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The central theme of this study is to survey and critically examine existing Saudi Arabian Airlines (Saudia) Management Development Programs (MDPs) in order to determine which areas of the current programs must be given priority and greater emphasis at Saudia, as well as to ascertain MDP's effects on managers, staff managers, and supervisors.

The purposes of this study are (1) to review and evaluate the progress made in managerial development at Saudia from 1972 to 1977 in terms of objectives and effectiveness, and (2) to explore the development of Saudia's managerial needs. The criteria used in this analysis are based upon managerial effectiveness.

Personal interviews were conducted with 33 Saudia top executives (vice-presidents and general managers) to ascertain their views on MDP. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and the Supervisory Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (SBDQ) by Edwin E. Fleishman, the Minnesota Satisfactoriness Scales (MSS) by Dennis L.
Gibson, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) by Patricia Cain Smith, and individual questionnaires developed to fit Saudi Arabian culture and circumstances were used to evaluate the airline's managerial talent and individual reactions to MDP. Data were obtained from questionnaires distributed to 130 managers, staff managers, and supervisors available in Jeddah at the time the research was being carried out. Of these questionnaires, 112 were returned, of which 99 were valid, submitted by 70 managers, 18 staff managers, and 11 supervisors. Analysis of variance was used for a number of variables related to the respondents' leadership, education, tenure, and participation in Saudia's Management Development Programs. Selected groups were compared with each other; a .05 level of significance was employed in all comparisons.

Although scattered significant differences appeared in some of the data presented in this study, no specific patterns were found among these differences, and it appeared that MDP could not produce any change in the behavior of those managers, staff managers, and supervisors who participated in it. This was a clear indication that MDP was far from achieving its objectives. Several factors contributed to this result, including misunderstanding of Saudi Arabian culture and circumstances; lack of support from top management; lack of manpower
analysis; lack of cooperation, coordination, and communication between the training department and other departments at Saudia; lack of formal plans for management succession; and other reasons related directly to MDP. In addition, there was no formal evaluation and sequence of MDP programs, and programs were imported rather than developed for Saudia's particular needs and problems. MDP programs were dispersed, minimizing their emphasis and impact on Saudia managers, and evaluation and follow-up of MDP were ineffective.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Saudi Arabian Airlines (Saudia) was established in 1946 as a government corporation. It had become apparent to the Saudi Arabian government that in a large country with such long distances between its cities and with an almost complete lack of paved roads, an airline was necessary as a means of establishing a transportation network to link the cities of the kingdom. Saudia began its operations in 1947 with all services and maintenance being handled under contract with Trans World Airlines (TWA). From that time to the present, there have been many stages in the historical growth of the airline (3, pp. 1, 2).

The conditions under which TWA operated Saudia in the past were different from those under which it operated its own company. TWA operated Saudia under different circumstances and in a different environment; it dealt with employees who differed from its own not only in their nationality, standards, and language, but also in their perceptions, problems, social traditions, extent of enthusiasm, and ambitions. In view of these conditions, the need for a switch from direct execution and decision-making to supervision and guidance became apparent to Saudia.
The direct execution of work and the decision-making were transferred to a group of specially selected and trained Saudi employees who were to occupy a number of positions in the management structure (5, p. 12). From this concept Saudization appears to be the best solution. Saudization is a major long-term objective meaning total nationalization of the jobs or the transfer of all functions and responsibilities now being held by foreign nationals to Saudis. But the achievement of total Saudization is one thing, and the establishment of a core of Saudi national management is something else again (4, p. 2).

Extensive Management Development Programs (MDP) have been established to qualify Saudi managers, staff managers, and supervisors for their increasing role in Saudia management operations. These MDP programs emphasize education, refinement, and appropriate skills necessary to meet the standards of management responsibilities (5, p. 20).

Background and Need for Study

Saudi Arabia is a developing country with an abundance of oil and a number of national development goals necessitated by the transition to a modern society and economic base. The government and the people work hard to achieve these goals and to utilize their wealth wisely in developing their country.
With the exception of oil and mineral resources, Saudi Arabia is an importing country. Almost everything is imported, especially foods which require fast transportation and special care.

The lifetime goal for the more than half-billion Muslims across the world is the pilgrimage to Mecca, regarded as the ideal culmination of religious experience. Every year brings hundreds of thousands of the faithful to Saudi Arabia. This creates a great responsibility for Saudia to provide service to the major Muslim population centers throughout the world and to develop a means of increasing the utilization of its long-range fleet.

The members of the work force that was generated during Saudia's expansion period and which exists today vary greatly in qualifications, experience, nationality, and both technical and academic education. The Saudi part of this work force varies greatly in age, motivation, and desire to be trained. It is the product of hiring employees over a period of thirty years without defined employment and development criteria. But even had these criteria been available it would not have been possible for Saudia to have staffed its organization without bringing in a large number of foreigners (3, p. 2).

An airline is one of the most sensitive and sophisticated of industries, notably because of its involvement
with safety of human life. An airline, therefore, requires especially talented managers not only from the standpoint of technical skill, intelligence, and work aptitude, but also from the standpoint of possessing a good sense of responsibility, organization, and self-discipline. These additional requirements make it even more difficult for Saudia to find properly qualified Saudi managers (5, p. 13).

The nature of the airline industry throughout the world requires managers and employees to be able to speak, read, and write the English language. There are no reference materials in the industry written in Arabic, and, even if such materials were available, Saudia employees would still be compelled to deal in English to a large extent because of the airline's close relations with international organizations and companies (3, p. 3).

The rapid expansion of the Saudia network and the extension for its services to enter the European and United States markets where competition is very keen have necessitated the recruitment of additional foreign employees. This trend not only increases the scope of the nationalization program but also makes it more urgent.

The Saudization objective seems to become even more difficult in light of these trends. The acceleration of nationalizing Saudia jobs occupied by foreigners encounters
more obstacles when demand for trained manpower throughout the kingdom is increasing due to the rapid expansion of all industry (4, p. 4).

The Board of Directors of Saudia initiated its Saudization program after the issuance of a royal decree in 1965; this program is intended to prepare Saudis to perform the functional, technical, and administrative and commercial jobs which are essential to the operation of the airline. Considerable progress has been made in developing an adequate air transport system in Saudi Arabia in recent years, but this system needs continuing emphasis in order to maintain acceptable levels of proficiency.

Saudia has a number of goals related to the training and development of its managers:

1. To operate the airline as a commercial entity and achieve financial independence from the government.

2. To contribute to the development of a national communication system by providing efficient scheduled and charter air service within the kingdom (5, p. 4).

3. To develop a cadre of Saudi nationals skilled in the use of modern air transportation techniques and capable of progressing with technological advances in equipment and methods.

4. To carry at least half the international traffic originating or terminating within the kingdom.
5. To maintain leadership in technological progress in the air transport industry.

6. To play a dominant role in developing new and better ways to serve the air traveling public in the Middle East (1, p. 198).

Purpose of the Study

The general purposes of this study are to survey and critically examine the existing Saudia Management Development Programs to determine which areas of the current programs must be given priority and greater emphasis, and to recommend ways and means of meeting Saudia's future managerial needs in the light of the socio-economic goals of Saudi Arabia.

The specific purposes of the study are as follows:

1. To review and evaluate the progress made in managerial development from 1972 to 1977 in terms of objectives and effectiveness.

2. To explore the development of Saudia managers' needs. The general criteria used in this analysis are based upon individual and group effectiveness, achievement, and the ability to assume responsibility—or, in other words, managerial effectiveness.
3. In the light of the findings and analysis, to prepare a framework for managerial development and to propose a conceptual model. It is hoped that this framework or model will offer alternative solutions and provide suggestions as to how such a framework or model can be applied and executed at Saudia.

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to 99 managers, staff managers, and supervisors of Saudi Arabian Airlines, located in Jeddah.

Procedure and Methodology

The research for this study was conducted at Saudia during the three-month period from April to July of 1977. Interviews were conducted, questionnaires were administered, and additional data were obtained by informal observation.

Relevant data on the Management Development Programs in Saudia, such as statistics, policies, and decrees pertinent to the role of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors, were obtained from company records and publications. Personal interviews were conducted with thirty-three top executives--vice-presidents and general managers--to ascertain their views. Questionnaires were used to evaluate Saudia managerial talents and reactions to various Management Development Programs. These data were obtained
from the questionnaires distributed to the population of this study, i.e., all managerial personnel available at the time of data collection, or 130 of approximately 150 individuals. Of the 130 questionnaires distributed, 112 were returned; 99 were usable, submitted by 70 managers, 18 staff managers, and 11 supervisors.

In-depth personal interviews were conducted to establish a basic mutual understanding and trust with vice-presidents and general managers. This encouraged frank answers to questions and hopefully contributed to obtaining more reliable data on their views with respect to Saudia's Management Development Programs as they affect managers, staff managers, and supervisors. In these interviews, sixteen items covering three major topic areas were discussed (see Appendix A).

Five questionnaires were administered to the managers, staff managers, and supervisors. These are described below.

1. Leadership Opinion Questionnaires (LOQ; see Appendix B), administered to each manager, staff manager, and supervisor in the study group).

2. Supervisory Behavior Descriptive Questionnaires (SBDQ; see Appendix C), administered to subordinates of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors in the study group.

3. Minnesota Satisfactoriness Scales (MSS; see Appendix D), administered to supervisors of each manager, staff manager, and supervisor in the study group. In
most cases these questionnaires were completed by two super-

4. Job Descriptive Index (JDI; see Appendix E), completed by all managers, staff managers, and supervisors in the study group.

5. Individual questionnaires relating to Saudia's Management Development Programs (see Appendix F), completed by all managers, staff managers, and supervisors in the study group.

All respondents (vice-presidents, general managers, managers, staff managers, and supervisors) were encouraged to be anonymous in filling out the questionnaires so that they could answer questions freely and honestly and provide accurate information.

A presentation made to all managers, staff managers, and supervisors gave them the information they needed to answer any questions they did not understand. The purpose of the study was explained to them, the questionnaires were distributed, and the questions were read to the participants. The major problem covering the main idea of the written questionnaires was discussed, bearing in mind the comparison between the oral discussion and the written answers. Arabic translations of the interview questions and of the other five questionnaires were distributed with the original copies in English to help clarify questions
and decrease the possibility of misinterpretation. All vice-presidents and general managers had no difficulty in English; and some of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors had little difficulty, but generally the translations were very helpful.

This pattern of interviews descended from top management—the vice-president or general manager—after introduction to the managers, staff managers, and supervisors encouraged them to give their full cooperation. With this method all departments of Saudia were covered.

Interviews with some of the vice-presidents and general managers were repeated at the end of the survey as necessary to assure the accuracy of the information obtained.

A problem developed in gathering relevant publications, documents, reports, and statistics, since many of the reports relating to Saudia's operations are confidential. Because of this restriction, many officials were either hesitant to provide assistance or asked that reports not be quoted nor the officials' names mentioned. In spite of these difficulties, however, sufficient data were gathered for the purposes of this analysis. It is believed that most personnel spoke freely and honestly regarding their views of Saudia's Management Development Programs.
Plan of the Study

The ultimate purpose of this study is to examine thoroughly Saudia's existing Management Development Programs to evaluate their progress between 1972 and 1977 and to determine which programs should be given priority and greater emphasis. To achieve these objectives, the study is divided into several chapters.

In the introductory chapter, a statement of the problem, the need for study, the purpose of the study, the limitation of the study, the procedure and methodology, and the definition of terms are given.

Chapter II presents, first, a general background of a macro approach to the manpower assessment of Saudi Arabia; second, historical background information about Saudi Arabian Airlines and the share of Saudia's responsibility in the five-year plan of Saudi Arabia from 1975 to 1980; and, third, the historical background of Management Development Programs from 1972 to 1977 and the implementation of these programs.

Chapter III presents executive perspectives about manpower planning for succession and Saudization efforts, Management Development Programs and the techniques used for management training and development, and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors.
Chapter IV reports the analysis of data gathered from the questionnaires given to the members of the study group and evaluates the progress made in managerial development from 1972 to 1977 in terms of objectives and effectiveness.

Chapter V presents a summary of the research, its findings, and the conclusions drawn from the study, as well as indications for further research possibilities.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined in order to facilitate the understanding of this study:

- AFME--American Friends of Middle East
- Kingdom--Saudi Arabia as a country
- LT--Leadership Training
- MBO--Management by Objectives
- MDP--Management Development Programs
- PADS--Performance Appraisal and Development System
- SA--Saudi Arabia
- Saudia--Saudi Arabian Airlines
- Saudis--Saudi Arabian nationals or citizens
- Saudi riyals--monetary unit of Saudi Arabia (one dollar equals 3½ riyals)
- ST--Supervisory Training
- TMM--Techniques of Modern Management
- TWA--Trans World Airlines
Saudi Fiscal and Hijra Year Dates and Gregorian Equivalents

The following conversion of Hijra and Gregorian dates will also be useful in understanding this study.

**TABLE I-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saudi Fiscal Year (1 Rajab to 30 Jumad II)</th>
<th>Starts on*</th>
<th>Hijra Year</th>
<th>Starts on*</th>
<th>Hijra Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1385-1386</td>
<td>25 Oct 1965</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1 May 1965</td>
<td>Muharram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386-1387</td>
<td>16 Oct 1966</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>21 Apr 1966</td>
<td>Safar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388-1389</td>
<td>23 Sep 1968</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>30 Mar 1968</td>
<td>Rabi II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389-1390</td>
<td>12 Sep 1969</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>19 Mar 1969</td>
<td>Jumad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jumad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390-1391</td>
<td>2 Sep 1970</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>9 Mar 1970</td>
<td>Rajab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391-1392</td>
<td>22 Aug 1971</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>26 Feb 1971</td>
<td>Shaban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392-1393</td>
<td>10 Aug 1972</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>15 Feb 1972</td>
<td>Ramadhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393-1394</td>
<td>30 Jul 1973</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>4 Feb 1973</td>
<td>Shawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394-1395</td>
<td>19 Jul 1974</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>23 Jan 1974</td>
<td>Dhul-Qi'dah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dhul-Hijjah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395-1396</td>
<td>9 Jul 1975</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>13 Jan 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396-1397</td>
<td>28 Jun 1976</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>2 Jan 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397-1398</td>
<td>16 Jun 1977</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>22 Dec 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398-1399</td>
<td>6 Jun 1978</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>11 Dec 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399-1400</td>
<td>26 May 1979</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>30 Nov 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1401</td>
<td>15 May 1980</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>19 Nov 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401-1402</td>
<td>4 May 1981</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>9 Nov 1980</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402-1403</td>
<td>23 Apr 1982</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>28 Oct 1981</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403-1404</td>
<td>12 Apr 1983</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>17 Oct 1982</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404-1405</td>
<td>2 Apr 1984</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>7 Oct 1983</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405-1406</td>
<td>22 Mar 1985</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>27 Sep 1984</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406-1407</td>
<td>11 Mar 1986</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>27 Sep 1985</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407-1408</td>
<td>28 Feb 1987</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>4 Sep 1986</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE I-1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saudi Fiscal Year (1 Rajab to 30 Jumad II)</th>
<th>Hijra Year</th>
<th>Gregorian Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starts on*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408-1409</td>
<td>17 Feb 1988</td>
<td>24 Aug 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409-1410</td>
<td>7 Feb 1989</td>
<td>14 Aug 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dates are approximate for future years.
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CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT
IN SAUDI ARABIAN AIRLINES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide background information Saudi Arabian culture and manpower planning, Saudi Arabian Airlines (Saudia), and the development of Saudia's management and management development programs.

