 1 organizations, System 4 organizations are held to be more productive and more adaptable toward environmental changes. This is because they make great use of their human resources (Likert, 1967).

Contingency Theory

According to the contingency theory, neither the classical theory nor Likert's System 4 type of organization necessarily provides the most effective organization design. On the contrary, either of these theories can provide the better approach, depending upon the situation (Gibson et al., 1982). Thus contingency theorists, like Morse (1969), Woodward (1967), and Rousseau (1979), in discussing the characteristics of organizations, emphasize the degree of their appropriateness to the task. Gibson et al., (1982) maintain that an organizational structure may be more or less appropriate for any particular organization. This agrees with the findings of Perrow (1967, 1970) and Rousseau (1979), who attempted to determine important factors to be taken into account in designing an organizational structure to fit a particular situation. These authors claimed that differences in technology and differences in environment can
make a difference in what organizational structure is appropriate.

In discussing differences in technology, Woodward (1967) held that the System 4 design is effective where there is a need for adjustment to new scientific knowledge. A bureaucratic design, on the other hand, is effective where organizations use mass-productive technology. In this latter respect Woodward appears to have been in agreement with Kobrerg (1988), who held that a bureaucratic design is essential for technical organizations that are typified by manufacturing or mass assembly operations. This type of organization requires a highly interdependent work process, and as interdependence among work units and individuals increases, the need also increases for coordinating mechanisms and formalization (Kobrerg, 1988). This formalization has been defined as the degree of written policies, rules, job descriptions, and procedures (Birnbaum & Gilert, 1985). The need for more coordination in such organizations leads to direct supervision and a clearly defined hierarchy of authority (Kobrerg, 1988). Kast and Rosenzweig (1974) also held that System 4 organizations were inappropriate for organizations involved in mass production and with many routine jobs, maintaining that scientific management and classical organizations are appropriate for such organizations.
With respect to environment, Lawrence and Lorsch (1969) stated that the more stable, certain and homogeneous the sub-environment (market, economic, or science), the more bureaucratic the organizational structure; but the more dynamic and uncertain the sub-environment, the more the organization should be designed as a System 4 organization. Kast and Rosenzweig (1974) suggested that bureaucratic structure is appropriate for firms that have routine activities and where productivity is the major objective. However, they held that bureaucratic organizations are not suitable for a highly flexible organization with non-routine activities, nor are they appropriate for organizations where creativity and innovation are important.

**Size and Organizational Structure**

The aim of this section is to determine whether the literature supports a relationship between size and organizational structure which can be applied to the Iranian iron companies studied. Several investigations have been done in other contexts to study the relationship of size to organizational structure.

The study of Hickson, Pugh, and Pheysey (1969) dealt with various organizations in England and how different aspects of organizational structure were related to the size of these organizations. These researchers found that role
specialization and functional specialization, two important elements of the organization, were positively and significantly related to size.

Another important aspect of organizations is the quality of decisions made (Fox & Lorge, 1953). Fox and Lorge found a significant relationship between size and quality of decisions in their study on the effectiveness of small and large air force groups. Results of their investigation indicated that the larger groups reached higher quality decisions. According to Fox and Lorge (1953), one reason for this was that the larger groups solved their problems by making use of larger numbers of participants.

The investigation of Bates (1953) also concerned military groups. Four medium bomber wings were studied, and it was found that there was no significant relationship between size and type of the organization. However, Bates found that performance of the bomber groups was better when there was a greater utilization of authority, and a greater frequency of production plans, orders and instructions sanctioned by authority.

**Job Satisfaction**

The concept of job satisfaction is one of the most important concepts in this study, as it attempts to
determine the relationship of job satisfaction to organizational structure. A number of other researchers have also considered job satisfaction an important matter for organizations, especially insofar as it is related to organizational goals. For example, the importance of job satisfaction to organizations was emphasized by Rubin and Berlew (1984) who held that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction have an effect on the achievement of organizational objectives. Employee dissatisfaction can be very costly to organizations, according to Rubin and Berlew (1984), and can lead to adverse results such as the covering up of mistakes, the taking of fewer risks, and the failure to confront difficult issues face to face.

Before discussing various theories of job satisfaction, it is important to gain an idea of what the term job satisfaction means. Definitions of the term characteristically make a reference to the feelings, perceptions, or attitudes of workers. For example, Hackman and Lloyd (1977) defined job satisfaction as a subjective perception of one about his/her job. However, since the term perception can be considered to apply to practically all human experiences, this definition is perhaps too general.

A more specific definition was provided by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), who defined job satisfaction as feelings or affective responses to facets of the job
situation. Beer (1983) elaborated some of these facets as: the attitude of the employee toward the company, the job, fellow workers, and other aspects of the work situation.

Morse (1969) tied job satisfaction to the worker's proficiency in his/her job by defining employee satisfaction as "an individual's sense of competence from mastering a particular task environment" (p. 86). Morse held that when an employee performs effectively in a task environment, he/she feels a sense of competence.

These definitions help to clarify the concept of job satisfaction, but in order to get a clearer view of this important concept, several theories of job satisfaction will be briefly reviewed. These include the single factor or traditional approach, multiple factor theory, expectancy theory, interactive theory, and job characteristics theory.

The Single Factor or Traditional Approach

This set of theories is affected by scientific management theories. Each one assumes that there is a single most important factor pertaining to job satisfaction. Early motivational theories assumed that either the economic factor, the social reward, or some employee characteristic factor was the most important determiner of job satisfaction. The most traditional approach held that if an
organization increased employee wages, the employees would be more satisfied with their jobs (Schein, 1980).

Hassan's (1984) investigation seemed to confirm the view of the traditional theory, finding that the most important factor in employee job satisfaction was wages. At the same time, Hassan found that the least significant factors in job satisfaction were the opportunity for promotion and the degree of fairness of work load.

Another study which investigated job satisfaction in relation to economic return was that of Askar (1981), who investigated the job satisfaction of teachers in Kuwait. Askar found that the teachers were not satisfied with the determined economic return from their jobs. Surhidda's (1983) study of job satisfaction of elementary school principals, on the other hand, found that overall, they were satisfied with their salaries.

After the Hawthorne study, the attention of many theorists turned to other factors in job satisfaction (Roethliberger, 1941). Researchers began studying occupational aspects other than wages, especially social and psychological considerations of work and their relation to job satisfaction (Lawler, 1971). Gurin (1960) found that employee identification with the work group was an important factor in job satisfaction, since the work group facilitates an important function in satisfying interpersonal and friendship needs.
There are also many personal characteristics of workers, such as sex and age, which have been studied in relationship to job satisfaction (Barahimi, 1986). The relation of demographic factors to job satisfaction of middle managers in the companies studied is in fact one of the important considerations of the present research.

In studying the relation of demographic factors to job satisfaction, Hoppock (1960) determined that male workers were more satisfied with their jobs than female workers, and also found that older workers were more satisfied than younger workers. Birmingham (1984) studied teachers' job satisfaction and burn out and claimed that people over 55 years of age and under 25 were the most satisfied, while the highest level of emotional exhaustion was experienced by 35-44 year olds. In contrast to Hoppock, Birmingham found that females were more satisfied than males.

Multiple Factor Theories

The work of Abraham Maslow and Fredrich Herzberg helped lay a foundation for theories taking into account multiple aspects of the job situation. Maslow (1954) developed a hierarchy of human needs that begins with low level needs such as physiological necessities, needs for safety and security, and needs for affection and affiliation, and rises to high level needs such as needs for
self-esteem and self-actualization. These needs provide motivation for people to perform actions in order to fulfill the needs, including gaining and maintaining employment. Moreover, when a certain level of need is fulfilled, as in the job situation, it can no longer serve as a motivator, and so the motivation for further actions becomes the fulfillment of higher level needs.

Herzberg et al., (1957) held that employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction are on two different levels and that removal of employee dissatisfaction does not automatically make the employees satisfied. Employee dissatisfaction is caused by extrinsic factors such as supervision, pay, and flexible time scheduling, and as a result, motivators based upon those factors can not improve worker satisfaction since the nature of the work itself has not changed (Herzberg et al., 1957). Job satisfaction, on the other hand, along with employee productivity, can be increased through job enrichment, which is the design of employee motivators based on factors intrinsic to the job, such as recognition and achievement (Herzberg et al., 1957).

Several scholars have criticized Herzberg's theory. Yebuda and Krausz (1983) stated that the theory of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards does not clearly distinguish between employees' motivation and job satisfaction. Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakell (1967) also criticized Herzberg's two factor theory, claiming that it is an oversimplified view of
the mechanism of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Dunnette and his co-researchers mentioned that there are many variations among people, such as individual background and individual social or religious values, that can affect job satisfaction and that these go beyond the two-factor dimension presented by Herzberg. Miskel (1983) also criticized Herzberg's theory, saying that there is a lack of clarity in the formulation of the two factor theory and that this leads to various interpretations.

Porter and Lawler (1968) claimed that Herzberg's views were inconsistent with the results of other surveys. They reversed the traditional expected relationship that job satisfaction leads to employee productivity and argued that production is mainly a result of perceiving that certain behavior leads to rewards. Porter and Lawler (1967) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance and held that job satisfaction is caused by job performance. They believed that good performance leads to extrinsic rewards and that these rewards lead to job satisfaction, recommending that management direct the reward system to employees' performance in order to increase job satisfaction. McGregor (1960), in The Human Side of Enterprise, also saw the effort put forth on the job as an important factor. McGregor's study suggested that a significant increase in human effort by employees would not only result in higher productivity, it would also result in
less alienation of employees, a finding which suggests an
increase in job satisfaction. Vroom's (1964) study seemed
to contradict this, however. Vroom found little
relationship between job satisfaction and productivity.

Hall (1977) saw Maslow's and Herzberg's theories as
being similar. Hall held that needs can be divided into low
level and high level needs as was suggested by Maslow.
However, this division was seen as paralleling the
intrinsic-extrinsic division as set out by Herzberg, with
intrinsic rewards being correlated with high level needs and
extrinsic rewards being correlated with low level needs
(Hall, 1977).

Other studies which have taken into account multiple
factors include Birmingham's (1984) investigation of teacher
job satisfaction and burnout in Minnesota. It was found
that fifty-eight percent of all teachers surveyed were
dissatisfied with teaching, thirty-three percent were
satisfied, and nine percent were highly satisfied. Teachers
were most satisfied with social service, creativity,
variety, and ability utilization. They were dissatisfied
with advancement, compensation, company policies and
practices, and recognition.
Expectancy Theory

Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction in terms of employee expectations. Satisfaction depends upon the degree to which an employee believes his or her own efforts will lead to perceived attractive outcomes of the job (Vroom, 1964). Similarly, job motivation depends upon the employee perceiving that if he or she improves in performance, rewards will be forthcoming, where the rewards are consistent with the worker's individual goals (Doll, 1983).

Kendal and Hulin (1969) also emphasized the importance of expectations of employees, but they took into account differences between what is expected and what is experienced by the employee. Large discrepancies between what is experienced and what is expected in the job situation can lead to employee dissatisfaction (Kendal & Hulin, 1969).