Saudi Arabia is a unified plateau occupying four-fifths of the Arabian Peninsula; its area is estimated at about 865,000 square miles (21, p. xii). The surface is mainly desert, and the population is scattered among a few cities in the eastern and western areas, making air transportation essential for this vast country.

Reliable data on the population are not publicly available. The population estimates fluctuate between 7 million and 3.2 million; where one publication gave 7 million, another gave 5.6 million, a third gave 4.7 million, and a fourth gave 3.2 million (10, p. 1). These widely varying figures make any economic developmental plan unreliable. As some officials have observed, the problem of making an accurate population count is complicated by the fact that perhaps one-third of the population
are shepherds and live nomadic lives, moving from one place to another in search of water and green grass.

No accurate census of foreigners existed in Saudi Arabia in early 1978. Some statistics suggested that their numbers are about twice those of the Saudi population; other statistical data suggested that foreigners are equal to the Saudis in number—which seems probable—or perhaps fewer.

Saudi Arabia is the land of Islam (submission to the will of God), the most unifying force in the country. It permeates all aspects of the life of all citizens. This includes society, family, government, politics, economics, the observance of daily prayers, fasting during the Muslim month of Ramadhan, abstinence from alcohol and gambling, making the pilgrimage to Mecca, total reliance on God, assisting the needy in the name of God, the high value placed on kinship ties and family honor, the strict punishment of theft and adultery, and the relative absence of social differentiation among the people. All of these aspects of life have been sanctioned by Islam and deeply inculcated in Muslim society.

The two holiest Muslim cities are located in Saudi Arabia. The first one is the Holy Mecca, the location of the Kaaba, the sacred shrine to which Muslims from all around the world have for centuries annually repaired during the pilgrimage season. The second is Medina,
where the prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him) lived and preached. Saudi Arabia thus serves as both the servant of Islam's holiest places and as the administrator of its most sacred rites. Islam itself was revealed to the prophet Mohammed by Gabriel from God in this virgin land. Thus the inhabitants of this country are more intimately bound to the faith than any other people on earth. All permanent residents of Saudi Arabia are adherents of Islam (21, p. 105).

Hence, the members of the government of Saudi Arabia consider themselves to be the servants of the Holy Places and of Muslims not only in their land but in all the lands around the world. Thus, Saudi Arabian Airlines has an essential responsibility for keeping and maintaining the transportation service between Saudi Arabia and all the Muslim world at the highest possible standard.

Saudi Arabian Airlines has several different problems apart from those of any other airlines in the world. The first and most important problem is to provide facilities and services during several seasons each year at specific times for all Muslims. The large number of individuals making pilgrimages and visitations to Mecca and Medina require exceptions demands on Saudia resources.

The second problem is the movement of the government in the summer every year for about three months--June,
July, and August. Saudia is responsible for moving all these people in a very short time, which interrupts the airline's usual schedule and puts unusual demands on the facilities and equipment.

The third problem is the influx of foreigners into Saudi Arabia in unusual numbers to help implement and complete the country's five-year plans. As noted above, according to some estimates, the foreigners in Saudi Arabia now outnumber the Saudi residents by about two to one or are at least equal in numbers to the native population of Saudi Arabia.

The fourth problem is the huge number of foreign teachers who come to Saudi Arabia from all around the world at a specific time, in August and September, and also leave at a specific time, in May and June.

Brief History of Saudi Arabian Airlines

Saudi Arabian Airlines (Saudia) began its operations in 1945 with three DC-3's, flying irregularly between Riyadh, Jeddah, and Dhahran. In 1963 it became a government corporation and initiated its air cadet programs to train Saudi nationals as pilots and airline executives. At this time Saudi also purchased two Boeing 720 jets (12, p. 3).

Saudi Arabia issued a royal decree number M/24 in October of 1965 to organize the corporation and to require
training for all employees. The royal decree read, in part, "Establishment and organization of institutions and private schools for practical education for flight operations, aviation, and employee training within its objectives, with the aim of preparing Saudis to perform their functional, technical, and administrative and commercial jobs which are in its purpose" (19, p. 5).

The Saudi Arabian government initiated its first Five-Year Development Plan for the period 1970-1975 to modernize and speed the growth and development of the country. Among the biggest constraints in implementing the first five-year plan was the transportation system (5, p. l). The second five-year plan, for the period 1975-1980, contained numerous general social goals similar to the first plan, but with some specifics reflecting the large funds available to the government. Some of these social goals included, for example, the beginning of free medical services, interest free loans as subsidies for family purchase of houses, free education and vocational training, and the like.

Both the government and Saudia have five-year plans. Saudia initiated its five-year plan (1975-1980) parallel to the government's plan, followed by the updated plan for 1980-1985. The Saudi plans reflect the increase of
its passengers, its financial expenditures, its human resource requirements, and its fleet.

In 1972, Saudia's services reached 49 cities in three continents, including a domestic jet network linking 20 major centers in Saudi Arabia. From that time to the present, there have been many stages in the historical growth of the airline connected with its financial resources, its fleet, its domestic and international services, and its manpower. These stages are briefly explained below (12, p. 4).

1. Financial resources: When it began its operation in 1945, Saudi Arabian Airlines was totally dependent on the government's annual subsidy. No subsidy has been allocated to Saudia for the fiscal years subsequent to 1974, however. Table II-1 shows the financial statistics for Saudia between 1970 and 1979.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Profit/Loss</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>78.69</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>19.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>86.94</td>
<td>77.71</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>93.17</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>138.23</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II-1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Profit/Loss</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>210.80</td>
<td>217.54</td>
<td>(6.74)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>419.14</td>
<td>365.57</td>
<td>(29.40)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>515.49</td>
<td>563.23</td>
<td>(47.74)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>671.71</td>
<td>660.11</td>
<td>(11.60)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>744.86</td>
<td>670.51</td>
<td>(17.20)</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE II-2

PROJECTED BUDGET INCREASES
IN SAUDIA FIVE-YEAR PLANS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Estimates (Millions)</th>
<th>Budget Request (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$2,204.57</td>
<td>$3,297.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,976.00</td>
<td>4,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3,868.59</td>
<td>6,447.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4,836.00</td>
<td>8,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>5,803.14</td>
<td>9,672.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>6,673.71</td>
<td>11,122.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In accordance with the rapid expansion in Saudi Arabia as a whole and with Saudia's five-year plans, a change is apparent in the projections in 1979. A substitution was made for the last plan, which was 2,607 million riyals.
($744.86), in the form of an increase to 7,716 million riyals ($2,204.57); the subsequent years' plans were changed accordingly (estimates). Budget requests are actually in excess of expected financial requirements.

The five-year plan of the government details the annual financial requirements of Saudia, as shown in Table II-3.

**TABLE II-3**

ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS OF SAUDIA FOR FINANCING DURING THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN (1975-1980)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Expenditures System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125.51</td>
<td>103.66</td>
<td>98.74</td>
<td>89.66</td>
<td>78.20</td>
<td>495.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit (Loss)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>39.74</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>51.71</td>
<td>183.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Requirements**</td>
<td>100.17</td>
<td>66.14</td>
<td>57.34</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>294.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In millions of dollars.
**Project expenditure less depreciation, less system profit and loss.

2. Saudia's fleet: The fleet grew dramatically from its original three DC-3's in 1945. Presently Saudia has a
fleets of 43 jet airliners. This includes eight Lockheed Tristars, eleven 707's/720's, and sixteen Boeing 737's, and leased aircraft including three Boeing 720's, two Boeing 727's, and three Boeing 747's. The fleet is expected to grow to fifty-five aircraft by 1980 (16, p. 19).

3. Domestic and international services: The number of Saudia's passengers grew from several thousand in 1945 to about one million in 1972. The number of passengers boarded in 1977 reached 4,800,000, according to the February 20, 1978, issue of Al Bilad newspaper. According to Saudia's plan, the fleet's passenger load is expected to reach 15,235,000 passengers at the end of 1984 (1, p. 2).

TABLE II-4

GROWTH OF SAUDIA'S PASSENGER LOAD FROM 1973 TO 1978*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II-5

ESTIMATED GROWTH OF SAUDIA'S PASSENGER LOAD FROM 1979 to 1984*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,229</td>
<td>9,124</td>
<td>10,949</td>
<td>12,591</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td>15,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4. Employees: Employment expanded from a handful in 1945 to about 4,006 in 1970. At the end of 1977, Saudia had 10,766 employees, a figure which is expected, according to the five-year corporate plans of Saudia, to reach about twenty thousand employees at the end of 1984. Tables II-6 and II-7 illustrate employee growth at Saudia.

TABLE II-6

GROWTH OF SAUDIA'S EMPLOYEES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>4,265</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>5,269</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>8,702</td>
<td>10,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II-7

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AS ESTIMATED
IN SAUDIA'S FIVE YEAR PLAN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>15,770</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates from Saudia's corporate plan.

Saudia's Objectives and Policies

The purpose of Saudi Arabian Airlines is to carry out all kinds of activities relating to civil and commercial air transportation within the kingdom and outside the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Saudia has many objectives and goals for the corporation and for employee training and management development (15, p. 4). These are summarized below.

1. Create and exemplify the highest public image of the country and the airline.
   a. Improve the quality and appearance of the airline's physical facilities and the apparel of its public contact personnel. Improve the quality of services and communication provided by Saudia.

2. Establish and monitor corporate standards for various operating functions relative to staffing, space needs, and equipment requirements.
3. Develop Saudi Arabians skilled in the use of modern airline techniques capable of progressing with advances in airline equipment and technology and of operating the airline to the highest standards of the industry.

   a. Establish specific on-the-job development and training programs for Saudi employees to enhance their present skills and prepare them for greater responsibility. Increase the number of Saudi management employees, without impairing the operational standards of the corporation, by a planned program of development and recruitment.

4. Maintain Saudia's position domestically and internationally as the chosen organization to meet Saudi Arabia's expanding needs for air transportation.

   a. Maintain a continuous review and assessment of the air transport needs of Saudi Arabia and the intentions of existing and potential competitors elsewhere in the world.

   b. Meet or exceed the forecast passenger-and-cargo kilometer targets which provide the basis for revenue forecasts and the fleet plan.

   c. Provide prompt and timely corporate response to changing conditions, demands, and competitive climate.
d. Stimulate the growth of Hajj (pilgrimage) air traffic and improve Saudia's participation in such traffic.

5. Develop and maintain an environment that will ensure the well-being of every Saudi employee and that meets competitive practices and moral standards and permits functional efficiency.

   a. Establish a medical care program for Saudia employees.

   b. Develop a retirement plan for Saudia pilots.

6. Maintain an operation free from the need for public service revenue.

   a. Reduce cost of available ton-kilometers.

   b. Increase revenue ton-kilometers.

   c. Remain constantly alert to possibilities for activating viable ancillary services.

7. Provide a cadre of competent personnel at all managing and operating levels for the present and future development and expansion of the airline.

   a. Establish and prescribe the required levels of qualifications/competency for all management positions.

   b. Establish a comprehensive and coordinated program for human resources acquisition and utilization and maintain the system of management by objectives throughout Saudia's management structure.
8. Conduct a safe and reliable operation in keeping with the highest industry standards.

   a. Improve station on-time performance to 95 per cent for domestic flights and 85 per cent for international flights.

   b. Improve operating reliability to scheduled plus five minutes for departures and scheduled plus fifteen minutes for arrivals.

   c. Improve existing safety standards and performance in all corporate operations.

In the above objectives and policies, items three and seven concentrate on the development of human resources (15, pp. 1-4).

Government Five-Year Plan (1975-1980)
Organization and Manpower Development

The Saudi Arabian government issued its second five-year plan for the country as a whole in 1975. This section concentrates on the Saudia manpower development which the government expects Saudia to achieve at the end of the plan (6, p. 465). The following objectives are those which appear in the five-year plan.

1. Saudia is to provide an organization and system for analyzing and determining manpower needs of the corporation, based on a special study to be conducted in 1975.
2. Saudia is to expand its management planning and programming system to all areas of management and train employees in its effective use as a management tool.

3. Saudia is to teach supervisors in job-skill training to develop standard procedures for on-the-job training and assist each operating department to implement them.

4. Saudia is to concentrate major training efforts on the basic education and training program for newly-recruited personnel.

5. Saudia is to initiate and administer a management appraisal and development program for all levels of present and potential managers.

6. Saudia is to provide education, training, and development facilities and services, including a first-level supervisory course.

TABLE II-8

PLANNED ANNUAL OUTPUT OF SAUDIA TRAINING PROGRAMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Manpower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>17,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II-8--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>11,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>6,105</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>30,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From Table II-8 it can be seen that the government's second five-year plan placed major emphasis on objectives dealing with human resources and the management development program. Available data and informal interviews, however, indicate that these planned training programs are very far from the actual figure at Saudia.

Saudia Organization Structure

Saudia's structure consists of several levels of management, beginning with the board of directors. Below the board of directors is the director general assisted by the deputy director general and senior vice-presidents. This group comprises the executive level. The operating levels include general managers, managers, staff managers, and supervisors.

An examination of the design of Saudia's structure reveals that Saudia follows a division of labor in defining
the individual job. This makes the employee more specialized because the job contains few tasks. Thus, the training of replacements is much easier, and at the same time, this system helps the employee become more proficient in performing his tasks. The departments are both functional (e.g., marketing, accounting, public relations, etc.) and territorial (as with the district managers, who can perform more than one task).

The span of control is mixed. In some departments it is wide and in others, narrow, as in the accounting and maintenance departments, respectively.

Authority within Saudia is primarily restricted to vice-presidents and general managers. The managers have little authority, and staff managers and supervisors have even less authority. For example, only vice-presidents and general managers participate in planning and policy decisions. Managers, staff managers, and supervisors cannot discipline an employee and are also limited in other decision areas.

Saudia is, to some degree, decentralized among vice-presidents and general managers and, to some degree, district managers. This is a very limited tendency since most of the decisions are centralized. It is one of the factors which hinder the development of the professional managers and the development of a competitive climate within Saudia. Managers are not able to exercise autonomy, limiting the
Fig. II-1—Saudia corporate organization
satisfaction of their desire to participate in problem-solving.

Management Development Programs

Historical and Background Information

After the issuance of the royal decree in 1965, in January of 1965 Saudia initiated English language training for newly-hired students (Saudia hires students at the high school level and trains them in selected subjects while they complete their formal education). This program was extended in June of 1967 to include all working employees (12, p. 3).

In 1967 Saudia initiated its air cadet training program, designed to train Saudi nationals as pilots and airline executives. The majority of the interviewed executives believed this program is generally successful because most graduates from this program are rated as qualified and efficient (12, p. 3). Then followed technical training, for flight engineers, dispatchers, maintenance mechanics, and ground equipment mechanics.

Later in the same year Saudia initiated a program of marketing training which is concerned with training for all jobs in the marketing function of the airline. These include airport services training, ticketing and reservations, supervisory training emphasizing supervisory responsibilities in sales, cargo, discipline, etc. In addition,
field training became an on-the-job function which was put into effect because classroom training alone was insufficient preparation (20, p. 301).

Saudia's Management Development Department was established in about the year 1970 with one TWA manager and one Saudi staff manager. A "job products survey" was carried out for all management positions occupied by expatriates, and replacement tables were prepared with plans for eventual occupation of these positions by Saudis. Although not named as such, this was the forerunner of today's Saudization program. Many positions, however, had no logical potential replacement due to a shortage of qualified and experienced Saudis (20, p. 810).

Unfortunately, the "job products survey" and the implementation of replacement tables were only partially effective and fell into disuse in 1972 because of the following reasons:

1. It was unrealistic to expect managers to develop replacements without specific guidelines.

2. The scheme was launched throughout the corporation in one fell swoop with insufficient staff backing and planning.

3. Replacement plans were not confidential, which caused disappointment, frustration, and anxiety (20, p. 810).
Since the beginning of the Management Development Programs in 1972, a number of significant changes have taken place:

1. Management and Supervisory Training has been established as a distinct department with two mainline programs.
   a. Techniques of Modern Management (TMM) began in February of 1972, but was modified to meet Saudia's specific needs.
   b. A basic supervisory course was developed in 1974 and presented in both Arabic and English (20, p. 810).
   c. A leadership program was started in July, 1976. From its beginning there were eighteen courses taught until 1977 (20, p. 806).

2. A corporation-wide program of Management by Objectives was launched in April of 1973. The forms and paperwork associated with this program were halved by 1974, and further simplifications were made in 1975. In 1977 Management by Objectives (MBO) was cancelled and removed from the program because it was too sophisticated,
required too much paperwork, and could not be digested by personnel for effective implementation (20, p. 811).

3. Since 1973, special project training and development have been carried out for groups at the request of department managers. Basically, these short-term training and development efforts provide practical management assistance and guidance in problem-solving and the implementation of improved management methods (20, p. 811).

Saudia Management Development Department

The Management Development Department has the basic responsibility for the formation and implementation of plans and processes for the identification, review, appraisal, and subsequent training and development of existing and potential managerial staff. The department further provides advice and guidance to managers in the application of appraisal and individual development procedures and programs (20, p. 800). The manager of the Management Development Department is under the supervision of the General Manager of Corporate Training, who reports to the Vice-President of Corporate Administration as shown in Figure II-2.

There are thirteen divisions for various kinds of training. As such, Management Development is concerned primarily with the long-term managerial efficiency. This requires that an individual manager's development plan have
Fig. II-2--Saudia corporate training
one or more intermediate promotional steps, consistent with the policy of one year between promotions. Management Development files exist for 121 Saudis who have been evaluated as having potential for assuming positions of greater responsibility or who have been evaluated as requiring further training and development (job improvement) in their career progression. Positive job-centered plans have been initiated for 91 of these Saudis (20, p. 800).

Corporate Training Purposes, Philosophies, Objectives, and Goals

The main purposes of all Saudia's training efforts are to meet the airline's work requirements and to train Saudia employees in sufficient numbers to ultimately fill all of Saudia's employment needs while maintaining a safe, efficient professional operation. It is the feeling of most top executives that it is imperative that all concerned with the training mission remain aware of the demanding standards that advanced aeronautical technology and modern business practices impose on Saudia. By taking these standards as their performance criteria, those who are responsible for planning and executing Saudia's training programs can assure the airline of well-trained personnel at all levels who are capable of performing their jobs efficiently and are prepared to meet the challenge of the future (14, p. 1).
Management development exists in Saudia for two reasons:

1. To ensure that there is a growing cadre of Saudi employees equipped to be promoted to managerial positions now occupied by expatriate managers.

2. To ensure that all Saudi management employees have their management potential for increased responsibility evaluated and an appropriate job-centered individual development plan implemented (20, p. 802).

Training at Saudia is based on the following philosophies:

1. To ensure maximum quality training at minimum cost and time away from the job.

2. To reduce trainee tension while accelerating the learning rate.

3. To convey and demonstrate human interest, warmth, and individual concern.

4. To train in NEED-TO-KNOW, NEED-TO-DO, and NEED-TO-SAY only.

5. To base all courses on producing behavior changes which coincide with predetermined objectives.

6. To encourage self-motivation, self-learning, and self-improvement.

7. To develop, through training, a company loyalty and motivation that cause each trainee to want to serve
in a manner that will help Saudia achieve its objectives.

8. To seek new and better training techniques on a continuing and endless basis (20, p. vi).

**Distribution of Candidates**

Table II-9 shows the overall status of the MDP program by division. This table emphasizes the difference between the number of management positions budgeted, the number occupied by Saudis, which is about 44.7 per cent, and the number of development candidates, which is only about 6.3 per cent.

**TABLE II-9**

**DISTRIBUTION OF CANDIDATES BY DIVISION***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of Management Positions (Budget)</th>
<th>Number Occupied by Saudi</th>
<th>Number Occupied by Other</th>
<th>Number of Saudin Development Candidates (as of 7/31/76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive (including Audit and Legal)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Svcs.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Opns.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Admin.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Affairs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plans were to increase the number of development candidates to 200 by June 30, 1977, and to complete the identification and coverage of all Saudi employees by 1980 (to include identifying non-management personnel having management potential; 20, p. 803). To date, these plans have not been achieved.

**Supervisory and Management Training**

The Management and Supervisory Training Department is providing short courses "in-house" which provide basic knowledge of management principles and management techniques and systems to middle management.

A general management program, or workshop, is being designed to provide a practical operating environment for middle and senior managers in which operational and administrative problems can be posed, avoided, or solved.

Once managers, have gained and understand essential management knowledge, the real-life, on-the-job management situations they face can best be dealt with by the management workshop or management projects approach (20, p. 804).

**Training methods.** Two main methods of training are used, seminar and on-the-job (see Table II-10).

1. Seminars are conducted in the classroom, using material that has been designed for use in Saudia. Through discussions and class projects, the trainees learn how to put their knowledge to work at their own job site. They
also became more aware of the total job of running Saudia because the mix of trainees in the seminars covers as many different departments as possible. Each trainee sees how his actions at his job fit in and can affect other departments and the overall operation of the airline (20, p. 804).

TABLE II-10

SUPERVISORY AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING COURSES, 1977*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Location and Number of Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Short Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMM (Techniques of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OOK—Out of Kingdom; JED—Jeddah; RIY—Riyadh; DAH—Dhahran; CAI—Cairo; LON—London.


2. On-the-job training is a follow-up to classroom training. Instructor staffs work with each trainee at his workplace to help put his management knowledge to work. Assistance with work improvement projects that are within
the framework of management techniques and principles makes a valuable contribution to efficiency (20, p. 805).

**Management Project Service**

The Management Project Service at Saudia has a number of goals, purposes, and benefits. The major goal of this service is to provide a follow-up after training in applied management. Requests are usually originated by participants in management training programs who see the need for improvement when they are back on the job, but do not themselves have sufficient resources (20, p. 809).

The purpose of the Management Project Service Program is to provide a practical management service at the request of managers which will assist their group in the analysis and solution of management problems and review, design, and application of better management methods and procedures (20, p. 808). This program has become widely accepted because it provides both training and practical assistance on the job to Saudia's various departments. It provides immediate benefits in terms of improved operational and administrative effectiveness. All projects are carried out with, rather than for, managers so that they gain the maximum personal benefits possible from the training.

Four generalized examples from the many projects completed since 1972 will indicate the variety of projects.
1. Improving the response time and accuracy of communications within an expanding region.

2. Analyzing the task of District Management within a region and obtaining positive action for improvement through the Regional Manager.

3. Establishing purpose, administrative needs, operational plans, and objectives for a new department.

4. A complete review and restructuring of career paths for all Saudi employees in a division.

Many projects are to introduce fundamental management practices such as basic job knowledge and understanding and simple planning methods to achieve meaningful results.

Current and planned activity. Frequent and increasing numbers of requests are received for management assistance. During 1976 Saudia has not been able to respond to these requests quickly enough, and in some cases not at all.

In 1976 Saudia's limited resources concentrated mainly on Saudi development and management training courses. However, with the full budgeted strength of Staff Advisors and Instructors, the corporation plans to double its capability to provide the Management Project Service when and where it is needed.
TABLE II-11

MANAGEMENT PROJECTS SERVICE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1976</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 (Est.)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977 (Planned)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tables II-12 and II-13 indicate that there is a slight difference between the planned and actual participants in TMM (held out of kingdom) and ST (held in Jeddah). There is not enough information for the newly-planned LT and PADS programs.

TABLE II-12

PLANNED SUPERVISORY AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TMM (OOK)</th>
<th>ST (IN-K)</th>
<th>TMM &amp; ST Total of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II-13

**Actual Supervisory and Management Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TMM (OOK)</th>
<th>ST (IN-K)</th>
<th>LT (IN-K &amp; OOK)</th>
<th>PADS** (IN-K &amp; OOK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Not enough information for PADS.

Air Cadet and Continuing Education

The Air Cadet program was initiated in 1967 and was a three-year program to meet the corporation's growing need for skilled, educated, and well-rounded Saudis. It was reduced to two years in 1971, and followed the same curriculum as is prescribed by the Ministry of Education for the second and final secondary school students in Saudi Arabia.

The graduating cadets are capable of pursuing a college education or other Saudia training program. The purpose of Air Cadet Education is to fill the ever-increasing demands of the corporation for skilled and educated Saudi national manpower by recruiting the students at the high school level.

In 1970 a Continuing Education Department was created to handle the first Air Cadet graduating class. Some of the graduates went to universities outside the kingdom (00K) and others went to the University of Petroleum and Minerals (UPM) in Dhahran, or King Abdul Aziz University (KAU) at Jeddah. Table II-14 shows the college enrollment either inside or out of the kingdom for the period 1970 to 1977 (20, p. 1001).
### TABLE II-14

**AIR CADET COLLEGE ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>70-71</th>
<th>71-72</th>
<th>72-73</th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>75-76</th>
<th>76-77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OOK Trainees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-K Trainees</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is natural, of course, that there should be a continuous growth of out-of- kingdom programs parallel with the growth and expansion of the corporation. Even the sudden surges as noted in Figure II-3 might also be a prerequisite for future developments. It should be noted, however, that if the past several years are indicative of the next few years, the rapid growth of out-of-kingdom training will continue (20, p. 1106).

As to the fields of study, Table II-15 shows that 64 of the 102 out-of-kingdom students (62.7 per cent) are pursuing business fields.

The Continuing Education Department also enrolls, processes, supervises, etc., a variety of short-term
Fig. II-3--Rise in out-of-kingdom enrollment, 1970-1977.
courses lasting from one month to one full year. Such courses include studies in the English language, a wide variety of courses offered by the Institute of Public Administration, management development courses, and other types of specialized training. These special courses are

\[\text{TABLE II-15}\]

\text{UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT AS OF AUGUST, 1976, FOR 1976-1977 YEAR*}

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Type of Degree} & \textbf{Emp.} & \textbf{Trainees} & \textbf{Special} & \textbf{Total} \\
\hline
\textbf{Bachelor's Degrees} & & & & \\
Aircraft Maint. Eng. & 8 & 2 & 1 & 10 \\
Aircraft Maint. Mgmt. & 1 & & 1 & 1 \\
Civil Eng. & & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
Electrical Eng. & 4 & 6 & & 10 \\
Electronics Eng. & 5 & & & 5 \\
Aeronautical Eng. & 1 & & & 1 \\
Airline Mgmt. & 1 & & & 1 \\
Business Admin. & 27 & 37 & & 64 \\
Education & 2 & & & 2 \\
Law (Cairo) & 2 & 2 & & 2 \\
\hline
\textbf{Master's Degree} & & & & \\
Mechanical Eng. & 1 & & & 1 \\
Business Admin. & & 1 & & 1 \\
\hline
\textbf{Associate Degree} & & & & \\
Safety Eng. & 1 & & & 1 \\
\hline
\textbf{Special Programs} & & & & \\
Medical & 1 & & & 1 \\
\hline
Total & 47 & 51 & 4 & 102 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

both in-kingdom and out-of-kingdom, as shown in Table II-16.