Miskel (1982) agreed with the views of Vroom and Doll, but added that a satisfied employee is one who receives positive feedback from his or her managers or supervisors. In contrast with Vroom and Doll, Lawler (1973) claimed that additional, concrete elements such as affiliation (belongingness, acceptance, and social interactions), power (control, authority, and influence), and achievement (accomplishment and success) must be taken into account when determining employee job satisfaction.
Interactive Theory

Interactive theorists emphasize the interaction between employees and the organization. Wabba and House (1974) held that the effects of management's views about human nature, communication, production, power, the role of conflict, and authority can determine employees' job satisfaction. For example, management's views about the desirability of communication with employees will affect the employees' job satisfaction (Wabba & House, 1974).

Oldham's (1976) views also highlight the importance of the organization's attitude toward employees. According to Oldham, it is the employee's experience of a sense of meaningfulness and responsibility in his or her job, combined with feedback about the effectiveness of the employee's performance, that determines his or her job satisfaction.

King and his colleagues (1978) tested the interactionist view with respect to organizations' coordination and control processes. These researchers found that these processes did have a significant effect both on workers' satisfaction and their retention, with greater control being correlated with less job satisfaction, and more coordination being correlated with greater job satisfaction.
Effects of Organizational Structure on Job satisfaction

Investigators who have studied the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational structure have considered factors such as supervisory process, attributes, individual needs, work groups, the rewards system, and other aspects of organizational structure (Porter & Lawler, 1965; Oldham & Hackman, 1981; Birnbaum & Gilbert, 1985; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). These researchers have held that the structural properties of organizations influence employees. For example, Gaines and Jermier (1983) stated that although employees' emotional exhaustion is partially the result of their personality types, departmental context and administrative policies also can have profound effects on employee burnout.

Brass (1981) held that organizational structure can shape job characteristics. Oldham and Hackman (1981) added that organizational structure can change the present job activity and that the intrinsic nature of the job affects the employee's reaction to the organization. According to Oldham and Hackman this process can have an effect on the employee's performance and job satisfaction.

Hamermesh and White (1984) claimed that organizational context can determine management employee job satisfaction
and productivity. They said organizational context includes three aspects:

1. Autonomy: the degree of management autonomy in decision making.
2. Line Responsibility: the degree to which managers have direct control.
3. Incentive Compensation: the percentage of the management's total cash compensation related to direct performance.

Investigating the relationship between bureaucratic organization and job satisfaction, Maier (1973) stated that in bureaucratic organizations there is a closeness of control that motivates employees to be more effective and satisfied in their jobs. The reason is that employees are clear about what is expected of them and about the criteria by which their performance will be evaluated.

On the other hand, Cooper and Marshall (1976), Division and Veno (1980), and Shistak (1980) all maintained that the presence of rule rigidity in the organization is a major contributor to employees' stress and psychological problems. Also, Freudenberger (1977) held that there is a positive relationship between routine and tedious jobs and employees' emotional exhaustion.

Another factor that can cause emotional stress in employees is organizational formalization (Maslach, 1978).
However, Maslach stated that the competent use of formalization and rule inflexibility factors enable management to alleviate employees' emotional problems.

Several studies have attempted to determine the relation between System 4 organizational structure and aspects of the job that are related to satisfaction. For example, the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research conducted a project for two General Motors divisions (Likert, 1961) which tested the effects of System 4 organizational structure on employees' emotions and behavior. Results of the project suggested that in System 4 organizations there is better communication flow, more participative decision making, and interest in individual welfare. Likert held that in this type of organization conflict is not rejected but is welcomed and that people in system 4 organizations work harder for promotion and participation.

Similarly, Worthy (1950) held that democratic organizations encourage the development of individual self expression and creativity which are necessary to the personal satisfaction of employees. Worthy also determined that organizations with a System 4 organizational structure have a better organizational climate and higher job satisfaction. In addition, Likert (1961) found that 92% of white collar and 95% of blue collar employees were favorable toward group decision making. Likert also found that the
greater management's skill in manipulating group dynamic supervision, the greater are productivity and job satisfaction.

Worker participation in decision making was also the subject of Hackman and Lloyd's (1977) study. They developed a concept called quality of work-life (QWL) which concerned the design of jobs, and which referred to industrial democracy and the increase of worker participation in corporate decision making. Hackman and Lloyd (1977) defined QWL as the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experience in the organization. Etzioni (1980) said that improvement of QWL might lead to more positive feelings toward one's self (greater self esteem, which is one of Maslow's high level needs), towards one's job (improved job satisfaction and involvement), and towards the organization (stronger commitment to the organization's goals).

Porter and Lawler (1964) analyzed the effects of organizational structure on job satisfaction with a more psychological orientation. They held that the effects of organizational structure on satisfaction vary depending upon the individual's psychological needs. Porter and Lawler also explained that the structure of tall organizations (organizations with a rigid hierarchy where the span of control is small) is advantageous in producing security and social needs satisfaction. However, they held that flat
organizational structures (those with a less rigid hierarchy and a larger span of control) tend to lead to greater fulfillment of self actualization needs. Contrary to above research, Kahn et al., (1964) found insignificant relationships between tall or flat organizations and job satisfaction.

Tichy (1983) stated that division of labor was suitable for the industrial revolution duration, when the economy found advantages in division of labor and reached tremendous productivity. Tichy held that if we do not redesign our organizational structures, we will discourage individual enterprise.

The Effects of Organizational Size on Job Satisfaction

A number of investigations have related size to job satisfaction, including Bass's (1981) study, which concluded that the size of an organization can affect managerial job satisfaction, and Jones's (1984) study, which held that as the size of an organization increases, job satisfaction decreases.

One element of job satisfaction that has been investigated by several researchers is role ambiguity (Bass, 1981), which occurs when the environment does not provide consistent guidelines for the employees' behavior, when there is a consistent change in those guidelines, or when
guidelines contradict each other in the organization (Lyons, 1971). Role ambiguity has been found to be related to organizational size by Kahn (1982), who held that as size increases, role ambiguity also tends to increase. This was in turn found to be related to job satisfaction by Korman (1971), who determined that there is a positive relationship between role ambiguity and job dissatisfaction.

Another important element of job satisfaction, found to be related to size, is individual visibility (Porter & Lawler, 1965). Bass and Barrett (1972), Green, Blank and Liden (1980), Jones (1984), and Porter and Lawler (1965) have discussed the relationship between the size of a company and individual visibility as well as visibility in relation to job satisfaction. These authors claimed that there is a significant relationship between employees' visibility in an organization and job satisfaction. They further maintained that in small organizations, individual contributions are more visible at lower levels in the hierarchy than they are in large organizations, while in large companies only the top management people have high visibility, which is related to the power which they exercise.

While Jones (1984) claimed that as the size of an organization increases, job satisfaction decreases, Porter (1963) said that for management personnel, this is the case only for lower levels of management. Porter held that the
lower levels of management are more satisfied with their jobs in small companies as opposed to large companies, while the higher the management level, the more satisfied the managers are with their jobs in larger companies. The findings of Elsalmi and Cummings (1968) were in agreement with Porter. In their study on the relation of management position to organization size and job satisfaction, they found that middle and lower level managers in large companies had less need fulfillment than did top management.

**Summary**

Theories of organizational structure range from Classical Theory which emphasize hierarchically structured organizations with strong management control (Taylor, 1947), to Participative Theory which stress the importance of employee participation in organizational decision making (Likert, 1961, 1967). Contingency theorists, such as Woodward (1967) and Kobrerg (1988) stressed neither of these positions, holding instead that the appropriate structure for an organization depends upon the particular organization and its situation.

Some theories of job satisfaction are single-factor approaches (Schein, 1980). These sets of theories emphasize the importance of wages, and Lawler (1965), who stressed socio-psychological factors. Multiple-factor theories
(Herzberg et al., 1956), on the other hand, emphasize a number of factors as relevant to job satisfaction. Still other researchers, such as Vroom (1964), stress employees' expectancy of achieving desired outcomes on the job as the most important factor in job satisfaction or, like Wabba and House (1974), emphasize the interaction of the organization with its employees.

Researchers such as Porter and Lawler (1965), Oldham and Hackman (1981), and Birnbaum and Gilber (1985) have studied the effects of various organizational structures on the job satisfaction of employees. Results of these studies have sometimes conflicted with one another, as can be seen in comparing Maier's (1973) investigation with Marshall's (1976) study. While Maier's (1973) investigation concluded that the closeness of control and the clarity of expectations in bureaucratic organizations lead to job satisfaction, Cooper and Marshall's (1976) research concluded that a main contributor of employee stress and psychological problems is rule rigidity in organizations.

The results of studies that have dealt with the effects of size on job satisfaction also appear to have been sometimes contradictory, as can be seen by comparing Jones (1984) study, which concluded that organizational size is negatively correlated with job satisfaction, and Porter's (1963) study, which held that for management personnel, this is true only for lower levels of management. Other
researchers have investigated particular aspects of job satisfaction, such as role ambiguity (Lyons, 1971; Kahn, 1982) and employee visibility (Porter & Lawler, 1965; Green, Blank, & Liden, 1980).
CHAPTER THREE
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter presents the methods and procedures used to conduct the study. The chapter begins with a discussion of the selection of subjects, including the selection of the companies involved in the study. The second section introduces the three testing instruments: Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC), Job Description Index (JDI) a researcher developed demographic survey. The third section concerns the procedures which were followed in the collection of data, while the fourth section outlines the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Selection of Subjects for the Study

This research involved sixteen companies that belong to the Iran Industrial Association. The subject selection and data collection were performed by a third party administrator in Tehran who was familiar with, and qualified in, the field being investigated. Before the companies were selected, the administrator contacted the Ministry of Higher Education for Iran in Tehran to explain the nature of the research, and to obtain a letter of introduction and recommendation. The administrator then contacted the Iran
Industrial Association, explained the nature of the research, and delivered the letter of recommendation from the Ministry of Higher Education. The Association provided the administrator with addresses and letters of recommendation for the twenty-seven companies associated with the Iran Industrial Association.

Of the twenty-seven Iranian iron companies (IICs), seventeen were randomly selected using a table of randomization. The administrator contacted representatives of each of those seventeen companies, and explained the nature of the research and how it would benefit the management of the company. It was also made clear that the data collected from the firm would remain confidential and that completed questionnaires would not be read in Iran. Each company was asked to allow its middle managers to take part in the study. Of the seventeen iron companies contacted, all but one agreed to cooperate with the procedures of the study. The sixteen companies involved in the study employed a total of 195 middle managers. These middle managers were the subjects of the study.

**Testing Instruments**

The instrumentation for this study consisted of three parts: Likert's (1967) Profile Of Organizational Characteristics (POC), the Job Description Index (JDI), and
a demographic questionnaire that was developed by the researcher.

Likert's POC is a standard questionnaire developed by the Organizational Development Research Program at the Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan (Franklin, 1973). The POC consists of 18 questions used to determine organizational structure. Six categories are included in the questionnaire, with three questions per category, designed to measure the operational variables of leadership, motivation, communication, decision making, goal setting, and control. There are four categories of answers to each question, and respondents are asked to select the answer which best describes their current organizational situation. For example, "virtually none," "some," "a substantial amount," and "a great deal" are the categories for the question "How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?".

On the basis of the four possible answers that could be given by the middle managers, values from one to four were assigned to the answers given by the middle managers, and the mean value for the 18 questions was then determined. In discussing organizational structure, Likert (1967) assigned an equal range of values on the POC to each of the four organizational structures. Therefore, the following ranges were used to indicate the four different structures:
System 1  1.0000 - 1.7499
System 2  1.7500 - 2.4999
System 3  2.5000 - 3.2499
System 4  3.2500 - 4.0000

Likert (1967) gave reliability data or inter-correlations from which reliability can be computed or estimated for the POC. The 18-item form S usually yields split-half reliability in the .90 to .96 range. In the New Ways of Managing Conflict, Likert (1976, p. 94) shows an extensive statistical description regarding the POC's validity. Likert states that in a study of 37 sales districts in Sweden, the r between POC total scores and sales was +.93.

The second part of the instrument was the Job Description Index (JDI). The JDI was used to measure the job satisfaction of the respondents. The JDI was developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) to measure satisfaction in five facets of the job: pay, promotion, job characteristics, co-workers and supervision. Nine questions cover pay, nine cover promotion, 18 embody job characteristics, 18 cover co-workers, and 18 cover supervision. The questionnaire is designed to distinguish between perceptually good and perceptually bad jobs. There are three possible answers to each question: "Yes," "No," and "Don't Know."
For characteristics that are considered positive, the scoring is as follows:

- Yes: 2
- No: 0
- Don't Know: 1

For characteristics that are considered negative, the scoring is reversed for "Yes" and "No" answers, as follows:

- Yes: 0
- No: 2
- Don't Know: 1

The JDI is a reliable instrument, with numerous correlations at .70 and .80 between JDI measures and other measures of satisfaction obtained by different methods, either concurrently or with very short time intervals.

The third instrument was a short demographic questionnaire developed by the researcher. Information was sought concerning type of job, work location, educational level, and marital status. It was judged by the researcher that each of these variables had the potential to influence the job satisfaction of the subjects. Therefore, this demographic information was collected to test whether anyone of the specific demographic variables was significantly correlated with job satisfaction. Furthermore, if any of the variables were found to be significantly related to job
satisfaction, that information might prove to be particularly useful to the companies involved.

All three parts of the instrument were translated into Farsi language and were administered in that form. Back-translations of the Farsi language instrument were made into English in order to ensure the accuracy of the Farsi language version.

Collection of Data

Data collection took place in May and June of 1989, by a third party administrator in Tehran. After the administrator obtained the introductory letters and randomly selected the seventeen companies, the researcher mailed the original Farsi questionnaire to the administrator by express mail to Tehran. The administrator contacted the representative of each company and asked permission to meet with all middle managers in the company either on that day or at a future date. Sixteen of the companies agreed to follow the research procedure. A meeting time prior to the lunch hour was requested in order to give middle managers sufficient time to answer their questionnaires. The subjects of the study were the 195 middle managers employed in the 16 IICs.

Changes in the standard procedure were accepted if they did not jeopardize the anonymity of employees or their
feelings toward the research procedure. The data was collected in one of four slightly different ways depending on company preference:

1) Contact with the company's representative, distribution of the instrument, and collection of the data on the same day. This occurred for six (37.5%) of the companies.

2) Distribution of the instrument and collection of the data on a single day, several days after the company's representative was contacted. This occurred for one (6.3%) of the companies.

3) Contact with the company's representative and distribution of the instrument on one day, and collection of the completed instruments on the following day. This occurred for seven (43.8%) of the companies.

4) Contact with the company's representative, distribution of the instrument, and collection of the data on three different days. This occurred for two (12.5%) of the companies.

In addition, two middle managers from one company asked to mail their questionnaires to the administrator. These questionnaires were received approximately two weeks after they were distributed.

Before distributing the questionnaires, the administrator explained the purpose and possible benefits of
the research. The subjects were informed that answering the questionnaire would take approximately twenty minutes of their time. The middle managers were told not to put their names anywhere on the questionnaire, and they were assured that no one in their company would see the questionnaires. In the cases where questionnaires were collected on a day later than the day they were administered, the instruments remained in the possession of the individual middle managers until the instruments were collected by the administrator.

All questionnaires collected from employees of a particular company were kept separate from all other questionnaires. In addition, questionnaires for a particular company bore a unique code to distinguish them from all other sets of questionnaires. When all sets of questionnaires were completed and collected, they were mailed special delivery to the researcher.

**Statistical Analysis**

Several statistical procedures were used to test the five hypotheses of this study. To test the first hypothesis, the overall means from the POC were first determined for the respondents from each company. The perceived organizational structure (System 1 through 4) was then determined on the basis of those means. Based on these results, it was determined whether there was one
organizational structure that all 16 companies had in common.

To test the second hypothesis, job satisfaction means from the JDI were calculated for each individual and each company. The job satisfaction means were then calculated for all of the middle managers who perceived their company as a System 1 organization, for all who perceived their company as a System 2 organization. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure test were then performed on these means.

To test Hypothesis three, the job satisfaction mean was calculated for all of the respondents of each company. A one-way ANOVA was then performed to determine if there were any significant differences among the companies with respect to job satisfaction.

To test Hypothesis four, the sizes of the companies were first determined based on the number of middle managers employed in the company. The number of respondents from each of those sizes of companies was then calculated, along with how they perceived their companies on the scale of organizational structure. Finally, a correlation coefficient test was done to compare the size of company with the organizational structure as perceived by the middle managers.

To test Hypothesis five, job satisfaction means were calculated for each of the four demographic variables. For
example, for the variable "Type of Job," which had three possibilities, the job satisfaction means were calculated for each of the possibilities: production workers, service workers, and administrative workers. A one-way ANOVA test was performed on the data for each of the demographic variables. Also, the Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure was used for the two variables which had more than two possibilities. These variables were "Type of Job" and "Education."

**Summary**

One hundred ninety-five middle managers from 16 Iranian iron companies took part in this study. The iron companies were randomly selected from those belonging to the Iran Industrial Association in the spring of 1989. Middle managers of those companies were administered a three-part instrument consisting of the Profile of Organizational Characteristics, the Job Description Index, and a short demographic questionnaire developed by the researcher. The POC contained 18 questions in six categories to which the subjects responded on a four-point scale. The JDI contained 72 questions in five categories to which the subjects responded on a three-point scale. The responses from the completed questionnaires were assigned values, means from both the POC and the JDI were calculated, and statistical
analysis was done by using analysis of variance, the Student-Newman-Keuls-Procedure, and a correlation coefficient test.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study as applied to each of the five hypotheses tested. The study focused on the organizational structure of 16 Iranian iron companies (IICs), the job satisfaction of middle managers of those companies, the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction, the relationship between the size of the companies and their organizational structure, and the relationship between job satisfaction and four demographic variables: type of job, company location, education, and marital status. The five hypotheses were stated in the null form as follows:

H1. There is no particular type of organizational structure common to the Iranian iron companies in this study.

H2. There is no relationship between the organizational structure of the Iranian iron companies in this study and the job satisfaction of middle managers in those organizations.

H3. There are no differences in job satisfaction among the Iranian iron companies in this study.
H4. There is no relationship between the size of the Iranian iron companies in this study and the type of organizational structure of those companies.

H5. There is no relationship between the demographic variables of the study and the job satisfaction variable.

The chapter begins with a description of the subjects who took part in the research, followed by a presentation of the data as it relates to each of the hypothesis. Additional demographic information on the subjects is given in the section that deals with Hypothesis Five.

Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 195 middle managers from 16 iron companies in Iran. Of the 195 subjects, 164 (84.1%) responded to all items in the Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC) section of the questionnaire, and 162 (83.1%) completed all items in the Job Description Index (JDI) section of questionnaire, while only 114 (58.5%) completed the short demographic section of the questionnaire.

The fact that considerably fewer subjects completed the demographic section than completed the other two sections of the questionnaire was due to a printing error which resulted in poor legibility of the demographic section
of the instrument distributed at two of the companies. Although this inadvertent error resulted in a smaller sample with which to test Hypothesis five, it had no effect on the demographic results that were gathered from the rest of the companies. Therefore, the demographic data gathered from the 114 middle managers who completed the demographic section of the questionnaire was accepted and used to test Hypothesis Five. This hypothesis was the only one for which the demographic information was relevant.

There was a considerable variation in size among the 16 Iranian iron companies, as reflected by the number of middle managers who completed the questionnaire from each company. The number of middle managers who filled out the questionnaire from a single company ranged from three to 26, with a reported mean of 10.25. The same data revealed a median of 7.5. The difference between the mean and median establishes that more companies had a relatively small number of middle managers than had a large number of middle managers, as shown in Table 1. A total of 11 companies had nine or fewer middle managers. The number of middle managers that completed the Profile of Organizational Characteristics and the Job Description Index from each of the five larger companies ranged from 12 to 26.
Hypothesis One

The researcher sought to determine whether or not there was a particular type of organizational structure common to the Iranian iron industry. The question of whether such a common structure existed was addressed by testing Hypothesis One, which stated: There is no particular type of organizational structure common to the Iranian iron companies in this study.

In order to accept or reject this first hypothesis, the researcher tabulated the responses to the Profile of Organizational Characteristics for the middle managers at each company and calculated the mean. The organizational structure of each company was assigned based on the following ranges of values for the means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000 - 1.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.750 - 2.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.500 - 3.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.250 - 4.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assignment of values was based on Likert's (1967) use of his Profile of Organizational Characteristics, in which he assigned an equal range of values to each of the four organizational structures. The System 1-4 framework for classifying organizational structures was also developed by Likert (1961, 1967, 1976). The four systems correspond
to organizational structures which Likert characterized in the following ways:

- **System 1**: Exploitative/Authoritative
- **System 2**: Benevolent/Authoritative
- **System 3**: Consultive
- **System 4**: Participative

Table 1 shows the results for the 16 Iranian iron companies involved in the study. The lowest mean was 2.1065, which was the average for the 12 middle managers from Company 7. This result corresponds to the System 2 organizational structure and indicates that the middle managers from Company 7 perceived their company as a Benevolent/Authoritative organization. The highest mean was 3.0185, which was the average for the nine middle managers from Company 1. This result corresponds to the System 3 organizational structure and indicates that the middle managers from Company 1 perceived their company as a Consultive organization.

It is interesting to note that companies 10, 11, 6, and 5, which are the four companies with the largest number of responding middle managers (19, 22, 23, and 26 respectively), had means which were very close together (2.5468, 2.5455, 2.6014, and 2.6453 respectively). This is a range of less than .10, and it indicates that the middle managers from the four largest companies had similar
Table 1. Organizational Structure of IIC's Studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0185</td>
<td>.3287</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5694</td>
<td>.6825</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5111</td>
<td>.5752</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5238</td>
<td>.5700</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.6453</td>
<td>.4815</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.6014</td>
<td>.4945</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1065</td>
<td>.4416</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>.5270</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6944</td>
<td>.4695</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5468</td>
<td>.4541</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.5455</td>
<td>.2598</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5444</td>
<td>.2166</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>.3998</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9630</td>
<td>.0849</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3968</td>
<td>.3691</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>.5052</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.5803</td>
<td>.4610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

perceptions about where their companies were situated on Likert's scale of organizational structure. Not only did each set of middle managers from those four companies perceive their company as a Consultive organization, they did so to about the same extent, which is indicated by the closeness of the means for those companies.
Based upon these results, Hypothesis 1 was accepted. There was no particular organizational structure that was common to all of the IICs studied. However, even though there was no common organizational structure for all of the IICs, Table 1 shows that there was a common organizational structure for 14 (87.5%) of the IIC's. All 14 of these companies were identified as being System 3 organizations. This indicates that the middle managers of those companies perceived their companies as having a Consultive organizational structure.