**TABLE II-16**

**CORPORATE CONTINUING EDUCATION**  
**OUTSIDE-COMPANY EDUCATION,**  
**1972-1977***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>6 Months</th>
<th>3 Months</th>
<th>1 Month</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN-K OOK</td>
<td>IN-K OOK</td>
<td>IN-K OOK</td>
<td>IN-K OOK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Education Assistance Program**

The Education Assistance Program was established in 1970-1971 to provide assistance to individual Saudia employees for the development of their special interests and talents which would prove to be of mutual benefit to themselves and the corporation. Of primary importance, of course, was to elevate the educational level of the corporation's Saudi work force by offering financial incentives to those who successfully completed each level of education from elementary (added in 1972) through university. As can be seen in the enrollments shown in
Table II-17, the program has resulted in the exceedingly rapid growth of university enrollments.

TABLE II-17

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>70-71</th>
<th>71-72</th>
<th>72-73</th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>75-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimate.

Manpower Statistics

The scarcity of a qualified work force constitutes a severe constraint on Saudization. The continuation of growth and diversification will eventually lead to ever-increasing demands for manpower skills of every type. The key to meeting these growing demands is an educational system directed to meeting the manpower needs of the country. The public educational system expanded tremendously from 1972 to 1977, with the number of students increasing from 432,864 to 690,918. This represents an increase of about 160 per cent, as illustrated in Table II-18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>308,598</td>
<td>330,955</td>
<td>363,258</td>
<td>391,677</td>
<td>420,011</td>
<td>339,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>56,664</td>
<td>63,225</td>
<td>69,455</td>
<td>80,618</td>
<td>91,037</td>
<td>104,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>13,966</td>
<td>15,675</td>
<td>18,749</td>
<td>22,606</td>
<td>25,717</td>
<td>32,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>7,778</td>
<td>8,527</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>10,834</td>
<td>10,587</td>
<td>9,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>4,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>42,810</td>
<td>48,142</td>
<td>53,923</td>
<td>62,911</td>
<td>55,603</td>
<td>61,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>9,471</td>
<td>11,337</td>
<td>14,882</td>
<td>19,093</td>
<td>26,437</td>
<td>34,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>432,364</td>
<td>470,423</td>
<td>519,469</td>
<td>574,940</td>
<td>609,990</td>
<td>690,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Covers Ministry of Education facilities (boys' education only). Source: Saudi, Training Status Report, October 18, 1976.*
The number of individuals enrolled in higher education increased from 9,471 in 1971-1972 to 34,560 in 1976-1977, or about 365 per cent (see Table II-18; 9, p. 32).

**Government five-year plan.** Table II-19 shows the five-year plan from 1976 to 1980 for college enrollment. The number of graduates estimated in 1975 in general and technical education is 81,541 and in 1980 is 170,370 with an increase of 88,829 graduates. The number of graduates in higher education in 1975 was 1,241, whereas in 1980 it is expected to be 5,193, an increase of 3,952 (6, p. 220). No comparisons could be made between the five-year plan and the actual graduates due to the lack of information for the years 1975, 1976, 1977, and 1978.

Table II-20 shows the five-year plan of the government and the manpower requirements of Saudia from 1975 to 1980 by occupational group. For instance, the estimated managerial requirement for 1975 is 102 with annual increases until it reaches more than double that number in 1980 (6, p. 223).

Due to the lack of information and the difficulty of obtaining any information from Saudia about the future plans for manpower requirements, no comparison could be made between the five-year plan and the actual figures in order to determine to what extent Saudia is trying to put the plan into effect. But, according to the information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Program</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Increase 1975-1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General and Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>49,663</td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>21,894</td>
<td>45,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Secondary</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>13,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>7,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>7,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total--General and</td>
<td>81,541**</td>
<td>170,370**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Riyadh</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Abdul Aziz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum and</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, Riyadh</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, Jeddah</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total--Higher</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>5,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>3,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic University</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates 1975</td>
<td>Number of Graduates 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious Education (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imam Mohammed Ibn Saud (Islamic University)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Religious Education</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>8,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Education</td>
<td>86,236</td>
<td>184,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vocational Training (craft level; Ministry of Labor)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>7,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimates of Graduates by Educational Program</td>
<td>87,436</td>
<td>192,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Boys and girls.
### TABLE II-20

SAUDIA MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS OF PLANNED PROGRAMS BY EMPLOYMENT, 1975-1980, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, IN THOUSANDS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Professional and Technical</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Related</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual and Service</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,126</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>8,604</td>
<td>9,339</td>
<td>9,991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

supplied by most vice-presidents and general managers, they feel that the organization is trying to follow the five-year plan to the letter. The situation and circumstances as explained in this and later chapters seem to indicate a need for more flexibility in manpower planning.

Saudis Studying Abroad

According to the newspaper Al Jazeerah, the number of graduates from United States universities at the end of 1983 will total 9,512 students (2, p. 1), as shown in Table II-21.

The numbers of graduates at different levels and degrees are expected to total about 9,521--446 Ph.D.'s, 1,706 master's degrees, 5,523 bachelor's degrees, 118 diplomas, 410 teacher training certifications, and 1,318 others (technical training).

Students on Scholarships from Saudia

The number of expected graduates in Table II-21 does not include the students sent to the United States by Saudia. Table II-22 includes the number of expected graduates supported by Saudia. At the end of 1983, Saudia expects about 182 graduates in different majors, most of them in business administration (2, p. 2), as shown in Table II-22.
### TABLE II-21

**NUMBER OF SAUDI NATIONAL GRADUATES EXPECTED FROM U.S. UNIVERSITIES***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>9,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


P--Ph.D., M--Master's; B--Bachelor's; D--Diploma; TT--Teacher Training; O--Other (Technical)

### TABLE II-22

**NUMBER OF EXPECTED GRADUATES (BACHELOR'S) FROM U.S. UNIVERSITIES SENT BY SAUDIA***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table II-23 shows the number of enrollment, teachers, graduates, and schools according to the government five-year plan. Between 1976 and 1980 enrollment will
### TABLE II-23

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF EDUCATION IN SAUDI ARABIA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>619,878</td>
<td>1,041,163</td>
<td>30,831</td>
<td>50,463</td>
<td>49,774</td>
<td>97,481</td>
<td>374,370</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>4,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>120,410</td>
<td>230,052</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>15,513</td>
<td>25,173</td>
<td>53,166</td>
<td>205,036</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>35,444</td>
<td>72,486</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>17,021</td>
<td>65,202</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes</td>
<td>15,689</td>
<td>27,487</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>4,547</td>
<td>7,914</td>
<td>31,294</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institutes</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>14,405</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>3,469</td>
<td>10,604</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Senior Level</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy</strong></td>
<td>84,433</td>
<td>519,831</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>31,091</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>54,165</td>
<td>123,698</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>3,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Level</td>
<td>10,872</td>
<td>24,757</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>4,497</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>12,807</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University Level</td>
<td>15,327</td>
<td>42,965</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>7,158</td>
<td>22,086**</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Middle East Economic Consultants, Saudi Arabia, Developmental Aspects. articles collected from the book published in the Guardians.

**Bachelor's degrees, 20,502; master's, 2,005; Ph.D.'s, 29.
approximately double at the elementary, intermediate, secondary, teachers training institutes, and university levels, while literary will increase more than six times and technical institutes and teacher training, post-secondary level, more than four times (7, p. 35).

The figures for graduates show an estimated increase of about double in elementary and teacher training institutes; more than double in intermediate; about three times at the secondary level; more than three times at the university level; more than four times at the technical institutes; more than thirty times at the teacher training, post-secondary level; and a hundred times increase in literacy.

Table II-24 shows an increase in managers from 1976 to 1980 of 13,000 and in professionals an increase of 45,000, while Table II-25 shows the increase in non-Saudi managers to be 61,000, an increase of 48,000 more than that of the Saudis.

Table II-26 presents vocational training programs. In the total plan, some 16,500 different training programs are available.

Table II-27 illustrates a tremendous increase in graduates from 1970 to 1977, where the total number jumped from 751 in 1970-1971 to 10,417 in 1976-1977, an increase of more than fourteen times. This increase is due to the expansion in the country as a whole as a result of
## TABLE II-24

SAUDI MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1976-1980 (THOUSANDS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers, officials</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and sub-professionals</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>134.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled workers</td>
<td>244.0</td>
<td>296.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>311.2</td>
<td>281.0</td>
<td>(30.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouins</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,286.0</td>
<td>1,518.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Middle East Economic Consultants, Saudi Arabia, Developmental Aspects, articles collected from the book published in the Guardians.*
### TABLE II-25

**NON-SAUDI MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1976-1980 (THOUSANDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and sub-professionals</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>162.5</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>314.0</td>
<td>812.6</td>
<td>498.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Middle East Economic Consultants, Saudi Arabia, Developmental Aspects, articles collected from the book published in the Guardians.*
TABLE II-26

ESTIMATED GRADUATES OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS, 1976-1980*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td>7,960</td>
<td>27,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-Job</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Middle East Economic Consultants, Saudi Arabia, Developmental Aspects, articles collected from the book published in the Guardians.

TABLE II-27

NUMBER OF GRADUATES, BY DEGREE (MALE AND FEMALE), IN-KINGDOM AND OUT-OF-KINGDOM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>5,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>7,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,053</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>9,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,182</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the first five-year plan (1970-1975), followed by the
second five-year plan (1975-1980; 2, p. 3).

Summary and Conclusion

Saudi Arabia is a very large country with an area estimated at about 865,000 square miles. The surface is mainly desert, and the approximately seven million inhabitants are scattered among a few cities, making air transportation essential for this vast country.

Islam is the most unifying force in Saudi Arabia. It permeates all aspects of the life of all citizens. Saudia has different problems than other airlines, such as teachers, pilgrimages, foreigners, and government movements.

Saudia began operation in 1945 with three DC-3 small planes; at present it has thirty-five jet planes and is expected to expand to fifty-five aircraft in 1980. Its number of passengers increased from 890 in 1973 to 4,800,000 in 1977. This figure is expected to rise to about 16,000,000 in 1984. Saudia's personnel expanded from a handful of men in 1945 to 10,766 in 1977, with an expected increase in the work force to about 20,000 employees in 1984. Saudia's training was initiated after the issuance of a royal decree in 1965, and its management program began in 1972. Saudia offers different programs such as Techniques
of Modern Management (TMM), Supervisory Training (ST), Personnel Appraisal and Development System (PADS), and others.

Due to lack of company information, exact figures for the years 1977 and 1978 and any plan for management development programs for the future are not available. TMM was to be offered three times a year, each time with twenty-four students, but actually this program was not applied as planned. Similarly, ST was supposed to offer nine cycles each year with fifteen students each, but it, too, actually was not held exactly as planned. This experience is typical and represents the general trend in evaluating the management development programs. Saudia is far from reaching full Saudization unless it can attract more Saudis, hold them, and follow through with planned training and development activities.

Saudia's Management Development Programs have been briefly described in Chapter I and in this chapter. This background provides a base for Chapter III, analyzing the top executive perspective about Saudia management development programs. The main focus of Chapter III will be on the manpower planning for succession and Saudization efforts.
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CHAPTER III

EXECUTIVE PERSPECTIVES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and analyze the data collected from interviews with thirty-three top executives—vice-presidents and general managers—at Saudia. It is anticipated that this analysis will lead to greater understanding of the included role and scope of the Management Development Programs (MDPs) at Saudia and will provide valuable insights for evaluation of the individual programs discussed in the second and fourth chapters of this study.

Saudia's rapid growth rate has caused many problems, especially in the area of manpower development. Saudia is expanding more quickly than any other airline in the world. In eighteen months, from October, 1975, to March, 1977, the number of planes in its fleet increased from thirteen to thirty-nine, a jump of two hundred per cent.

It was the general opinion of foreign management consultants that this rapid fleet expansion has caused an unprecedented workload among all levels of employees. The efficiency of managers could be improved, they believed, "by having more personnel available so that the
The major problem of training and development at Saudia is threefold: (1) Both formal and technical training lack efficiency and dedication. (2) Members of a departmental group are sometimes partial to their friends. (3) More manpower is needed to enable the employees to provide flexibility for Saudia management to attend training and development programs."

A number of factors contribute to Saudia's shortage of managerial personnel. First, it is difficult to recruit managers from outside Saudi Arabia to fill the vacancies created by the airline's growth, although Saudia can recruit them if it chooses the right market. Britain, for instance, currently provides manpower because of economic problems; thus, a shift is taking place, since the United States was formerly the best market for experienced airline personnel. Qualified Saudi Arabian national personnel are also available if the company pays enough money to attract them. There is, however, a general shortage of qualified manpower in Saudi Arabia as a whole, and it is very difficult for Saudi to recruit employees because better wages and benefits are available in the private sector. University graduates would be effective if Saudia could hold them after training.
Second, since Saudia's expansion is creating a great number of jobs to be filled, many people in the company have experienced very quick promotions, leaving vacancies behind them. Departments, of necessity, often keep personnel beyond retirement age. Many employees resign--which increases the manpower shortage problem--because of unsatisfactory working conditions, wages, and benefits.

Third, the specific technical qualifications required for many positions at Saudia often make vacancies difficult to fill; moreover, it is not easy to recruit employees for Saudia from other industries in Saudi Arabia because better wages and benefits are offered to employees in the private sector. Vacancies in marketing, finance, and administration are relatively easy to staff; overall, however, the shortage of Saudi managers is a serious obstacle to the goal of full Saudization defined earlier in this paper.

At the time of this study Saudia was experiencing about a thirty-three per cent shortage of managers, staff managers, and supervisors. The shortage of staff managers was especially severe. Attempts are being made to fill these vacancies and to distribute their responsibilities to other managers, but thus far success has been very limited and slow to develop.

The objective of the interviews presented here was to collect executive perspectives on three aspects of
management development (see Appendix A for the interview guide). The specific subjects covered in each interview were the following:

1. Manpower planning for succession and Saudization efforts.
2. Management Development Programs and the techniques used for management training and development.
3. Evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors.

In the summary and analysis of responses presented below, the answers of foreign executives will be specifically identified as such.

Manpower Planning for Management Succession and Saudization Efforts

In this section of the interviews several questions were designed to explore formal plans for management succession at Saudia other than Saudization, the ability to fill management vacancies from within, the forecasts made for manager requirements concerning the factors which affect the demand and supply for managers, and the policies, objectives, and scope involved in developing managers.