Two of the companies (12.5%) reported a System 2, Benevolent/Authoritative, organizational structure. The mean for one of those companies, Company 15, was 2.3968, which was only about .10 below the division point (2.499) between System 2 and System 3 organizations. The mean for the other company was 2.1065, which was about halfway between the division point between System 2 and System 3 organizations and the division point between System 1 and System 2 organizations (1.749). None of the companies studied reported either a System 1 (Exploitative/Authoritative) or a System 4 (Participative) organizational structure.

The fact that the means for 14 of the companies placed them in the System 3 classification agreed with the results obtained when the overall mean for all 16 companies was calculated. This overall mean, which was calculated by
averaging the responses of all 164 middle managers who answered the Profile of Organizational Characteristics, was 2.5803, as shown in Table 1. This figure further supports the finding that on the average, the organizations studied had a System 3 organizational structure.

It is interesting that the means for most of the companies fell within a very narrow range. As mentioned before, the range for all of the IICs was from 2.1065 to 3.0185, which is a difference of .912. However, Table 2, which presents the means in increasing order, shows that the means were grouped in the middle of that range. In fact, for 10 (62.5%) of the companies, the means ranged from 2.5111 to 2.6453, which is a difference of only .134. As was the case for the four largest companies, where the range was only about .10, this result indicates that middle managers from 10 of the companies had similar perceptions about the organizational structure of their companies.

Hypothesis Two

While Hypothesis One was designed to reveal the organizational structure for each of the companies studied and to determine if there was a commonality, Hypothesis Two focused on the relationship between organizational structure and mid-management job satisfaction. Hypothesis Two stated:
Table 2. Means for the 16 IICs, in Increasing Order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1065</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3968</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5238</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5444</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5455</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5468</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5694</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6453</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6944</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9630</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no relationship between the organizational structure of the Iranian iron companies in this study and the job satisfaction of the middle managers in those organizations. This was one of the most important questions for the study, since any relationship found between organizational structure and job satisfaction might be especially useful information to the companies studied.
In order to test Hypothesis Two, the mean job satisfaction of the middle managers was calculated for each of the Iranian iron companies studied. The results, shown in Table 3, include the minimum and maximum job satisfaction scores for each company. The lowest individual job satisfaction score obtained from the Job Description Index was 39 (Company 10), and the highest score was 181 (Company 5), a range of 142.

The company in which the responding middle managers expressed the highest overall job satisfaction was Company 4 (133.0000). This was a company with seven responding middle managers whose answers on the Profile of Organizational Characteristics indicated that they perceived their company to be a System 3, Consultive organization, with a POC mean equal to 2.5238. The IIC in which the responding middle managers expressed the lowest job satisfaction overall was Company 7 (108.6667). This was a company with 12 responding middle managers whose answers on the Profile of Organizational Characteristics indicated that they perceived their company to be a System 2, Benevolent/Authortative, organization. The POC mean for this company was the lowest of the 16 companies studied (2.1065).

The mean for all 162 respondents to the Job Description Index was 123.0926, but 11 (68.75%) of the company means were above the overall mean. The ranges in job satisfaction were usually wide, which was also shown by
the overall standard deviation of 29.3357. These wide
ranges indicate considerable differences in job satisfaction
among the middle managers of most of the companies. The
greatest range was in the job satisfaction scores of the
middle managers from Company 5 (60 to 181, a range of 121).
This was a company with 26 responding middle managers whose
answers to the Profile of Organizational Characteristics

Table 3. Job Satisfaction Scores for Each Company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>133.0000</td>
<td>24.3362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>114.2500</td>
<td>34.7023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>132.4000</td>
<td>45.6322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>133.2857</td>
<td>33.9152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>124.3200</td>
<td>33.5792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>125.3636</td>
<td>25.8927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>108.6667</td>
<td>30.3684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>130.2500</td>
<td>39.0331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>131.8750</td>
<td>30.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>116.5263</td>
<td>33.2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>116.9545</td>
<td>24.2732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>126.2000</td>
<td>10.0349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>119.0000</td>
<td>22.7266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>135.3333</td>
<td>9.8658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>126.2857</td>
<td>31.3407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>128.6000</td>
<td>30.5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>123.0926</td>
<td>29.3357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated they perceived their organization to be a System 3, Consultive, organization (POC mean = 2.6453). The standard deviation for job satisfaction scores of Company 5 was 33.5792. Job satisfaction scores for middle managers in companies 12 and 14 showed ranges that were considerably less than those for middle managers in the other IICs. These were both small companies. For Company 12, the range was 116 to 137, with a standard deviation of 10.0349. This was a company with five responding middle managers whose answers on the Profile of Organizational Characteristics indicated that they perceived their company as a System 3, Consultive, organization (POC mean = 2.5444). For Company 14 the range was 124 to 142, with a standard deviation of 9.8658. This company had three responding middle managers, and they also perceived their company as having a System 3, Consultive, organizational structure (POC mean = 2.9630).

After calculating the job satisfaction scores of middle managers who completed the Job Description Index, the next step in testing Hypothesis Two was to match those job satisfaction scores with the results from the organizational structure instrument. This was done by calculating the mean job satisfaction score for all of the middle managers whose answers on the POC showed that they perceived their company as a System 1, Exploitative/Authoritative organization, and then doing the same calculation for the other three
organizational structures. The result of this matching is shown in Table 4.

The data revealed that as the organizational structure perceived by the middle managers rose from System 1 to System 4 (more authoritative/less participative to less authoritative/more participative), the mean job satisfaction of the middle managers also rose. In fact, the lowest job satisfaction for those who perceived their company as a System 4 organization was only one point lower than the highest job satisfaction for those who perceived their company as a System 1 organization.

In order to determine whether this correlation was significant, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The results of the ANOVA test are presented in Table 5.

Table 4. Job Satisfaction Means and Organizational Structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Organiza. Structure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Job Satisfac-</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83.4286</td>
<td>18.3381</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>113.5614</td>
<td>25.8519</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>129.4138</td>
<td>27.6568</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147.7273</td>
<td>26.4314</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123.0926</td>
<td>29.3357</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. ANOVA Test Comparing Organizational Structure and Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26342.5765</td>
<td>8780.8588</td>
<td>12.3640</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>112211.0346</td>
<td>710.1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ANOVA test showed that F Prob, which is the significance of F, or the P-value, equalled 0.000, which was less than 0.05. There was thus a significant relationship at the 0.05 level between perceived organizational structure among the middle managers and their job satisfaction. This relationship was found to be positive by the Pearson's r test. It was determined that $r = 0.4857$. The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure Test was also applied to the data, in order to compare job satisfaction results for each pair of organizational structures. The results of this test showed that the job satisfaction for each of the four organizational structures was significantly different from the job satisfaction for each of the other three structures. As a result of these tests, Hypothesis Two was rejected.

These findings indicate that as the organizational structure of Iranian iron companies changes from System 1 to
System 4, job satisfaction of middle managers increases. This in turn indicates that the job satisfaction among middle managers of those Iranian iron companies with a more participative, less authoritative organizational structure will generally be greater than the job satisfaction of middle managers in those companies with less participative, more authoritative organizational structures.

**Hypothesis Three**

The determination of any significant differences in job satisfaction among middle managers in the different companies surveyed was potentially useful information for the companies. If significant differences were found, this would be especially useful information for any company that had a significantly lower job satisfaction than other companies, because such a company could investigate further to determine reasons for the difference. Therefore, the question of whether there were any significant differences was investigated, and was addressed by Hypothesis Three, which stated: There are no differences in job satisfaction among the Iranian iron companies in this study. Table 16 summarizes the mean scores on job satisfaction for each of the 16 companies studied, along with standard deviations.
When a one-way ANOVA test was completed on the data presented in Table 6, no significant differences were found. The P-value equaled .8562. It was determined there were no significant differences in job satisfaction among the companies studied. Hypothesis three was accepted.

Table 6. Job Satisfaction Means for Each Company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>133.0000</td>
<td>24.3362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114.2500</td>
<td>34.7023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132.4000</td>
<td>45.6322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133.2857</td>
<td>33.9152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>124.3200</td>
<td>33.5792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>125.3636</td>
<td>25.8927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>108.6667</td>
<td>30.3684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130.2500</td>
<td>39.0331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>131.8750</td>
<td>30.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>116.5263</td>
<td>33.2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116.9545</td>
<td>24.2732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126.2000</td>
<td>10.0349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>119.0000</td>
<td>22.7266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135.3333</td>
<td>9.8658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126.2857</td>
<td>31.3407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>128.6000</td>
<td>30.5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123.0926</td>
<td>29.3357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Four

The question of how the organizational structure of the 16 Iranian iron companies studied related to their size was also important for this study. The views of Kobrerg

Table 7. ANOVA Test Comparing Job Satisfaction and Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8279.6233</td>
<td>551.9749</td>
<td>0.6186</td>
<td>0.8562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>130273.9878</td>
<td>892.2876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1988) suggested that as organizations become larger and more complex, the need for formalized, bureaucratic structure becomes greater. This in turn suggests that larger Iranian iron companies may have more authoritarian, less participative organizational structures than smaller companies. The question of whether any relationship existed between size and organizational structure was addressed by testing Hypothesis Four, which stated: there is no relationship between the size of the Iranian iron companies in this study and the type of organizational structure of those companies.
The sizes of the IIC's in the study were determined according to the number of middle managers employed in the company. Therefore, the first step in testing Hypothesis Four was to group the IIC's together according to the number of middle managers working for the company, and then to determine how many of the middle managers from each size of company completed the Profile of Organizational Characteristics. The results of this calculation are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Number of POC Respondents for the Different Sizes of Companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid Managers in Company</th>
<th>Number of Companies</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next step in testing Hypothesis Four was to determine how the respondents from each size of company perceived their companies, based on their answers to the Profile of Organizational Characteristics. Table 9 shows how the respondents from each size of company perceived their company on the scale of organizational structure from System 1 through System 4.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Size (Number Mid Managers)</th>
<th>Respondents' Perceptions</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final step in testing Hypothesis Four was to do a correlation coefficient test. This test compared organizational size with organizational structure, and it showed that \( P = .986 \), which is not less than or equal to 0.05. Therefore, there was no significant relationship found between the two variables, and Hypothesis Four was accepted.

The significance of these results is that they indicate that there is no significant difference between large and small Iranian iron companies with respect to their perceived organizational structure. Even though it is expected that the larger companies have more complex operations than the smaller companies, the results suggest that the larger companies do not have a significantly more hierarchical structure than the smaller companies do.

**Hypothesis Five**

Four demographic variables were of interest to the study: type of job, company location, education, and marital status. Sex was not a variable since all respondents were male. The researcher sought to determine whether any of these demographic variables were significantly related to the job satisfaction of middle managers surveyed. This question was addressed in Hypothesis Five, which stated: there is no relationship
between the demographic variables of the study and the job satisfaction variable.

The hypothesis was tested for each of the four demographic variables. The calculations were based upon the 114 respondents who completed the demographic survey. As mentioned earlier, this number was smaller than the number completing the other two instruments of the questionnaire due to an inadvertent printing error which affected only the demographic section of the questionnaire at two of the companies.

**Type of Job**

There were three types of jobs the middle managers held: production, service, and administration. Table 10 below shows the number of respondents that had each type of job and the job satisfaction mean for each of those three groups.

The greatest number of middle managers (49 or 43%) were employed in the area of production. The middle managers who were employed in the production area also reported the highest job satisfaction. The fewest middle managers (25 or 21.9%) were employed in the area of service, and reported the lowest scores on the job satisfaction instrument. There were 40 (35.09%) middle managers in administration with a job satisfaction mean of 121.2750.
A one-way ANOVA test was performed on the data, and the result of the test is shown in Table 11. The significance of F, or the P-value = .2899. This was not less than or equal to 0.05, and therefore there was no significant relationship between the type of job and the job satisfaction of the middle managers.

Table 10. Type of Job Related to Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>126.8367</td>
<td>29.0168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>115.6800</td>
<td>27.0859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>121.2750</td>
<td>30.8054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122.4386</td>
<td>29.3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. ANOVA Test Comparing Type of Job and Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2143.9613</td>
<td>1071.9806</td>
<td>1.2521</td>
<td>.2899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95032.1089</td>
<td>856.1451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure Test was also used to test the data, in order to compare each group singly with each other group singly. It revealed that job satisfaction between any two of the three groups was not significantly different.

As a result of these tests, Hypothesis Five was accepted for the first demographic variable, type of job. However, it is worth noting, as mentioned above, that even though no statistically significant differences in job satisfaction among the three groups were found, job satisfaction scores of middle managers in production were higher than those in administration by 5.6 points and higher than those in services by 11.2 points. This suggests that it would be worthwhile to test this part of Hypothesis Five with a larger sample.

Location

There were two locations that the middle managers worked in: in Tehran and outside of Tehran. The companies located outside of Tehran were located in the suburbs of Tehran. Typically, employees working for those companies are bused to their work locations on company buses, which might be perceived as inconvenient by some of those workers. On the other hand, working outside of the city of Tehran might be considered by some workers to be preferable, due to
being away from the congestion of the central city. Considerations such as these gave interest to the question of whether there was any significant difference in job satisfaction between those middle managers working inside Tehran and those working outside of Tehran. Table 12 shows the number of respondents in each location and the job satisfaction mean for each of the two groups.

Eighty-five (74.6%) of the respondents were located in Tehran and 29 (25.4%) were located outside of Tehran. The middle managers located outside of Tehran had a somewhat higher job satisfaction than those located in Tehran.

Table 12. Work Location Related to Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Tehran</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>121.6706</td>
<td>30.8523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Tehran</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>124.6897</td>
<td>24.6564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122.4386</td>
<td>29.3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way ANOVA test was performed on the data to determine the significance of this difference in job satisfaction between the two groups, and the results of the ANOVA are shown in Table 13.
The significance of F, or the P-value = .6342. This was not less than or equal to 0.05. It was determined that there was no significant relationship between the work location and the job satisfaction of the respondents. As a result, Hypothesis Five was accepted for the second demographic variable, work location.

Table 13. ANOVA Test Comparing Location and Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197.0868</td>
<td>197.0868</td>
<td>.2276</td>
<td>.6342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96978.9834</td>
<td>865.8838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

In the researcher's judgment, the determination of educational levels of middle managers would be of interest to each company, since each company would then be able to compare the educational levels of its own middle managers to the overall results. If a significant difference in job satisfaction were found among middle managers with different educational levels, this information would be potentially even more useful to the companies. The middle managers were grouped into four levels of education: no high school
diploma, high school diploma only, bachelor's degree, and a higher college or university degree. Table 14 shows the number of respondents at each educational level and the job satisfaction mean for each of those groups of middle managers.

The largest number of respondents (41 or 36.0%) had a bachelor's degree but had no higher degree. The fewest number (17 or 14.9%) had no high school diploma. Those middle managers with no high school degree had the lowest job satisfaction (116.9412). The 33 middle managers who had only a high school diploma had the highest job satisfaction (124.1515).

Table 14. Education Related to Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116.9412</td>
<td>29.0591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree only</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>124.1515</td>
<td>29.4736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>122.7805</td>
<td>28.9046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>123.4348</td>
<td>31.4857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122.4386</td>
<td>29.3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A one-way ANOVA test was performed on the data, and the results of the test are shown in Table 15. The significance of F, or the P-value = .8666. Since it was not less than or equal to 0.05, it was determined that there was no significant relationship between the educational level and the job satisfaction of the respondents.

Table 15. ANOVA Test Comparing Educational Level and Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>638.2100</td>
<td>212.7367</td>
<td>.2424</td>
<td>.8666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96537.8602</td>
<td>877.6169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding was also confirmed by the Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure test, which revealed no significant difference in job satisfaction between any two of the four groups. Therefore, Hypothesis Five was accepted for the third demographic variable, educational level.

Marital Status

The fourth demographic variable, marital status, was of interest because middle managers who were married could
be expected, in general, to have greater financial responsibilities than those who were single. This might have a further effect on job satisfaction, since wages earned might not buy as high a standard of living for married middle managers and their families as they do for single middle managers. Although any significant difference between married and unmarried middle managers might not be related to financial considerations, such a difference could be of interest to the companies. Each company could then decide whether to investigate further to determine reasons for the difference.

There were two possibilities for the variable marital status: single and married. Table 16 shows the number of middle managers single and married and the job satisfaction mean for each classification.

Ninety-seven respondents (85.1%) were married, while 17 respondents (14.9%) were single. Table 16 also shows that the mean job satisfaction of the single middle managers (125.7059) was somewhat greater than the mean job satisfaction of the middle managers that were married (121.8660).

A one-way ANOVA test was performed on the data, and the result of the test are shown in Table 17. As can be seen from the table, the significance of F, or the P-value equal .6206. Since the P-value was not less than or equal to 0.05, it was determined there was no significant
relationship between marital status and job satisfaction of the respondents. Hypothesis Five was therefore accepted for the fourth demographic variable, marital status.

Table 16. Marital Status Related to Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>125.7059</td>
<td>33.4585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>121.8660</td>
<td>28.6958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122.4386</td>
<td>29.3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results suggest that there is considerable similarity in job satisfaction between married and single middle managers. Although the job satisfaction of the 17 single middle managers was somewhat higher than that for the 97 married middle managers, the difference was only 3.1%, and it was found to not be significant. In addition, these results give no reason to believe that the greater financial responsibilities of married middle managers, which was discussed above, have any significant effect on their job satisfaction in comparison to single middle managers. The results of testing Hypothesis Five for each of the four demographic variables revealed that there were no significant relationships between any of the demographic
variables and the job satisfaction of the respondents.

Hypothesis Five was therefore accepted for all of the demographic variables.

Table 17. ANOVA Test Comparing Marital Status and Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213.2830</td>
<td>213.2830</td>
<td>.2464</td>
<td>.6206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96962.7871</td>
<td>865.7392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents a summary of the study including the purposes and objectives, the literature, the procedures used, and the findings. The second section presents conclusions made from the study and a discussion of the conclusions. The third section provides recommendations for the Iranian iron industry as well as recommendations for further research.

Summary

Purposes and Objectives

This study had two main purposes. The first purpose was to determine the types of organizational structure present in Iranian iron companies. The second purpose was to determine the relationship between type of organizational structure and middle management job satisfaction.

The study answered the following questions:

1. What type of organizational structure is present in the Iranian iron industry?

2. How satisfied are middle managers with their jobs in the Iranian iron industry?
3. Are there differences in job satisfaction among Iranian iron companies?

4. What is the relationship of organizational structure to job satisfaction among middle managers in the Iranian iron industry?

5. What is the relationship of organizational structure to company size in the Iranian iron industry?

6. What is the relationship of demographic data and middle managers' job satisfaction in the Iranian iron industry?

Review of Literature

The Review of Literature dealt with four topics: 1) organizational structure, 2) job satisfaction, 3) the effect of organizational structure on job satisfaction, and 4) the effects of organizational size on job satisfaction.

Theories of organizational structure were reviewed that ranged from theories emphasizing hierarchically structured organizations, such as Taylor's (1947) Classical Theory, to those which stress employee participation in management processes, such as Likert's (1961, 1967) theory. Contingency theory, which emphasizes the importance of structuring an organization to fit the situation, and which was advocated by Woodward (1967) and Kobrerg (1988), was also reviewed.
Several job satisfaction theories were reviewed, including both single-factor and multiple-factor theories. Single-factor approaches stress the importance of a single factor, such as wages (Schein, 1980), in job satisfaction. Multiple-factor theories, such as advocated by Herzberg et al., (1956), hold that a number of factors affect job satisfaction. Also reviewed were Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964), which holds that an employee's expectancy of desired job outcomes is the most important factor in job satisfaction, and theories that stress employee organization interaction, such as put forward by Wabba and House (1974).

Research concerning the effect of organizational structure on job satisfaction was examined in the third section of the Review of Literature. Some conflicting results were found in comparing different investigations. For example, the research by Maier (1973) indicated that employees of organizations with a bureaucratic structure have higher job satisfaction than those in some other types of organizations, due to the closeness of control and the clarity of expectations. But Cooper and Marshall (1976) concluded that rules rigidity in organizations can contribute to employee stress and low job satisfaction.

Research concerning the effect of organizational size on job satisfaction was examined in the last section of the Review of Literature. This research included Jones's (1984) investigation, which found that organizational size is
negatively correlated with job satisfaction, and Porter's (1963) study, which concluded that for management employees, there is a negative correlation between size and job satisfaction only for the lower management levels. Other research involving particular aspects of job satisfaction, including role ambiguity (Lyons, 1971; Kahn, 1982) and employee visibility (Porter & Lawler, 1965; Green, Blank & Liden, 1980), were also reviewed.

**Procedures**

Three instruments were used for this study: Likert's (1967) Profile of Organizational Characteristics, Smith, Kendall and Hulin's (1969) Job Description Index, and a short researcher-developed demographic questionnaire. The Profile of Organizational Characteristics measures employee perceptions of organizational structure, and the Job Description Index measures employee job satisfaction.

Likert's (1967, 1973) theory of organizational structure was also utilized in this study. In Likert's framework, organizational structures are classified into four groups, referred to as system 1, 2, 3, and 4, and which range from authoritarian organizations with rigid structures to participative organizations in which employees take an important part in decision-making.
The 16 Iranian iron companies studied were randomly selected from those belonging to the Iran Industrial Association, which has its headquarters in Tehran. Subjects were middle managers of those companies. A total of 164 middle managers completed the Profile of Organizational Characteristics, 162 completed the Job Description Index, and 114 completed the demographic survey.

Statistical analysis included the calculation of means from both instruments for each company to determine organizational structure and job satisfaction for the companies. The ANOVA test was used to determine whether there were any significant relationships between organizational structure and job satisfaction and between demographic variables and job satisfaction. The ANOVA test was also used to determine whether there were any significant differences among the 16 companies in job satisfaction of their middle managers. A correlation coefficient test was performed to determine whether there was a significant relationship between organizational size and organizational structure.

Findings

The study revealed the following findings:

1. There was no single organizational structure present in the 16 Iranian iron companies; however, 14 of the
16 companies were rated as being System 3, Consultive organizations.