The responses differed among executives, but, in general, the consensus was that Saudia had no formal plans for management succession either in the past or at the present time. As a foreign executive expressed it, "About six years ago the manager of Management Development hired a non-Saudi national who established reform
requirements for each non-Saudi national to nominate two Saudis to fill his job. Evidence from the interviews indicates that this plan was a total failure. The concept was good, but many non-Saudi managers had turned to Saudia because of their lack of success in their previous jobs and in search of high salaries. Of course, if such an individual was insecure, he would not be eager to train the Saudis to fill managerial positions. The incompetent foreign national who stayed in his job because of money would have little interest in maintaining and developing Saudis." Hence the emphasis on Saudization seemed to be minimized.

Executives commented on the connection between Saudia management succession plans and Saudization in general but stated that no written plan was used or on file. Members of the Training Department applied their knowledge and passed it on to others, thus providing a body of training and development ideas from which judgments could be applied to individuals. This method continues to be used at Saudia. All employees were involved in all aspects of training and development; they were given authority, allowed to make mistakes, and enabled to remedy those mistakes. Those in charge of selecting individuals to work in specific positions were able to use personal acquaintance as a basis for selecting the persons best qualified to fill the vacancies.
The following methods represent several policies and practices used at Saudia to implement efforts of Management Development Programs:

1. Counseling individual managers, which is a basic part of the performance appraisal process. Few people act as counselors, and few can do so, but they carry out this function as best they can.

   General managers and vice presidents counsel the candidate to line up reports on what he is doing in an acting capacity rather than merely on the job responsibilities without commitment. Then the decision is made as to whether or not to put him on the job. Counseling provides a link between managers, enabling them to see and solve problems and make improvements where needed.

2. Preparing career development. The final state of the performance appraisal and managerial development process is the preparation and implementation of an individual development plan. One aspect of this plan is MBO; the other is graduate programs of two years' duration for specific jobs.
   A. Internal courses such as TMM, ST, MBO, PADS, and leadership.
   B. External courses in various colleges either inside or outside Saudi Arabia.
   C. Job rotation for management division programs. This technique is quite limited and not commonly used; it was not emphasized due to the technical nature of the industry and the critical shortage of qualified management personnel.

Saudia does not assure management promotion for everyone, its policy being that such assurance can result only from job performance. This is an important aspect of management succession at Saudia because the validity of services and performance requires control by means of efforts and results. As one vice-president commented, 'Management succession must be determined through the managers' performance—whether they have gained a better
understanding of their jobs and strive for their interests. The only assurance of succession is the job performance and dedication of the individual; this is proven by results. But there is too much politics involved in succession; it is not based on merit or ability. Promotions are given by accident, plus nepotism. There is no depth. These are just some of the difficulties we face. There is no policy as a whole; succession depends on the managers themselves, and it is left to the individual to train his successor."

In their responses most general managers supported Saudia's view of management succession through performance appraisal and explained some of the problems involved in succession. They believed that management succession must be determined by the systematic application of the performance appraisal and development process. They felt, however, that they were faced with tremendous problems in this area, such as budgetary restrictions and a fifty per cent vacancy rate in available jobs. The general managers felt that they were not living up to the normal growth of the organization, since Saudia's expansion prevented them from keeping positions filled with Saudis.

Another subject directly related to management succession was the ability of Saudia to fill management vacancies from within. Most top executives at Saudia tried to do this because of the technical demands and the
nature of Saudia, as noted above. In some cases, however, a large void of qualified personnel still existed for promotion to fill management vacancies, and many foreign personnel continued to be recruited from the United States and Europe. In fact, current labor markets for qualified personnel included countries as distant from Saudi Arabia as Malaysia, Korea, and China. According to one general manager, "Announcements of vacancies are made within Saudia and people apply for them. Thus, in the majority of cases, replacement takes place by means of internal promotion. Some vacancies are also filled from within through effective selection. But there is a lack of experienced people in the local labor market."

Another general manager supported this view and added his personal insights. "Yes, vacancies are filled by the following process. First, employment supervisors inform personnel of vacancies, and the employees apply for them. Second, if information comes down that someone will be promoted, the senior people will say, 'We are prepared 50 per cent; you must undertake the other 50 per cent.' Because we are specialized, we prefer to fill vacancies from within. This is very easy by means of promotion. There is no development program for promotion. When executives want to promote somebody, they do. But filling vacancies from outside takes more time. Sometimes
an employee is promoted because he knows the boss. Filling vacancies is not very easy for Saudia in this time of record growth and expansion."

A vice-president also expressed this opinion that most management vacancies at Saudia were filled from within, but other executives disagreed, believing that vacancies were not filled from within due to the lack of qualified managers at Saudia.

One general manager stated, "Vacancies are not filled from within if it is done efficiently. Problems arise in putting the qualified man into the required position; it is difficult to give employees the necessary incentives to fill positions. There are a good number of qualified and qualifiable Saudis who could be guided to do their job efficiently, but they have to be encouraged in dedication to personnel and corporational concepts. When an employee is happy, he can do his job."

Management succession demands adequate and complete records for all employees; thus, another subject related to management succession at Saudia is the maintenance of such records for managers. Twenty-six general managers and vice-presidents felt that adequate manual records were maintained for managers. These records showed the number employed in each main category, but not the managers' age distribution; nor did they analyze the managers'
efficiency in their positions or show their reasons for leaving. These executives believed that such a system of records was a manpower planning function and therefore not their personal responsibility.

Although Saudia records typically did not include managers' reasons for leaving, most executives were in agreement on this subject. All vice-presidents and general managers believed that managers' dissatisfaction with salary was in first place among those reasons. Opportunities for work elsewhere were numerous and caused instability for Saudia manpower planning. Since competition in the private sector was very keen, private businesses usually offered more incentive than Saudia. Other managers believed that there were obstacles to their advancement and progress at Saudia; some were seeking improved benefits or better housing; some wanted to enter the private sector or engage in government work; some were prestige-conscious and wanted to be more than what one executive called "a cog in the machine." Other reasons for leaving were dissatisfaction, frustration, transportation difficulties, medical programs, and the like.

One vice-president commented, "This corporation stands on certain individuals; the others are insignificant. Those individuals have the big load. The best employees are leaving. The opportunities in business
elsewhere are tremendous. The Saudi employee does not want to work because he feels that he is the lowest in his country--foreigners have precedence, and, for that reason, the Saudi is indifferent. There are no standards to measure efficiency. Efficiency measurement in maintenance, operations, and other practical matters is easy, but manager efficiency is very difficult to assess because the human element is hard to measure. Communication is lacking. Management development is nothing. It is a relief for those who are in the job. We must study the present problems in the job and the differences between the human elements in concepts. We must create the environment. We have many nationalities in our corporation--thirty-five in all--and, for that reason, cooperation is zero."

Twenty-nine general managers and vice-presidents felt that Saudia's records did not contain adequate information for future management needs. The efficiency of managers, staff managers, and supervisors was not analyzed in these records, but thirty-one executives estimated that efficiency as follows: 7, excellent; 8, very good; 3, good; 4, poor; 3, very poor, 4, no answer.

According to these responses, although opinions of managerial efficiency ranged as low as "very poor," the
majority of the thirty-one executives estimated the efficiency of their managers, staff managers, and supervisors as excellent and very good. These executives believed that efficiency could be improved by support from top management for training and development programs, by availability of more time for study, by recruiting more manpower and hiring more qualified instructors, by sending outside to similar airlines, by stabilizing of personnel in their positions, and by providing advanced management courses tailored to the needs of individual departments.

Most general managers and vice-presidents stated that Saudia's records were not maintained to fill the future needs of the organization for managers, or to list the names of individuals with potential for promotion, because this information was highly confidential. Schedules of potential managers were secured by means of manager career planning and development.

One general manager believed that such record-keeping was not the most effective basis for managerial succession: "We do not maintain such records to show the future need for managers. It is very difficult to measure efficiency but almost impossible to evaluate with national figures. In an industrial company you try to assess the activities of personnel, taking into account the added value that they produce. Efficiency can be improved on an individual
basis, doing it properly according to where employees are now in terms of achievement and expectations. Then you make an assessment of their potential. Management development is for the individual by analyzing his needs."

On the subject of evaluation, this general manager continued, "Saudia is experiencing unprecedented growth. Because of this rapid expansion it needs a large number of qualified people in a short time to run the airline--and training and development will be the means of achieving this objective. They provide the ways of supplying Saudia with qualified people. Monitoring and controlling the calculation are carried out in managerial audits. One means of calculating the value of the company's manpower is to assess the potential of that manpower. Then once this assessment is made you will arrive at value in terms of employees. If you are in a service industry, such as an airline, you are engaged in giving the customers a satisfactory product. The service is carried on by people, so the value of the people is worth looking at; the quality of the service given to the customers depends on the quality of service the company gets from its employees."

Another general manager stressed what he called "self-evaluation," saying, "Such evaluation is part of Saudia's program today. I think it is invaluable."
Managers are passing the buck instead of holding themselves accountable, as every person should. I have to accept my responsibilities. To own my job, I must hold myself responsible for this job; this is essential. ... The manager must be accountable—accountable for his personal performance, accountable for his effectiveness, accountable toward his boss, and accountable for successful growth."

Another subject directly related to management succession was the forecasts made for future managerial requirements and the labor market data affecting the demand or the supply for managers. The majority of general managers and vice-presidents believed that forecasts were made of Saudia's future manpower requirements. Estimates of the number and skills of future managers were based on government statistics by division or occupational class, but executives felt that these government forecasts were not based on reliable data. Additional data, such as that to be derived from the Personnel Information System (PIS), would be helpful in making forecasts more accurate. Executives believed that forecasts affected the demand for managers at Saudia within the overall corporate demand for manpower. Forecasting techniques affecting supplies had not been adopted by Saudia, but plans have been made to develop such methods,
to be based upon government estimates for the Saudi national labor supply.

Eleven top executives stated that Saudia employed counseling and reviewed change. "There are no formalized forecasts. We generally have five-year plans that will tell us if we need more expansion in the future. Before budget work begins, every department sets up new organization. They study very thoroughly their requirements and their contribution to the employment department before this selection is made. On the individual level, some basic things are spelled out in job descriptions. You can train the employee and improve his function by exposing him to new material. We give the individual employee training and make him capable of handling his job. We believe that any data will be helpful for management forecasting, such as statistical computer information. It would be helpful to know what resources are available in the manpower plan and what could be provided by government only, but we are normally involved in trying to get the job done instead of doing research and planning--that is one of our problems."

One general manager viewed forecasts as "somewhat meaningless" in view of Saudia's management development problems. "Many Saudi managers are resigning due to the inadequate salary program. Anyone with any basic management
skill and initiative could secure a higher salary with a private firm. Excessive processing of paperwork frustrates many managers who have been recommended for promotion since it is many weeks before they actually receive the bona fide promotion. Much capable talent is 'wasted' on menial jobs and misappropriated to areas where the person has a 'friend' in a higher level position who looks after the subordinate but does not necessarily determine where he is best placed. The availability of suitable Saudi managers from outside the company is sadly lacking, since the salary and benefit programs leave much to be desired. Since the company is so intent on Saudization, many qualified foreign managers are overlooked or not recruited."

Another general manager stated, "Management succession is affected by Saudia's rapid change and growth. The problem is that there is no integration between the fleet and the manpower planning. Fleet planning comes first; manpower planning, last. This situation will not coincide with manpower because Saudia's rapid changes carry a tremendous demand for change from managers. The organization is facing problems of obtaining the required manpower, especially on the managerial level. Developing managers in the proper way will take a long time, and this will make a big difference in development."
Most top executives believed that managerial forecasts were taken for corporate planning assumption on a regular basis. Recruitment was currently more linked to the corporation budgetary system, but with the development of the Personnel Information System and manpower standards it would become an integral part of manpower forecasting. Executives also commented upon the necessity of keeping forecasts and recruitment adequate to meet Saudia's current and projected expansion.

Another subject directly related to management succession at Saudia is the policies, objectives, and scope involved in developing managers. Top executives believed that career planning and development should be provided for Saudi nationals only, for the expatriate work force exists only to provide technical and professional experience for a temporary period. Saudia's policy was, first, to build up a group of managerial personnel qualified to run the airline industry, and, second, to nationalize the managerial personnel, especially in top management positions. There were no limitations for expenditure on manager development.

Most comments on the objectives of manager development fell into the following categories:

1. To develop managers and potential managers to replace expatriates now occupying managerial positions.
2. To equip existing Saudi managers to be able to assume positions of higher authority.
3. To get Saudis to Saudize the airlines.
4. To provide tutorial training on the job and formalized classroom training. Each Saudi middle manager should have a consultant working with him who has technical as well as managerial expertise in his area.

A general manager stated, "Saudia should take every single Saudi in a management position, analyze his strengths and weaknesses, examine his potential, and then draw up a special plan for him. Saudia's objectives must be (1) to provide the company with a group of managers to fill all the positions which exist now and in the future as far as can be foreseen; (2) to make sure that every Saudi management employee is used to the best of his ability in Saudia work; (3) to ensure that the potential of each Saudi manager is fully realized. People should be given the power in their jobs which would make them better managers in a general sense. Plans should also be made for their future positions so that they can be given the necessary training for those positions. All of these measures should be carried out in accordance with the annual budget and with the approval of top executives."

The executives interviewed stressed the need for a comprehensive development program for all Saudia personnel, a program which would thus benefit both the individual employee and the company as a whole.
Summary

From the interview comments presented in this section it is apparent that in general Saudia had no formal plans for management succession. Executives believed that politics was too often the basis of succession, rather than merit or ability; and promotions were given by accident or nepotism. On the whole, management succession lacked depth and was weakened by the absence of an overall policy. Vacancies were usually filled from within the company due to the technicality of many of Saudia's positions. The manual records kept by the company showed the number employed in each category but not the managers' age distribution, occupation, or reasons for leaving; nor were adequate records maintained to fill the future manpower needs of the organization. The efficiency of managers ranged from poor to outstanding. Saudization, the major problem of Saudia, could be improved by better training and development. Saudia did not use the "management audit" concept, and forecasts were not based on reliable data. Saudia's policy for the future was to build a qualified managerial group and to Saudize all positions. Executives believed that every employee must be developed and provided with a career plan. Saudia's managerial practices, inadequacies, policies, and goals, as analyzed by the company's executives, demonstrate that its career
planning and management succession were still in the beginning stage of effective implementation.

Management Development Programs at Saudia and the Techniques Used for Training and Management Development

Executives were asked questions to determine (1) the satisfactoriness of Management Development Programs (MDPs), (2) the generalized and/or specialized parts of MDPs, (3) collective or individual needs, (4) the relationship of the Training and Development syllabus to overall objectives and the definition of these objectives, (5) techniques used in MDPs and the steps taken to follow up after training, and (6) the methods of selecting courses.

Most general managers and vice-presidents believed that MDP was generally satisfactory, but they pointed out that it was far behind schedule because of the rapid expansion taking place in Saudi Arabia as a whole. The executives had attended TMM and believed that this program could become independent and self-sustaining, after weaknesses were corrected and the program modified to fit the environment and changes in its own philosophy. Saudia had no personal evaluation scheme, but either monthly or quarterly reports were used to enable a manager to keep an eye on his employees and follow up on their progress. At the time of the interviews, the entire management
development process was under review, and a new system was being considered.

Eight general managers and vice-presidents felt that the development program in general was especially suited to lower level management—for instance, as it provided refresher courses for those with business majors and an introduction for beginners. They also believed that the development program had been linked too closely with MBO to achieve success, since the latter necessitated a great deal of paperwork for supervisors and thus was not effective. This difficulty was one manifestation of MDP's need for continuing modification.

A foreign general manager said of management development at Saudia, "The best test is on the job. Good training is important in critical areas, such as marketing. Trainee measurement standards and the criteria for on-the-job performance must be improved so that an employee is able to book or cancel a reservation in two or three minutes. It is on the job that good training—or the lack of it—will show up. Performance measurement is not good as assessed by the employee's performance on the job, using the tools he has to use. This concept of testing for achievement is currently getting a lot of attention. If management does not measure employee performance in a closed loop system utilizing MBO, nothing will happen."
"A structure should be established to make every employee responsible to his boss for doing his job. Measuring activities is a waste of time. We are measuring results, not activities. The main focus should be on employee contributions, but the airline has lacked the necessary interest and capability; we have to have leaders who want to do this, a goal which will require some time to accomplish. Development efforts must be transmitted from the top down in the airline's employment hierarchy."

Saudia's top executives, as indicated by these comments, viewed MDP as satisfactory, on the whole, but they nevertheless pointed out specific weaknesses which they had observed in the program.

The next area discussed in the interviews was which portion of MDP was specialized and which collective. Most general managers and vice-presidents stated that individual development plans were used and that the development of the manager was the basis for meeting managerial Training and Development needs. As carried out, however, training was generalized and collective. One general manager's comments illustrated this duality: "We do not have a firm, fixed plan yet. It must be resolved and discussed with top management. We sometimes use counseling between the employee and his immediate supervisor. Sometimes, for the plan as a whole, we are
not limited to individual needs and requirements. If we have management development needs for individual departments—e.g., to improve linguistic ability—the training and development department localizes the problem and then finds the deficiencies. Training and development are collective."

In this section of the interviews, again, Saudia executives had both complimentary and critical opinions of MDF, with one general manager laying particular stress upon the need for improvement. All, however, commented upon Saudia's combination of individual and general approaches in training.

The next subject related to MDPs at Saudia concerned the technique used for training and development, the plan for a syllabus and its flexibility to meet current problems and development situations. The general feeling was that the syllabus was planned by the instructor responsible for development of the program with the consent and approval of the manager. This syllabus met corporate and departmental objectives, was thoroughly reviewed by the general manager and vice-president, and was edited and revised as necessary.

Some executives stressed what they believed to be deficiencies in this method. One general manager observed, "Our training program is imported [from non-Saudia sources]."
In my opinion, good training and development should be designed to meet the diagnosed needs. At the beginning you import, but then the program must be modified. The plan is not related to the overall objective and is not even measurable. It is not flexible."

Another general manager commented, "Saudia has been experiencing a variety of circumstances and conditions. It has been exposed to many emergency changes, and there was no stability until we began development by the general directorate, but Saudia could not depend on one element, especially that of human resources. This situation affects the contract, and politics has brought about this change in the development of Saudia. We have thirty-five nationalities who came only for money, but the Saudi sacrifices for his country because of his love for it. The plan is not necessarily related to the overall objectives. Its flexibility depends on how you use it."

As shown by these and other comments, Saudia executives were not in agreement about the flexibility of the development plan; one general manager, for instance, stated, "It meets corporate and departmental objectives. Objectives are reviewed every year to make sure that they cover changing circumstances"; but a vice-president declared, "The program is logically but insufficiently planned by corporate administrators. It is related to
overall objectives to a certain extent. It should be flexible, but it is not."

Another related subject with regard to MDP at Saudia was the definition of objectives in terms of standards of performance and the areas involved. Most top executives defined the objectives in terms of what a manager was able to do when he completed the course of instruction. Adequate standards were not available for management courses and managerial forms, but standards had been set up for non-managerial personnel.

One general manager commented, "Standards of performance are set with checkpoints established following learning segments to be certain that the student understands and is able to use the material. Additionally, a work simplification project is introduced and confirmed by the staff to evaluate the student's practical use of his understanding of the material at his work place. This is the real test of how well he performs after the training experience."

A vice-president responded, "There are three kinds of objectives: (1) trainees' performance objectives (what we will be able to do); (2) training department objectives; (3) management or corporate objectives handed down (guides for the kinds of objectives we have). The trainee is able to function in training. The need to know, to do, to say,
to decide, to calculate, etc., is most important. We put
great emphasis on the trainee."

Another general manager observed, "It is important to
create an efficient managerial staff to satisfy the growth
rate of the airline. We train the individual manager and
show him how much material he can absorb and how well he
is performing in the light of what he was taught. These
standards are related to all job performance and are basi-
cally geared to our needs. Ours was and still is a good
program."

These representative comments amply demonstrate the
emphasis placed by Saudia executives upon individual job
performance as the measure of whether management training
objectives had been achieved.

A subject related to the techniques used for MDPs
was whether programs consisted of one or of a mixed balance
of the following techniques: (a) formal instruction, (b)
discussion, (c) projects, (d) case studies, (e) practices,
(f) others.

Fifteen general managers and vice-presidents agreed
that the MDPs at Saudia employed all these methods. The
executives used regular reports on their objectives and
related those reports to the personal experience of staff
members with their work environments. Personnel also
utilized recovery, rescheduling, and retraining procedures
to deal with unusual situations. For case studies the past experience of the managers was used, plus presentation involvement in analyzing that work.

One general manager commented, "We have to do some intellectual work in the program by showing, telling, and doing exercises; most of these are ineffective, compared to training by doing. The training program is formal in that it is structured heavily on induced trainee participation, with involvement of the teacher who taught the trainees, strong emphasis on trainee objectives, and concentration on the 'need to know to do to perform' theory. It is a closed loop system. We use all these techniques in addition to real life simulations. The goal is to simulate the real environment. In certain courses we employ TV feedback. We also use interviews, deputization (acting capacity), and MBO for problem areas, as well as films and other media."

Among the combination of techniques used for management training at Saudia, executives tended to favor what this general manager called "training by doing," a view in accordance with their emphasis, mentioned above, on job performance for evaluation of that training.
The next subject directly related to MDPs and techniques was determination of the steps taken to follow up after training and evaluation or modification were carried out. Top executives noted that, as far as management development was concerned, a questionnaire used to be sent to the superior six months after the completion of a course. As far as the subject was concerned, a one- or two-day review session was held when the course met again to present the project. The training programs were evaluated on three bases: (1) feedback from the students—what they thought about the course; (2) feedback from the superiors—whether they were satisfied or not; (3) review sessions held by the staff responsible for the course and a continuation of the review to determine whether circumstances were changing. The programs were modified whenever necessary to do the job properly.

Again, the opinions of Saudia executives on the merits of this procedure varied greatly. Some stressed the importance of evaluation and described in detail techniques used to carry it out. One general manager remarked, for instance, "Informal reporting on progress after training and regular rechecks are used to ascertain that the trainee is applying what he learned. The modification is feedback revised. We write to the training department about the weakness and shortage in the training
programs. Sometimes we try to give the employees another chance after consulting the training department, and we cooperate with them to complete the required frame."

A vice-president also elaborated upon Saudia's methods for evaluating training: "In meetings with employees we ask them questions, sometimes to evaluate training, and we make inquiries to their superiors. Sometimes we have training sessions in which we ask each supervisor or manager to provide us with reports on the performance of the trainees so that we can determine whether there has been any change in himself and his subordinates. Training programs are evaluated through personal counseling and observation of development or review, carried out by the manager's superior. An increase in his productivity and an unusual change of attitudes for the better are the best indicators. You give the manager pointers on the different steps he takes and on the job or activities he performs. We use evaluation sheets as a format and discuss with him what he knows about his career. And we increase follow-up for training too strongly done or interviews not properly covered."

Ten general managers and vice-presidents, however, expressed contrasting views, agreeing that very few follow-up steps were taken for evaluation, except in TMM. Some felt that there was no follow-up; other felt that follow-up
was conducted on a rather narrow basis; others said it was the duty of the general manager of that division or his representative.

Another subject related to MDP and its techniques involved manner of selection of external courses and development of internal courses on the basis of needs, relevance, values, and personal choice.

Ten general managers and vice-presidents felt that everyone in the training department contributed to the selection and development of courses, from the instructor to the general manager and vice-president. The need for basic training through a cadet system by 1968 was filled by TWA; an English language program was provided by the foreign staff. Management-initiated training within Saudia began in 1971, as did TMM, but supervisory training continued to be imported from the United States. The Leadership program designed at Saudia was a mixture of Arabs and foreigners for lead agents, and the orientation course was developed by personal planning and training. The MBO program was developed by a British consultant. The Performance Appraisal and Development System (PADS) was developed by the training division.

External courses were developed according to need, chosen on the assessment of (a) training needs, (b) the relevance of the course in relation to training and
development needs, (d) personal choice of the individual, and (e) orders from the top management.

One executive stated, "Our in-company programs were developed by one department with the consultation of the training division. The external courses were selected by corporate training and sometimes by definite requirements. The courses are selected on the basis of individual training needs."

Another executive commented on training courses in more detail: "Just the training department develops its own internal program by using consultants from outside and according to the requirements developed and the consent of top management in the courses to be set up. The external courses are developed with different institutions, such as universities either inside or outside Saudi Arabia—for instance, Stanford, AMA, Broxel, and BAOC. United States institutions participation through the American Friends of the Middle East and other countries through correspondence, personal visitation, and consultation with other institutions. The courses are selected on the assessment of individual training needs to a great extent. . . . Whether people are put into the courses is determined on the basis of how they perform in their jobs. Employees are trained and retrained in order to qualify them for jobs. The effectiveness of the training is sometimes
intangible; is the employee achieving his potential? Can the corporation certify him effectively? Some individuals choose the courses voluntarily because they feel they are useful, but some courses are compulsory as the ticket reservations are made by computer.

Summary

Many questions were asked in this section of the interviews to determine the satisfactoriness of MDPs at Saudia. Most top executives felt that MDPs would be satisfactory after weaknesses were corrected and the program modified to fit the environment and changes in its own philosophy. MDP was not on schedule, and it lacked an evaluation scheme, although occasionally the program was evaluated by rule of thumb. Formal instruction, discussion, projects, case studies, practice, and other methods were used in MDPs. In-company programs were developed by personal planning and training.

Evaluating Strengths and Weaknesses of Managers, Staff Managers, and Supervisors

The next section of the interviews was intended to pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of managers, staff managers, and supervisors by identifying the major criteria used to assess their performance, to affirm or deny the existence of a systematic performance appraisal, and
to determine whether it was overelaborate or easily understood by employees.

Twenty-five general managers and vice-presidents agreed that the current system was not adequate for assessing systematic performance. The major criteria of performance included attitudes, correspondence, appearance, acceptability of the overall picture, achievement, and participation in each assignment. Quality and quantity of work, adaptability, willingness to accept responsibility, mastery of the English and Arabic languages, past performance, and ability to make judgments were also considered.

Most managers were aware of the results of the performance review. They were very conscious of delay and of the nature and services of individual mistakes; as a result, they tried to correct their own errors. They held meetings at regular intervals—staff meetings every week and month. During these meetings, managers recorded the activity of all staff members, as well as explaining some points, discussing weaknesses and strengths, and attempting to find solutions for problems.

One general manager commented, "We have an annual performance appraisal system linked to the anniversary of the date each employed joined the organization. Job performance is the major criterion. We think that
individual managers counsel and interview subordinates when they appraise them, but it is impossible to know for sure in every case. I do not know if the managers attempt to hold meetings with their staff. The system provides for discussing strengths and weaknesses; but, again, it is impossible to know to what extent each manager does this. Agreement on the training and development needed should be as a result of performance appraisal, but nobody does it."

A general manager stated, "Performance appraisal is a component of the management development process. The old process takes place once a year. A management development form is filled out by employees and another by supervisors. The concept of this procedure is good, but the forms are not, since they require comparison of the employee with his peers and evaluation of his technical performance, an evaluation which few managers are trained to do well. If we use this system for self-appraisal, it is hard to get people to talk. They pick on the weaknesses of the system."

A vice-president strongly criticized performance appraisal: "The company has a piece of paper for everybody. Evaluation is not practical and does not fit the individual. It is difficult to get and it does not stress practical matters of qualitative and non-qualitative
aspects of performance. The employee's personality role, his capability of facing an unseen situation, his capability of supervising others, his mastery of the language, and his approval by other people are the major criteria. The performance review that has been conducted is very narrow, not on corporate levels. When a manager faces some problems and finds himself confused, he collects his colleagues and subordinates to help him reach a solution. I discuss weaknesses and strengths with employees individually whenever I have an opportunity to do so. I will not wait a whole quarter to see if we are doing poorly. I carry out such assessment continuously. Performance appraisal is not specifically geared to the general requirements of the airline as a whole; rather, it is aimed at bringing about improvement in certain areas, and it is left to the manager himself to assist in the direction of employees."

In general, then, Saudia executives found more weaknesses than strengths in the performance appraisal system, indicating that this was an area where much improvement was needed.

A subject related to the evaluation of the managers', staff managers', and supervisors' strengths and weaknesses was determining whether managerial personnel used performance reviews to identify training and development and
to establish potential for promotion and salary increases, whether the performance appraisal system was over-elaborate, whether it could be understood by employees, and whether managers were trained in carrying out review and conducting counseling meetings.