2. The organizational structure means of 10 (62.5\%) of the companies were within a very narrow range, from 2.5111 to 2.6453, a difference of .134. Also, the organizational structure means of the four largest companies were within an even narrower range, from 2.5468 to 2.6453, a difference of .0985. Both results indicated similar perceptions among middle managers of those companies about the organizational structure of their companies.

3. There were considerable differences in job satisfaction scores among the middle managers of most of the companies.

4. There was no significant difference in middle managers' job satisfaction scores among the 16 companies.

5. There was a positive correlation between perceived organizational structure on the four-point Likert scale and the job satisfaction of middle managers.

6. There was no significant relationship between the size of the companies, as determined by number of middle managers working for the companies, and the organizational structure of the companies.

7. There were no significant relationships between any of the four demographic variables, Type of Work, Job
Location, Education, and Marital Status, and job satisfaction.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the findings from this study. These concern the areas of organizational structure, job satisfaction, the relation of organizational structure to job satisfaction, the relation of organizational structure to organizational size, and the relation of demographic variables to job satisfaction. These five areas are discussed below.

Organizational Structure

On the basis of the findings of this study, there is no single organizational structure present in Iranian iron companies. However, since 14 of the 16 companies surveyed had a System 3 organization, it can be concluded that most Iranian iron companies are System 3, Consultive organizations. This finding of a similarity in organizational structure among most Iranian iron companies is also supported by the fact that 10 of the companies surveyed had organizational structure mean scores that were within a very small range of only .134 on the four-point Likert scale.
One possible reason for this similarity in perceived organizational structure among Iranian iron companies is related to the Iranian culture. Iran can be classified as both a paternalistic and a consultive society in the way fathers and their family members relate. It is consultive in the sense that fathers often consult with their adult family members about decisions which affect family affairs; however, it is paternalistic in the sense that fathers usually make the final decision in such matters. It may be that this strong cultural element is carried over to the structure of Iranian organizations and the way employees at higher levels of the organization relate to employees at lower levels. Such a carry-over offers some explanation for why the perceived organizational structure for most Iranian iron companies is System 3, or Consultive organization.

This possibility also suggests that further research on the relation of this and other cultural factors to the structure of Iranian organizations could be valuable. For example, although the results of this study indicate that the middle managers in Iranian iron companies were more satisfied with their jobs in System 4, participative organizations, further research on the relationship of cultural factors to organizational structure and job satisfaction might show that a System 3, Consultive, structure is better suited for Iranian organizations. These considerations also point out the importance of
conducting research on organizational structure and job satisfaction in countries other than highly industrialized ones, because there are fundamental differences between cultures. It is reasonable to think that the factors that are most fundamental in a culture are reflected in the organizations and institutions that are created within that society.

It is also important to notice that there are significant political, economic, and technological differences between countries that may influence organizational structure and job satisfaction. Until recently, Iran was at war with the neighboring country of Iraq, and this war lasted for several years. It seems probable that both the war and the present cease fire have had some effects on Iranian workers and Iranian organizations. This is suggested by the investigation of four military groups by Bates (1953), which indicated that performance of the groups was better where there was greater use of authority. Bates's study suggests that the organizational structures of Iranian industrial organizations may have been more hierarchical while the war was going on, especially in industries such as the iron industry, which are essential for a country which is at a war. On the other hand, since the cease fire took place in Iran, organizational structures of some of those organizations may have turned to be more participative.
This study was not designed to take political and economic factors into account. However, it is important to understand that cultural, political, economic, and technological factors in different countries might have an effect on organizational structure and job satisfaction.

**Job Satisfaction**

Concerning job satisfaction, two conclusions can be drawn based on the results of this study. First, on the basis of the finding that no significant differences in job satisfaction existed among the 16 companies surveyed, it can be concluded that in Iranian iron companies the overall job satisfaction of middle managers is similar. Second, on the basis of the finding that in 13 (81.25%) of the companies surveyed the job satisfaction scores varied by 70 points or more, it can be concluded that in most Iranian iron companies there are wide variations in job satisfaction scores among middle managers.

The wide variation in job satisfaction indicates substantial differences among the middle managers of Iranian iron companies concerning how satisfied they are with their jobs. Reasons for these wide variations are not known, and there may be different reasons in different companies. For example, it is not known what, if any, training is provided middle managers by the different companies studied. In
companies that do provide management training, it is not known if all middle managers are involved. Training could be one of the variables affecting variations in job satisfaction.

Whatever the reasons are for this wide variation, it would be useful for individual Iranian iron companies to investigate the job satisfaction of their own employees. If it is found that wide variations in job satisfaction exist among middle managers of the company, it would be valuable for the company to investigate the reasons.

The Relation of Organizational Structure to Job Satisfaction

On the basis of the results of this study, it can be concluded that in Iranian iron companies, job satisfaction increases as the organizational structure changes from more authoritative to more participative. For example, in the present study, the seven middle managers who perceived their company as a System 1 organization had a mean job satisfaction score of 83.4286, but the eleven middle managers who perceived their company as a System 4 organization had a mean job satisfaction of 147.7273, a difference in job satisfaction scores of 64.2987. Also, the highest job satisfaction score of those who perceived their company as a System 1 organization, 103, was only one point above the lowest job satisfaction score, 102, of those who
perceived their company as a System 4 organization.

This result supports Likert's (1967) theory which held that job satisfaction of employees increases as organizations become less hierarchical and allow the employees to participate in decision making. Further research needs to be done in order to clarify the relationship between job satisfaction and employees' job performance in Iranian iron companies. But it would appear worthwhile for Iranian iron companies to consider changing their organizational structures to let employees participate more in decision making.

Any attempt to change organizational structure should be carefully planned. This is particularly true in Iranian culture because of the important paternalistic/consultive factor. This factor suggests that System 3, Consultive, organizations may result in higher job satisfaction in Iranian organizations than in organizations in other cultures. A training and development intervention could be designed influence middle managers' preferability of organizational structure. However, a strong front end analysis would be necessary to determine the training objectives.

Another reason change should be carefully planned is based on Contingency Theory, as set forth by Woodward (1967) and Kobrerg (1988). Contingency Theory asserts that organizational structure should fit the situation. For some
organizations in some situations, a participative organizational structure may be the most productive; for other organizations in other situations, a more bureaucratic structure may be appropriate. Contingency Theory is therefore a kind of synthesis of other theories, and it seems to pay more attention to the actual circumstances of an organization than any of the other theories. In the researcher's opinion, it should be looked at closely by any organization interested in creating the most effective organizational structure.

The Relation of Organizational Structure to Size

On the basis of the results of this study, it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between organizational size and organizational structure in Iranian iron companies. As mentioned above, most Iranian iron companies have a System 3, Consultive organization, which has no relationship to the size of the company.

This is an interesting result, because it indicates that even large Iranian iron companies do not have a more hierarchical or authoritarian structure than small ones. The similarity of companies, regardless of size, could be related to the paternalistic/consultive cultural factor discussed above.
The Relation of Demographic Variables to Job Satisfaction

No significant relationships were found between any of the demographic variables and job satisfaction in this study. On the basis of this finding, it can be concluded that in Iranian iron companies, the type of work done by middle managers, their education, and their marital status have no significant relationship to their job satisfaction. It can also be concluded that whether middle managers in Iranian iron companies work in Tehran or in the suburbs of Tehran has no significant relationship to their job satisfaction. However, no conclusions can be made about the relationship of work location and job satisfaction for Iranian iron companies that are located beyond the suburbs of Tehran.

It is worth pointing out that some of the results concerning the relationship of demographic variables and job satisfaction suggest the need for further research in this area. Although differences in job satisfaction for the variables Type of Job and Education were not significant, they were large enough to indicate the value of repeating this part of the study with a larger sample. It would also be worthwhile for the companies involved to consider further investigation of these two variables and their relation to job satisfaction.
On the basis of the demographic results, a profile can be drawn of the most satisfied middle manager in Iranian iron companies. This middle manager is unmarried, has only a high school education, works in the suburbs of Tehran, and works in Production. The most dissatisfied middle manager, on the other hand, would be married, with no high school education, and he would work in Tehran in the Service area. Since no significant differences in job satisfaction were found for any of the variables, these profiles are made only to suggest factors that the companies might want to investigate if they conduct their own research on the job satisfaction of their middle managers.

**Recommendations For Future Research**

**Iranian Iron Industry**

The results of this study suggest several directions for further research that should be considered not only by the companies involved in this study but by other Iranian iron companies. By undertaking such research, companies can better understand their own internal structure and functioning, how organizational aspects affect the job satisfaction of this employees, and how both structure and employee job satisfaction are related to the company's objectives. The following recommendations are made for further research by Iranian iron companies themselves.
1. Because job satisfaction may affect job performance, those companies involved in this research where job satisfaction was low compared to other companies, and those where job satisfaction scores varied greatly, should take steps to determine the reasons for low job satisfaction responses. A systematic approach should be used to analyze performance problems associated with low and varying job satisfaction scores. A training professional should conduct the performance analysis.

2. Companies involved in this research should investigate the job satisfaction of employees in higher management. It is suggested that the Job Description Index be used so that results can be closely compared to results from the present study.

3. Other Iranian iron companies not involved in this research should investigate the job satisfaction of both middle and higher management employees. Again it is suggested that the Job Description Index be used for the sake of comparison of results with findings from the present study.

4. Iranian iron companies should seek to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity in their company.

5. Iranian iron companies should attempt to determine what type of organizational structure is preferred by
both middle and higher level managers, and implement management training programs that develop skills consistent with the desired organizational structure.

6. Iranian Iron companies should provide opportunities for middle managers without high school diploma to continue their education and training. Managers with no high school diploma had the lowest job satisfaction in this study.

7. Further research should be undertaken by the companies studied to determine why middle managers employed in service jobs had the lowest job satisfaction.

8. Since job satisfaction increases as organizational structure changes from more authoritative to more participative in Iranian iron companies, the companies should consider utilizing methods to change their organizational structure from System 2 and 3 to System 4 in order to increase job satisfaction. However, this should be done carefully, with middle management participation and training. These efforts could best be carried out in conjunction with Recommendations 4 and 5 above.

**Future Study**

The following recommendations are made for future studies:
1. The current study should be example to determine what training exists for middle managers in the companies studied and to determine if training is a factor contributing to the wide variation in job satisfaction among middle managers in IICs.

2. A study should be designed to determine the relationship between the consultive/paternalistic cultural element in Iran and the structure of Iranian organizations.

3. The effect of environmental factors including economic, political, and technological changes should be taken into consideration in future studies of organizational structure and job satisfaction in Iran.

4. Similar studies should take into account other variables related to the middle managers, including personality type and cultural background.

5. Similar studies should be conducted utilizing on Iranian organizations located in cities other than Tehran. In addition, other kinds of Iranian companies should be studied:
   (a) other industrial organizations, such as mining companies and farm implement companies;
   (b) companies that employ women as middle managers, such as chemical, medical, and garment companies.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL ENGLISH INSTRUMENTS

Section One

Profile of Organizational Structure

Please put (X) beside an item if the item describes the particular aspect of your organization.

1. How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
   A. ....Virtually none
   B. ....Some
   C. ....Substantial amount
   D. ....A great deal

2. How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?
   A. ....Not very free
   B. ....Somewhat free
   C. ....Quite free
   D. ....Very free

3. How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?
   A. ....Seldom
   B. ....Sometimes
   C. ....Often
   D. ....Very frequently

4. Is predominant use made of 1 fear, 2 threats, 3 punishment, 4 rewards, 5 involvement?
   A. ....1, 2, 3, occasionally 4
   B. ....4, some 3
   C. ....4, some 3 and 5
   D. ....5, 4, based on group-set goals

5. Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?
   A. ....Mostly at top
   B. ....Top and middle
   C. ....Fairly general
   D. ....At all level
6. How much cooperative teamwork exists?
A. ....Very little
B. ....Relatively little
C. ....Moderate amount
D. ....Great deal

7. What is the usual direction of information flow?
A. ....Downward
B. ....Mostly downward
C. ....Down and up
D. ....Down, up and sideways

8. How is downward communication accepted?
A. ....With suspicion
B. ....Possibly with suspicion
C. ....With caution
D. ....With a receptive mind

9. How accurate is upward communication?
A. ....Usually inaccurate
B. ....Often inaccurate
C. ....Often accurate
D. ....Almost always accurate

10. How well do superiors know problems faced by subordinates?
A. ....Not very well
B. ....Rather well
C. ....Quite well
D. ....Very well

11. At what level are decisions made?
A. ....Mostly at top
B. ....Policy at top, some delegation
C. ....Broad policy at top, more delegation
D. ....Throughout but well integrated

12. Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?
A. ....Almost never
B. ....Occasionally consulted
C. ....Generally consulted
D. ....Fully involved
13. What does the decision-making process contribute to motivation?
   A. .....Not very much
   B. .....Relatively little
   C. .....Some contribution
   D. .....Substantial contribution

14. How are organizational goals established?
   A. .....Order issued
   B. .....Orders, some comments invited
   C. .....After discussion, by orders
   D. .....By group action (except in crisis)

15. How much covert resistance to goal is present?
   A. .....Strong resistance
   B. .....Moderate resistance
   C. .....Some resistance at times
   D. .....Little or more

16. How concentrated are review and control functions?
   A. .....Very highly at top
   B. .....Quite highly at top
   C. .....Moderate delegation to lower levels
   D. .....Widely shared

17. Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?
   A. .....Yes
   B. .....Usually
   C. .....Sometimes
   D. .....No..same goals as formal

18. What are cost, productivity, and other data used for?
   A. .....Policing, punishment
   B. .....Reward, punishment
   C. .....reward some self-guidance
   D. .....Self-guidance, problem-solving
Section Two

Job Description Index

Please put Y (yes) beside an item if the item describes the particular aspect of your job (work, pay, etc), N (no) if the item does not describe that aspect, or ? if you can not decide.

WORK

....Fascinating
....Routine
....Satisfying
....Boring
....Good
....Tiresome
....Healthful
....Challenging
....On your feet

PAY

....Income adequate for normal expenses
....Satisfactory profit sharing
....Barely live on income
....Bad

SUPERVISION

....Ask my advice
....Hard to please
....Impolite
....Praises good work
....Tactful
....Influential
....Up-to-date

....Doesn't supervise enough
....Quick tempered

....Creative
....Respected
....Hot
....Pleasant
....Useful
....Frustrating
....Simple
....Endless
....Give sense of accomplishment

....Income provides luxuries
....Insecure

....Highly paid
....Less than I deserve

....Tells me where I stand
....Annoying
....Stubborn
....Knows job well
....Bad
....Intelligent
....Leaves me on my own
....Lazy
....Around when needed
PROMOTION

....Good opportunity for advancement
....Opportunity somewhat limited
....Promotion on ability
....Dead-end job
....Fairly good chance for promotion

CO-WORKERS

....Stimulating
....Boring
....Slow
....Ambitious
....Stupid
....Responsible
....Fast
....Intelligent
....Easy to make enemies

....Good chance for promotion
....Unfair promotion policy
....Infrequent promotion
....Regular promotions

....Talk too much
....Smart
....Lazy
....Unpleasant
....No privacy
....Active
....Narrow interests
....Loyal
....Hard to meet
Section Three

Demographic Section

1. What is the nature of your job?
   A. Production....
   B. Administration....
   C. Service....

2. What is your educational status?
   A. Under high school diploma....
   B. High school....
   C. Bachelor....
   D. Higher education....

3. Where is the location of your company?
   A. In Tehran.
   B. Out of Tehran.

4. Are you married?
   A. Yes....
   B. No....

5. You are ?
   A. Male....
   b. Female....
APPENDIX B.

BACK TRANSLATED INSTRUMENTS

Section One

Profile of Organizational Characteristic

1. How much confidence and trust is shown by the supervisors toward subordinates?
   A. In reality none....
   B. Some.....
   C. Substantial amount....
   D. A great deal....

2. How freely do the subordinates talk to their supervisors?
   A. Very little....
   B. little....
   C. Average....
   D. A lot....

3. In your work-place, to what extent are the subordinates' ideas and feedback implemented?
   A. Seldom....
   B. Sometime....
   C. Often....
   D. Always....

4. What kind of policy do the supervisors most frequently use to control the subordinates' behaviors? 1- fear 2- threat 3- punishment 4- reward or 5- participation in decision making?
   A. 1,2,3 and 4....
   B. 4 sometimes 3....
   C. 4 sometimes 3 and 5....
   D. 4 and 5 based on group set goals....

5. Which part of the organization is held responsible for achieving organizational goals?
   A. Mostly at top....
   B. At top and middle level....
   C. Relatively all of the levels....
   D. All levels....
6. How much cooperation is there in your work-place?
   A. Very little....
   B. Relatively little....
   C. Moderate.....
   D. A lot....

7. What is the direction of the flow of information in your work-place?
   A. Downward....
   B. Usually downward....
   C. Up and down....
   D. Up, down and sideways....

8. How do the subordinates accept the supervisors' communication?
   A. With suspicion....
   B. Little suspicion....
   C. With caution....
   D. With a receptive mind....

9. How accurate is the upward communication?
   A. Usually not correct or exact....
   B. Often not correct or exact....
   C. Often correct and exact....
   D. Almost always correct and exact....

10. How well do supervisors know about the work related problems of their subordinates?
    A. Not very well....
    B. Relatively well....
    C. Well....
    D. Very well....

11. At what level of organization are the decisions made?
    A. Mostly at the top....
    B. Policies at top but some authority has been delegated to subordinates....
    C. General policies at top but lot of authority has been delegated to subordinates....
    D. At all level of organization and well integrated....
12. Are the subordinates involved in decisions affecting their work?
   A. Almost never....
   B. Occasionally consulted....
   C. Generally consulted....
   D. Fully involved....

13. To what extent do the decisions contribute to employee motivation?
   A. Not very much....
   B. Relatively little....
   C. Some contribution....
   D. Substantial contribution....

14. How are organizational goals established?
   A. By orders....
   B. Some comments are invited, by orders....
   C. After discussion, by orders....
   D. By group participation, cooperation, and corporation....

15. How much hidden resistance is there toward organizational goals?
   A. Strong resistance....
   B. Moderate resistance....
   C. Some resistance ....
   D. Little or no ....

16. In your work environment, how concentrated are control and review function, and who does them?
   A. Very highly concentrated at top ....
   B. Highly concentrated at top....
   C. To some extent delegated to lower level....
   D. Widely decentralized and shared by every body ....

17. Is there any resistance from your colleagues toward the organizational decisions and policies?
   A. Yes ....
   B. Usually ....
   C. Sometimes .....
   D. No ....
18. What information such as cost or productivity is used in the organization?

A. Control and punishment ....
B. Reward and punishment ....
C. Reward and guidance ....
D. Guidance and problem solving ....
Section Two

Job Description Index

Please answer all the questions.

Questions About Your Job:

1. It is fascinating job.
2. It is routine.
3. It is satisfying.
4. It is boring.
5. It is a good job.
6. Induces employees' creativity.
7. It is respected job.
8. It is an exciting job.
9. It is a pleasant job.
10. It is an useful job.
11. It is a hard, boring, and tedious job.
12. It is a healthy job and does not make one depressed nor physically ill.
13. It is a job which motivates you to be activate and more productive.
14. You should be alert all the time.
15. It is a job that you can not finish.
16. It is a simple job.
17. It is an endless job.
18. It is a job that gives you a sense of success and fulfillment.

Questions About Your Salary:

1. My salary is enough for normal expenses.
2. I am satisfied with profit sharing of the organization.
3. Hardly afford my life.
4. My salary is bad.
5. I have made a luxury life with my salary.
6. I do not feel secured with this salary.
7. My salary is less than I deserve.
8. I have been highly paid.
9. I have been underpaid.

Questions About Promotion:

1. On my job there is good opportunity for promotion.
2. Opportunity for promotion is some what limited.
3. Criteria for promotion and advancement are based on abilities.
4. There is no opportunity for promotion.
5. There is good chance for promotion.
6. Organizational policies for promotion are unfair.
7.... Promotion seldom has been given.
8.... There is regular promotion.
9.... There are suitable chance for promotion.

Questions About Your Supervisor:

1.... My supervisor asks my advice in doing the job.
2.... He/she is hard to be pleased.
3.... He/she is an impolite person.
4.... He/she honors and praises a good job.
5.... He/she is diplomatic person.
6.... He/she is an influential person.
7.... He/she knows the latest technologies.
8.... He/she does not supervise enough.
9.... He/she is a quick tempered person.
10.... He/she tells me where I stand.
11.... He/she annoys me.
12.... He/she is a stubborn person.
13.... He/she knows his/her job well.
14.... He/she is a bad person.
15.... He/she is an intelligent person.
16.... He/she gives me freedom to do my job according to what I want to do.
17.... He/she is always available to solve problems.
18.... He/she is a lazy person.

Questions About Your Co-Workers:

1.... They inspire people.
2.... They are boring people.
3.... They are slow and dull people.
4.... They are ambitious people.
5.... They are stupid people.
6.... They are people who accept responsibility.
7.... They are fast people.
8.... They are intelligent people.
9.... They can easily make enemies.
10.... Talk too much.
11.... They are smart people.
12.... They are lazy people
13.... They are unpleasant people.
14.... They do not let you to have privacy.
15.... They are active people.
16.... They have limited interests.
17.... They are loyal and sincere people.
18.... In the new job they are difficult to know.
Section Three

Demographic Questions

1. What is the nature of your job?
   A. Production....
   B. Administration....
   C. Service....

2. What is your educational status?
   A. Under high school diploma....
   B. High school....
   C. Bachelor....
   D. Higher education....

3. Where is the location of your company?
   A. In Tehran.
   B. Out of Tehran.

4. Are you married?
   A. Yes....
   B. No....

5. You are?
   A. Male....
   b. Female....
APPENDIX C
FARSI INSTRUMENTS

نام هذا پرسشنامه ملی خمیصی پیروانی مسائل اداری و سازمانی و مسائل متکل به آن‌هاست. متأسفانه این نوع تحقیق که مسائل و مشکلات سازمانی را بصورت کامل ملی و بیطرفانه مورد بررسی قرار دهد ناکافی در بیشتر کشورهای جهان می‌باشد و بیشتر سکوی این موضوع خصوصاً در کشورهای ایران و اینگونه نگرانی‌ها سازمانی و ایفای راه حل‌های لازم کاملی ضروری و بی‌کننده است و بی‌نیتی و درک این موضوع نیست. در حالی که در کشورهای اساتید شیعه مانند ایران، مسئولیت‌های مختلف سازمانی و آزاد راه حل‌های لازم کاملی ضروری و بی‌کننده است. به‌همین‌رغم این‌که نگرانی‌ها و مشکلات موجود اغلب بیشتر در مورد مشکلات و سازمان‌های کشورهای ایران در پژوهش‌هایی داشت. به‌همین دلیل در این پرسشنامه چنین مسئولیت بررسی نظرات کارمندان این سازمان‌ها ویژه‌تر.