Twenty-nine general managers and vice-presidents stated that they used performance review reports to identify training and development needs. Some used these reports every months; others, every three, four, or six months. Still others used such reports only annually, and some used them only when they decided to send the manager for training and development. Managers used the reports to establish potential for promotion, salary increases, and transfers. Some decided that the method was simple, efficient, and applicable; others said it was complicated and that the manager could not implement it correctly. They declared that the application of reports created unnecessary duplication and that they were lengthy, difficult, impractical, and, most important, subject to the bias of the person making the appraisal, with a consequent loss of objectivity, depending on the individual relationships between personnel. The use of reports needed simplification to be understood by employees so that they could learn what was wrong with their performance and correct it. PADS was conducted to train
managers to carry out performance review; some implemented it correctly, but some did not. Some managers carried out such reports in the classroom only. Also, many of the managers said that they were trained to conduct counseling meetings and that most of them were doing so.

Four top executives commented differently, saying that they were not using review reports to identify training and development needs but were using them as a basis for promotion, salary increases, and transfers. They believed that the method was not simple and that employees could not understand it. They said they were trained in conducting review and counseling meetings but did not believe them to be useful. Thus, most of the executives interviewed used performance reviews and felt them to be effective, in spite of their generally low opinion of the performance appraisal system.

Another subject directly related to the evaluation of managers', staff managers', and supervisors' strengths and weaknesses was determining the basis for assessment of training and development needs—manager forecasts, company growth, job analysis, and/or performance review. Most general managers and vice-presidents believed that the assessment of employee performance was carried out through consultation with departmental managers or upon the supervisory and management force who had and had not
received training through in-house course offerings. A computer listing of managers by salary grade and division was prepared for the Management Development Department by data services, and, by cross-referencing their files, those individuals who had received formal training could easily be identified. However, it was the responsibility of the vice-president or general manager to make the final selection of the employee for promotion. Once they planned to move an employee into a higher position, they had to prepare him for that job. New courses were developed to meet corporate needs at all levels for improved performance of management staff.

A vice-president commented, "Assessment is carried out by reaction, to a great extent. We wait for somebody to come to us, but we take the initiative in a few cases. We do not have money problems; when it comes to development, the budget is never cut, but a great deal of money is spent and progress wasted because of the lack of staff. The assessment must fit the requirement and be commensurate with company growth to a certain degree. Job analysis and performance review are carried out through evaluating requirements of the job representatives, functions, etc."

One general manager said, "Training and development assessment depends on the needs of the manager, on the
difference between the existing qualifications of the candidates and the qualifications needed for the position, on the circumstances as needs arise, on past performance, and on observation. Assessment on the basis of managers' forecasts takes place on the basis of fleet size and route development. Company growth is assessed through job vacancies. In job analysis you give ratings to every step that should be taken in performance of the job. Performance review varies among managers from being greatly used to, more often, not being used at all."

The next subject directly related to evaluating managers', staff managers', and supervisors' strengths and weaknesses was determining whether the training and development plans were prepared by setting out (a) problem areas, (b) proposed action, (c) responsibility for action, (d) and (e) costs and benefits of the proposal, and (f) other.

The response of top management was limited to a few executives, who felt that evaluation was carried out by setting out problem areas generally, with strengths and weaknesses self-committed to the employee's difficulties, since the individual could not be helped if his limitations and capabilities were not perceived by his superiors. The responsibility for such evaluation lay with the individual manager. Sometimes action was proposed and a plan
established to improve training and development. The cost of the proposal was very tenuous; sometimes it was an intangible cost outside of normal business hours. Saudia did not concentrate on such efforts as these. The benefits of the proposal were assessed by the general manager of that division. The prime target of Saudia, of course, remained Saudization and nationalization of jobs; cost was no object in reaching this goal.

**Summary**

As indicated by the executives' responses in this section of the interviews, Saudia had an annual performance appraisal system linked to the anniversary of the date each employee joined the organization, in which job performance was the major criterion. Performance review reports were generally used to identify training and development needs. Some executives used it every months; others every three, four, or six months, or annually. Assessment of an employee's performance was made according to the areas in which he needed improvement. Job analysis and performance review were carried out through evaluating requirements of the job representatives, function, et cetera.

The English program was extremely important to MDPs, since most of them were given in English, and the language was essential to the running of the airline as a whole;
thus, assessment of the efficiency of Saudia's English program and the ways in which it could be improved was very significant.

Twenty general managers and vice-presidents stated that Saudia's English program was inefficient and very poor because it was not serving its purpose, although personnel had received training. The program could be improved by having qualified staff design the programs based on the existing needs and the capability of the employees as determinants of what the level of the program should be. Decisions were also required on how to teach in Arabic. The atmosphere of the environment for English courses was not adequate; the executives preferred a six-month period in which the employee could speak, practice, etc. Students had always made good grades in these English courses--introductory, intermediate, and advanced—but the environment was not suitable to increase their efficiency.

Five top management personnel were in agreement and felt that the English program had lost its former excellence, for it was too much like instruction in the public schools. The language was not taught in an English environment; the employees studied but did not practice, and then, of course, they forgot much of what they had learned.
Eight general managers and vice-presidents, however, most of them in technical departments, felt differently in regard to the program: "The English program is excellent and well-designed to serve its purpose. It has been quite good for twelve years. Employees are fully equipped in the language, and English is the language in aviation. Corporate training is doing an excellent job; employees are totally fluent in English."

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter has been to show how Saudia general managers and vice-presidents viewed management plans for training and development for managers, staff managers, and supervisors. This was achieved by interviewing thirty-three top management personnel at Saudia. The interviews were designed to cover three points:

1. Manpower planning for succession and Saudization plans.
2. Management development programs and the techniques used in management training and development.
3. Evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors.

Most general managers and vice-presidents believed that Saudia had no formal plans for management succession either in the past or at the present time. All management succession in Saudia was based upon the assumption that career progression of Saudi nationals was monitored by MDP. Saudization plans had been made to improve the performance
of existing managers at Saudia with the guidance of the management and training department, because of the rapid growth and change in Saudi Arabia as a whole and the lack of effective policy for manpower at Saudia to attract and keep efficient managers, staff managers, and supervisors. There was a thirty-three per cent shortage of managers and supervisors and an even more severe shortage of staff managers. Local businesses attracted the managers with high salaries and other benefits, such as housing, medical care, recreation, and the like, which were lacking at Saudia. At the time of this study, fifty per cent of the jobs at Saudia, 1,500 vacancies, were not filled. Most Saudis felt inferior to the other nationalities at Saudia when the compensation was based on the person, not on the job. They also felt that they were evaluated unfairly because most other foreign personnel had their problems solved by the company; buses for their children, housing, electricity, and maintenance were all ensured for the foreigners, but not for the Saudis who thus had less time to spend on their jobs while they were solving these problems for themselves. This affected their performance.

Four vice-presidents and general managers felt that problems existed in many areas, especially in executing effective formal plans for management succession. They felt that the Saudia board members lacked sensitivity to
the personnel and lacked concern for the problems, as well as moving too slowly toward solutions of the employees' and the company's problems. Many plans were introduced which the board of directors refused; such refusals delayed the achievement of Saudization. With the upward growth spiral affecting every department, it was essential that Saudia be effective and try to locate problems before they arose--the company could not just wait until they happened. These findings may be compared to Coventry and Burstiner's statement in *Management: A Basic Handbook*:

> Basically, it is the responsibility of the board of directors to ensure proper management succession at every level down the line. In particular, the board should be actively concerned with the continuing office of president, or other chief executive, as appropriate (1, p. 368).

The lack of formal management succession plans at Saudia led to an increase in the number of foreigners and a decrease in the number of Saudis in the company. This, too, may be considered in light of an observation by Coventry and Burstiner:

> A lack of planning can result in frustration among senior executives, and, in the face of any unexpected vacancy arising at or near the summit, emergency recruitment from outside (1, p. 368).

It is also apparent from the analysis of the executive interviews that most of the general managers and vice-presidents at Saudia were not maintaining adequate records to show the numbers employed in each main category and the age distribution of managers, staff managers,
and supervisors. They did not use any analysis for their managers, staff managers, and supervisors by occupation or exit interviews to show their reasons for leaving Saudia. Records were not maintained to show the future needs of the organization and names of potential individuals for promotion, nor were managerial personnel using the management audit concept to inventory the management skills available. Forecasts for managers, staff managers, and supervisors apparently were not often made. According to one general manager, "We did not give this any attention in manpower planning established in 1975. I have never seen any table do that, with managers, general managers, staff managers, or supervisors for 1975 to 1978, etc." In addition, many executives did not know the numbers and skills of managers, staff managers, and supervisors needed in the future. Even if some departments had these forecasts, executives felt that they were not based on reliable data. This situation affected the demands for managers, staff managers, and supervisors either in expansion or contraction and also affected the supply of managers for promotion, retirement, wastage from within the organization, and the availability of suitable managers, staff managers, and supervisors from outside. These forecasts were not translated to satisfy recruitment, redeployment, training or retraining, or
improving utilization and productivity of the managers, staff managers, and supervisors at Saudia.

The managers, staff managers, and supervisors were partially to blame for this situation. Much of management development was self-development, self-performance, and self-evaluation. The managers must do these things to ascertain their own strengths and weaknesses and to determine how to improve their ability to function. Some managers "passed the buck" and tried to blame others for their own laziness; they must have the ability to hold themselves accountable. All personnel should accept responsibility. They must be accountable for personal performance, accountable toward their superiors, accountable for their effectiveness, and accountable for successful growth. Coventry and Burstiner agree with these views:

Fundamentally, the aim of management development is to make sure that the men set aside as future executives are properly trained, and ready for action, by the time they are due to take their appointed place in the overall plan. If the right initial selections are made, individual management development plans effectively organized, and the individuals themselves highly motivated, then strategic promotion through to the top would seem to be sufficient to provide for normal succession (1, p. 369).

Saudia's management development program as a system was satisfactory, especially for lower management, as introductory courses for those who had no previous basic instruction in business and as refresher courses for those who had a major in business or who had already
been exposed to management courses in one way or another. The individual programs needed continuing modification because, as one general manager put it, "MDPs were prepared by those people who are not familiar with the nature of this country, its culture, mentality, or with the Saudis' way of life, tradition, customs, religion, etc."

There was no systematic evaluation for MDP. Some managers evaluated the development by the rule of thumb; some used observation; occasionally, they gave projects to the students and evaluated them after they returned to their jobs. Comprehensive management development programs were essential to prepare professional managers for highly technical jobs at Saudia. In any event, as the general manager of career planning said, "The whole program is under review, and we are introducing a new system."

English has become essential to these programs; for that reason, it was one additional factor affecting the success of MDP because fluency in English increased understanding of the program content. The English program, however, as most general managers and vice-presidents agreed, was very weak and should either be abolished or developed as an introductory course which then must be followed by an advanced course. The introductory course was especially designed for those who constantly practice
English in the company, such as the technicians, pilots, dispatchers, and the like.

Saudia's more serious difficulties in this area were the lack of employees—about a fifty per cent shortage—and the necessity of employees' attending English programs after work. Such an after-hours program gave them less time to digest what they had learned. These conditions added other problems to affect the entire management development and English fluency programs.

All Saudia management development programs were too generalized. Ideally, the executives interviewed felt that they should be organized on a seventy per cent individual and thirty per cent generalized basis. The executives also agreed that training and development needs were collective but must be met on an individual basis.

The courses were given on a collective basis. As one general manager commented, "Management courses are very well planned. The management and training staff planned them. They meet corporation and departmental objectives. They are reviewed every year to make sure that they cover changing circumstances." The standards of performance were not defined for management courses because, as one general manager said, "We do not have adequate managerial standards. As far as marketing and technical courses (which are non-managerial courses) are concerned, there
are standards of performance which are used in this context."

Most programs consisted of one or more of the following methods, used as needed: (a) formal instruction, (b) discussion, (c) projects, (d) case histories, (e) practices, (f) presentations, (g) games, (h) simulations, and the like.

Managerial personnel had an annual performance appraisal system, linked to the anniversary of the date the individual joined the organization. Job performance was the prime criterion for evaluation. As one general manager put it, "We assess personnel performance by (1) achievement of the work plans to which they committed themselves and (2) the progress they made in Saudia in terms of promotion and progress through management grades."

The managers were aware of the results of performance review, and counseling was automatically used. The weaknesses and strengths of managers were discussed periodically after meetings were held. The performance appraisal system was simple, and employees could understand it if special steps were taken to assure their comprehension. Seminars were being conducted to train the managers, staff managers, and supervisors in carrying out a review and in conducting counseling meetings. Training and
development needs were assessed through consultation with departmental managers.

The evaluation sheet used at Saudia was concerned with special problems in the minds of the foreign nationals who had filled it out and wanted specific or fixed answers to their questions. In every environment and culture and even in every organization people should think positively to solve their own specific problems, including the problems which are brought up by special associations or individuals. The evaluation was only a blindfold hiding the real problem, and it must be changed constantly according to the nature of the organization.

The efficiency of managers, staff managers, and supervisors, as one general manager put it, ranged "from poor to outstanding." The efficiency of personnel could be improved, however, as another general manager stated, "By proper guidance and full staffing and proper facilities and communication."
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CHAPTER IV

SAUDIA MANAGERS, STAFF MANAGERS, AND SUPERVISORS: THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Introduction

This chapter describes and analyzes the questionnaire data collected from managerial personnel throughout Saudi Arabian Airlines. The questionnaires were distributed to 130 managers, staff managers, and supervisors. One hundred twelve answers were returned; 99 were usable.

The questionnaires distributed were of five kinds:

1. LOQ (Leadership Opinion Questionnaire; see Appendix B): LOQ provided measures of two important dimensions of supervisory leadership. These were consideration, which reflected mutual trust and the supervisor's respect for the subordinates' ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between himself and them; and structure, which reflected the supervisor's definition and structure of his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. Alternatives to each item in this questionnaire were scored 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 automatically by the self-scoring format of the answer sheet. Complete scoring instructions were given inside the answer sheet. The
20 items in each scale allowed a maximum possible score of 80 for consideration and 80 for structure. Generally, for this and all the other questionnaires, the higher the score, the more favorably it is regarded. LOQ scores generally ranged from 30 to 70 (1, p. 1). Representative means for different groups are given in all tables for different variables in this chapter.