در پاسخ به سوالات توجه به نکات دیل از اهمیت ویژه ای برخودار است.

۱. سوالات این پرسشنامه مرکز شده در پرسشنامه سوالات دیگری نخواهد داشت.
۲. پرسشنامه طوری تنظیم شده که سوالات دنیای جامعه متغییر و کانکسیون باشد و هیچ‌کدام نیست و یا درست نیستند. بنابراین محل سوالات لازم باید باشد.
۳. بکی از اهداف این پرسشنامه‌ان است که نظرات ویژه ای در برگیرد، نه نظری که دیگران و یا افکار عمومی به آن معتقد.
۴. نگاه در سوالات یا بیش از همه جواب موافق‌های نیست و یا با هیچ‌کدام موافق‌نیست، لطفاً جواب‌های انتخاب کنید که بیشتر به نظر شما نزدیک‌تر است.
۵. ابتدای این پرسشنامه توانایی غرب‌های یعنی از مسائل سازمانی باشد، این ابتدای ظرفیت این جامعه اداری کشورهای کردنه باشد. بنابراین یک قلمونه تغییر این است که در پاسخ به سوالات یک دقت و حوصله لازم را مبادله دارید.

با کمال احترام و تشکر
قسمت اول
سوالات زیر مربوط به اوضاع فعلی محیط کار شیست. هر سوال دارای چهار جواب است، خواهندشد.

1. در محیط کار شیا اهداف سازمان بطور گروهی تصویب می‌شود؟
   - هیچکدام
   - هیچ
   - پنتارت
   - بعضی مواقع
   - هیچیک

سوالات:
1. در محل کار شیا چقدر ابتدا و اطمینان نسبت به زیرساخت‌تان داشتید؟
   - هیچ
   - پنتارت
   - بعضی موارد
   - بعضی مواقع
   - هیچ

2. کارمندان چه‌چه به راحتی با سرپرست یا رئیس خود در مورد کاربرد صحت می‌کنند؟
   - کم
   - متوسط
   - بالا
   - متوسط
   - کم

3. در محل کار شیا چه‌چه حضور و مقایسه زیرساخت‌تان مورد استفاده قرار گرفته‌اید؟
   - کم
   - متوسط
   - بالا
   - بعضی مواقع
   - هیچ

4. سرپرستان برای کنترل اعمال زیرساخت‌تان نالگاهی از کدام یک از مواد زیر استفاده می‌کنند: ترس، تهید، تنیه، پدشی، یا به هیئاری و هیکاری طلیبدن انری؟
   - ترس
   - تنیه
   - پدشی
   - هیئاری
   - هیکاری

5. برای نیل به اهداف سازمانی کدام قسمت از سازمان مسئول شناخته می‌شود؟
   - رأس سازمان
   - رأس سازمان و سطوح مبنی
   - نسبتاً تمام سطوح
   - تمام سطوح

6. زیرساخت‌تان نامعلوم شده‌است؟
   - کم
   - متوسط
   - بالا
   - بعضی مواقع
   - هیچ
6. در محل کار شما چقدر هکری کروهی وجود دارد؟

- خیلی کم
- نسبتاً کم
- متوسط
- خیلی زیاد

7. جریان حرکت اطلاعات در محل کارتان بچه صورت است؟

- هیچ‌یک از بالا به پایین
- معقولاً از بالا به پایین
- از بالا به پایین و از پایین به بالا
- از بالا به پایین، از پایین به بالا و بصورت اتفاقی

8. مکان‌های و اطلاعات مدیران چگونه و با چه حالی مورد قبول زیربستگی واقع می‌شود؟

- با به کامپیوتر و سوئیچ
- با کم‌سوئیچ
- ممتا‌سوئیچ
- با فکر بای

9. گزارشات، مکان‌های و اطلاعات که به مقامات بالا داده می‌شوند تا چه حد دقیق و صادق هستند؟

- هیچ‌یک نادرست
- بعضی مواقع نادرست
- معمولاً صادق
- تغییری به هیچ‌یک صادق

10. تا چه حد سیرپستگی به مشکلات اداری و کاری زیربستگان آگاه هستند؟

- آگاهی چندانی ندارند
- نسبتاً آگاه هستند
- آگاه هستند
- خیلی آگاه هستند

11. در چه سطحی از سازمان تصمیمات گرفته می‌شود؟

- معمولاً در بالای سازمان
- خط مشی‌ها در بالای سازمان گرفته می‌شود و معاصر اختیارات به زیربستگان تفویض
- سیاست‌های کلی در بالای سازمان گرفته می‌شود و اختیارات زیادی به زیربستگان تفویض
- شده است

12. میزان تصرفات در تهیه سطوح و بصورت هکری و هیباری گروهی انجام می‌گیرد

- نگران یا خطرگز در دلخت ندارند
- کاه گامه مورد مشورت فرار می‌گیرند
- میزانی مورد مشورت فرار می‌گیرند
- کامل دلخت هستند
13. چه جد تصمیم گیرهای سازمانی در ایجاد انگیزه، تحکیم و فعالیت بیشتر کارشناسان موثر است?

- خیلی کم موثر است
- نسبتاً کم موثر است
- متوسط موثر است
- تأثیر قابل توجهی دارد

14. اهداف در سازمان چگونه به افراد تغییر می‌شود (چگونه اهداف در سازمان جا می‌افتند؟)

- بوسیله فرم‌های ابلاغ می‌شوند
- با مقداری نظر خواهی از افراد بصورت فرم‌های ابلاغ می‌شوند
- بعد از گفتگو و مذاکره با افراد بصورت فرم‌های ابلاغ می‌شوند
- بوسیله نباید نظر هیکاری، و همیاری گروهی ایتالی بجز در مواقع بحرانی

15. در سازمان چه تجدید مفاهمت و موضع‌گیری به‌نفع نسبت به اهداف سازمان موجود دارد؟

- متقاعد گردید است
- متقاعد متوسط است
- متقاعد کمتر از متوسط است
- متقاعد کم است و با وجود ندارد

16. در محل کار شما چگونه بوسیله به اشتراک انجام می‌گیرد و چه حد متکلم است؟

- بوصورت خیلی متکلم و در بالای سازمان
- کم متکلم و در بالای سازمان
- این چیزهای تا حد امتدادی به سطح بالا چیزی نیست سازمان تفویض نشده است
- این وظیفه باصورت خیلی متکلم انجام می‌گیرد و بطور وسع‌تر در گان شرکت دارد

17. آیا متفاوتی از طرف افراد نسبت به مصوبات، آئین نامه، و ابزارهای مؤسسه وجود دارد؟

- هیچ چیز بله
- ممکن است بله
- بهتر بله
- نه

18. اطلاعات از قبیل مقدار تولید، هزینه‌های موجود، و دیگر شاخص‌ها به چه منظور در سازمان و یا مؤسسه‌ها استفاده می‌شوند؟

- منظور کنترل و تنظیم افراد
- منظور کنترل و یا تشغیق افراد
- منظور تشغیق و راهنمای افراد
- منظور راهنمایی و مشکل‌گذاری افراد
سوالات این بخش تصویر جملات سیاسی کوتاه مطرح شده است، خواهانید است که در مقابل سوالی که با آن موافق هستید کلمه "آ ن" و یا حرف "آ" را بنویسید، و در مقابل سوالی که با آن موافق نیستید کلمه "خیر" و یا علامت "ع" را مرقوم بگرماهید، و چنانچه در مورد سوال نظر قاطع و خاصی ندارید در مقابل آن ملامت "د" را بگنارید. لطفاً به تمام سوالات پاسخ دهید.

سوالات مربوط به حقوق شما:

1. کار جدایی است.
2. کار پیگیری و مادی است.
3. کاریست رضایت بخش.
4. کاریست کمل کننده.
5. کار خویش است.
6. کاریست که موجب خلافیت در افراد میشود.
7. کاریستنشری.
8. کاریست هیجان آور.
9. کاریست مطبوع و بیشتر.
10. کاریست میخ و سودمند.
11. کاریست سخت و خسته کننده.
12. کارسالی است و موجب ناخوشی جسمی و روحی نی شود.
13. کاریست که در آن شما تشوندی می شوید که عالی و جاری پیشگاه بیشتر باشید.
14. کاریست که در آن مبایست دالم گوش بزنگ باشید.
15. کاریست نام نشته.
16. کار ساده است.
17. کاریست که پایان ندارد.
18. کاریست که در آن احساس کارآمدی و شایستگی میکنید (احساس اینکه کار را با موقعیت و شایستگی انجام داده‌اید).

سوالات مربوط به حقوق شما:
سوالات مربوط به پیشرفت و ترقی:

1. در کار من شرايط و امکانات خویی برای پیشرفت و ترقی وجود دارد.
2. امکان ارتقاع و ترقی تا اندازه ای محدود شده است.
3. ضوابط ترقی و پیشرفت بر اساس توافقات و لیاقت افراد تعیین شده است.
4. امکان درخواست برای ترقی و وجود ندارد.
5. شرایط خوب برای ترقی وجود دارد.
6. قوانین و ضوابط در مورد ترقی و تشییع نهاده همکاری می‌باشد.
7. ترقی بندی داده می‌شود.
8. ترقی مادي داده می‌شود.
9. شرایط مساعد و مناسب برای پیشرفت و ترقی وجود دارد.

سوالات مربوط به سیورست شما:

1. سیرستا برای انجام کارها با من مشورت می‌کنند.
2. آماد یا هیچ است.
3. آماد یا هیچ است.
4. آماد یا هیچ است.
5. آماد یا هیچ است.
6. آماد یا هیچ است.
7. آماد یا هیچ است.
8. آماد یا هیچ است.
9. آماد یا هیچ است.
10. آماد یا هیچ است.
11. آماد یا هیچ است.
12. آماد یا هیچ است.
13. آماد یا هیچ است.
14. آماد یا هیچ است.
15. آماد یا هیچ است.
16. آماد یا هیچ است.
17. آماد یا هیچ است.
18. آماد یا هیچ است.

سوالات مربوط به هگران:

1. هگرانه آماده روح و روحی می‌باشند.
2. آمدا هیچ کسی گمان نمی‌کند.
3. آمدا هیچ کسی گمان می‌کند.
4. آمدا هیچ کسی گمان می‌کند.
قسمت سوم

1. نوع کار شیا؟
   — تولیدی
   — اداری
   — خدمات

2. محل کار شیا؟
   — در تهران
   — خارج از تهران

3. سلخ تحصیلات شیا؟
   — زیر دیپلم
   — دیپلم
   — لیسانس
   — بالاتر از لیسانس

4. وضعیت تاهل شیا؟
   — مجرد
   — متاهل

5. نوع جنسیت؟
   — گذا
   — خانم