2. SBDQ (Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire; see Appendix C): SBDQ was designed to measure the behavior patterns of supervisory and management personnel as seen by their subordinates on two major dimensions of leadership, consideration and structure. The five alternatives for each item were scored 0, 1, 2, 3, 4; thus, the highest possible score for consideration, with 28 items, was 112, and for structure (20 items) the highest possible score was 80. Scores generally ranged from 22 to 106 for consideration and from 13 to 68 for structure. A scoring key is provided to obtain scores on each of the two scoring scales (2, p. 2).

3. MSS (Minnesota Satisfactoriness Scales; see Appendix D): MSS provided a measure of supervisors' satisfaction with five areas of their subordinates' job performance and behavior. The first 27 items were scored 1, 2, or 3, depending on the response alternative chosen, so that a higher score indicated greater satisfaction. The last item was scored 4, 3, 2, or 1, with the highest
number corresponding to the most favorable response. Thus, a person rated most favorably by his supervisor on each item would receive a general satisfactoriness score of 85. If rated as low as possible, he would score 28. Table IV-1 shows the maximum and minimum scores for this questionnaire (3, p. 2).

**TABLE IV-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Possible Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjust.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satis.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minnesota Satisfactoriness Scale, p. 4.

4. JDI (Job Description Index; see Appendix E): JDI measured employee satisfaction with five areas of a job--type of work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and people on the job (4, p. 69). The scales for work, supervision, and people each had 18 items. The maximum score for each item was 3 and the minimum zero, totaling 54 for these three areas. The pay and promotion scales
had 9 items each; again, the maximum score for each item was 3 and the minimum zero, giving a total of 27 for these two scales. This figure was multiplied by two to give each section of JDI an equal maximum score of 54 (4, pp. 69, 83).

5. Individual questionnaires were developed to fit the circumstances of Saudi Arabian Airlines and to evaluate in-company programs (see Appendix F). Representation means for different groups are given in all tables for different variables in this analysis.

This chapter compares questionnaire results and opinions regarding Saudia MDP of managers, staff managers, and supervisors, using different variables related to their leadership, education, tenure, and participation in Saudia's management programs. The significant difference of .05 is considered for all comparisons. Selected groups were compared with each other, since comparison with U.S. norms would be meaningless for the Saudi nationals.

The first section is an analysis of the questionnaire results based upon managerial classification—managers, staff managers, and supervisors. Subsequent sections analyze questionnaire results based on a variety of personal, demographic, and job experience factors. Finally, opinions are analyzed to reflect behavioral and attitude changes resulting from Saudia's management development programs.
Management Classification

Saudia has classified its management into various levels, from grade 51 supervisors up to the head of the company. This classification starts with supervisors and proceeds to staff managers, managers, general managers, and vice-presidents. At the top is the general directorate, headed by the board of directors. This study is concerned only with 70 managers, 18 staff managers, and 11 supervisors. Table IV-2 analyzes each questionnaire by management classification.

Table IV-2 indicates a significant difference between managers and staff managers for the areas of work and personal adjustment, a significant difference between managers and supervisors in the areas of promotion and people, and a significant difference between staff managers and supervisors in the areas of work, promotion, people, and personal adjustment. All managers, staff managers, and supervisors were dissatisfied with their work, supervision, and people and were particularly dissatisfied with their pay and promotion.

It should be noted again at this point that no attempt has been made to compare these questionnaire results with American norms. However, the mean scores on JDI are low, particularly so if compared with American norms. The mean scores reveal dissatisfaction with all variables on this questionnaire, but how much dissatisfaction cannot be accurately stated. This holds true for the remaining analysis and discussion presented in this chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager to Supervisor</td>
<td>56.56</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>75.24</td>
<td>73.78</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>54.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 11</td>
<td>50.56</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>75.24</td>
<td>72.18</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>54.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 18</td>
<td>53.49</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>75.24</td>
<td>72.18</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>54.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
Consequently, discussions and observations will use phrases such as "less dissatisfied" to indicate general dissatisfaction, but to varying degrees.

Considering mean raw scores in Table IV-2, generally the managers rated higher than the staff managers and supervisors in both LOQC and LOQS. They were less dissatisfied than staff managers and supervisors in the variables of work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people. The managers' superiors were more satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness than with those variables for both staff managers and supervisors.

The subordinates of the managers rated them higher than staff managers in both SBDQC and SBDQS and lower than supervisors in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

**Personal Characteristics**

In this section personal characteristics such as age, education, major, place of education, function, and service are analyzed with the fourteen variables and their effects on the managers, staff managers, and supervisors.

**Age.** Because of the nature of the work at Saudia and the type of personnel involved, three age categories were compared with each other: group 1, ages 21 to 35; group 2, ages 36 to 40; and group 3, ages 41 to 45.
Personnel aged 46 and over are rare in Saudia in the management classifications used for this study.

Table IV-3 indicates a significant difference for LOQC between the managers aged 21 to 36 and those aged 36 to 40, and also between those aged 36 to 40 and those aged 41 to 45. Also indicated in Table IV-3 is a significant difference for promotion between the managers aged 21 to 35 and those aged 36 to 40, and a significant difference for pay and promotion between those supervisors aged 21 to 35 and 36 to 40, as well as between those supervisors aged 36 to 40 and those aged 41 to 45. There is no significant difference in most variables for LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ between managers, staff managers, or supervisors in different categories of age, but the average mean raw scores reveal that generally managers, staff managers, and supervisors aged 36 to 40 rated higher in both LOQC and LOQS. They were generally less dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people.

The supervisors of the managers and staff managers were satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. The subordinates of managers and staff managers rated them higher in SBDQC and lower in SBDQS. The superiors of the supervisors aged 36 to 40 were more
### TABLE IV-3

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Age Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG 1. LOGC</td>
<td>54.94^a</td>
<td>60.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOGS</td>
<td>53.08</td>
<td>53.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD 1. Work</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>41.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pro.</td>
<td>24.88^b</td>
<td>35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sup.</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>36.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Peo.</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>46.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS 8. Perf.</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conf.</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>18.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dep.</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. P.A.</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>19.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. G.S.</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>75.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHC 13. SDBGC</td>
<td>76.89</td>
<td>78.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SDBGS</td>
<td>51.31</td>
<td>50.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

** Group 1—ages 21-35; Group 2—ages 36-40; Group 3—ages 41-45.
satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Education. The respondents were classified in two educational categories, college graduates and others. The latter group included education on the elementary, intermediate, secondary, and vocational levels. Among managers there were 29 graduates and 41 others; among staff managers, 4 college graduates and 14 others; and among supervisors, no college graduates and 11 others. Thus, among supervisors the data were insufficient for comparison between college graduates and others.

Table IV-4 indicates a significant difference between college graduate staff managers and others on the JDI variable work but shows no significant difference between college graduate managers and others in LOQ, JDI, MSS, or SBDQ. Considering the mean average scores between college graduates (managers and staff managers) and others (managers and staff managers), Table IV-4 shows that the college graduate managers rated higher in LOQC and LOQS and were less satisfied in the JDI variables work and people; they were more dissatisfied with pay, promotion, and supervision. Their superiors rated them higher in the MSS variables of performance,
TABLE IV-4

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON LEVEL OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers N =</th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coll. Grad.</td>
<td>Others 41</td>
<td>Coll. Grad. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>57.29</td>
<td>55.52</td>
<td>57.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>54.22</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>39.79</td>
<td>24.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>73.15</td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>68.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>75.41</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>70.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>50.52</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness; and their subordinates rated them higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS. The college graduate staff managers also rated higher in LOQC and LOQS. They were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, and supervision, and less dissatisfied with the JDI variable people. Superiors of the college graduates rated them lower in most MSS variables, and their subordinates rated them lower than others in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Educational major. Majors were divided into two categories to obtain a comparison between business majors (accounting and data processing, marketing, management, finance) and other majors (engineering, law, humanities, social science, vocational—e.g., pilot, commercial, etc.). Forty-nine managers had business majors and 21 had other majors; among staff managers there were 2 business majors and 16 other majors. Among supervisors no major was mentioned.

Table IV-5 indicates a significant difference among managers in the JDI variable pay between business majors and others and a significant difference in SBDQS between other majors against business majors. There was no significant difference between staff managers with business majors and others in LOQ, JDI, MSS, or SBDQ. Even though
TABLE IV-5

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON EDUCATIONAL MAJOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N =</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Staff Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.81</td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96*</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>76.45</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.55</td>
<td>76.55*</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.76</td>
<td>47.15*</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
there was no significant difference between business majors and others among both managers and staff managers, however, the average mean raw scores show that managers with business majors rated lower than those with other majors both in LOQC and LOQS. They were more dissatisfied with their pay (significant difference), promotion, supervision, and people. Their supervisors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and higher in SBDQS.

Staff managers with business majors rated higher than those with other majors in LOQC and the same in LOQS. They were somewhat less dissatisfied with their work, pay, and promotion, and more dissatisfied with their supervision and people. Their supervisors were less satisfied with them than with other majors in their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and slightly higher in SBDQS.

Place of education. Respondents were classified by place of education to determine the effect of this factor on their job-related questionnaire results. Data were insufficient for supervisors for purposes of comparison; therefore, only managers and staff managers are analyzed here.
Place of education was divided and coded into four areas: (1) Saudi Arabia (SA), (2) Middle East (Egypt, Lebanon, Pakistan, etc.), (3) Europe (England, France, Italy, Germany, etc.), and (4) United States of America (USA). Table IV-6 shows no significant difference for place of education in LOQ, JDI, MSS, or SBDQ variables among managers. Although there was no significant difference, Table IV-6 reveals some effect on the average mean raw scores in the place of education. Those managers who were educated in the USA rated higher than others in LOQC and LOQS. The mean scores in work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people indicate that these managers were less dissatisfied than others. Their superiors rated them higher than others in their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness, indicating that they were more satisfied with them. Their subordinates generally rated them higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Table IV-7 indicates significant differences in place of education for the MSS variables of dependability and general satisfactoriness among staff managers. In contrast to the managers, the average mean raw scores for staff managers show no specific pattern in any of the areas of education in most variables, as can be seen in Table IV-7.
### TABLE IV-6

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON PLACE OF EDUCATION--MANAGERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables N =</th>
<th>1 to 43</th>
<th>2 to 11</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>4* to 12</th>
<th>2 to 3 to 4</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>56.56</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>44.36</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>44.36</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjust.</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satis.</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>70.91</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>70.91</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>74.42</td>
<td>71.64</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>71.64</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQ</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>57.25</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>57.25</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.25</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1--Saudi Arabia; 2--Middle East; 3--Europe; 4--United States of America.
### TABLE IV-7

**Mean Questionnaire Scores for Saudia Managerial Personnel Based on Place of Education—Staff Managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1 to 4</th>
<th>2 to 3</th>
<th>3 to 8</th>
<th>2 to 3</th>
<th>3 to 8</th>
<th>3 to 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>61.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>51.71</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>52.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>39.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjust.</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satis.</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>65.29%</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>68.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>68.85</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>70.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>44.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

** 1--Saudi Arabia; 2--Middle East; 3--Europe; 4--United States of America.
Managerial function. Function was divided and coded into five categories according to the major departments at Saudia:

1. Marketing
2. Accounting (auditing and security, finance, and data processing)
3. Technical services (engineering and maintenance, etc.)
4. Flight operations
5. Administration (legal affairs, public affairs, corporate administration, properties and facilities, external affairs, executive affairs)

Data were insufficient for staff managers and supervisors for comparison between different categories of staff.

Table IV-8 indicates significant differences in the variables of pay and supervision for managers. Considering the average mean score, Table IV-8 shows that those managers in technical services (engineering and maintenance) and flight operations rated higher than those from other departments in both LOQC and LOQS. The mean scores of work and people reveal that the managers were satisfied with these two variables. The mean scores in pay, promotion, and supervision among engineering and maintenance managers indicate that they were dissatisfied
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 to 2</th>
<th>2 to 4</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>4 to 5</th>
<th>5 to 7</th>
<th>2 to 4</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>4 to 5</th>
<th>5 to 7</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>4 to 5</th>
<th>5 to 7</th>
<th>4 to 5</th>
<th>5 to 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>58.91</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>36.77</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promo.</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Super.</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cont.</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dpem.</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. P.A.</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. G.S.</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>78.10</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>78.10</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQG</td>
<td>78.55</td>
<td>68.95</td>
<td>70.73</td>
<td>75.76</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>68.95</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>75.76</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>75.76</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>75.76</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
** 1--Marketing; 2--Accounting; 3--Engineering and Maintenance; 4--Flight Operations; 5--Administration.
with these three variables, while the mean scores for pay, promotion, and supervision among flight operations managers indicate that they were less dissatisfied with these three variables. The mean scores in MSS reveal that these managers' superiors were satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. The mean scores in SBDQC and SBDQS, however, indicate that their subordinates were not satisfied with the managers' supervision.

Service. Due to insufficient numbers of managers, categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 for length of service were combined into one, namely, less than seven years of service. Accordingly, service was divided into only two groups, (1) less than seven years of service and (2) seven years or more of service.

Data for supervisors were insufficient because all supervisors had more than seven years of service in this group of the study; thus, the analysis presented deals only with managers and staff managers. Nine managers and 9 staff managers had less than seven years of service, and 61 managers and 9 staff managers had more than seven years of service.

Table IV-9 indicates a significant difference in the JDI variable people among both managers and staff managers between less than seven and more than seven years of service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N =</td>
<td>Less Than 7 Years</td>
<td>More Than 7 Years</td>
<td>Less Than 7 Years</td>
<td>More Than 7 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.56</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>51.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>35.02</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>45.74</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>45.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>72.85</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.78</td>
<td>75.46</td>
<td>74.38</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>51.36</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>49.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
Although most variables in LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ showed no significant difference, the average mean raw scores indicate that length of service had a positive effect on both managers and staff managers. Managers with more than seven years of service rated higher than those with less than seven years of service in LOQC and lower in LOQS. The mean JDI scores reveal that managers with more than seven years of service were less dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people. The mean MSS scores indicate that generally their superiors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness, and more satisfied with their dependability. Their subordinates rated them higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Those staff managers with more than seven years of service rated lower than those with less than seven years of service in LOQC and higher in LOQS. The mean scores in JDI indicate that they were less dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people. The mean scores in MSS reveal that their superiors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and higher in SBDQS than those staff managers who had less than seven years of service.
Training

Managers, staff managers, and supervisors were divided into two groups for analysis. The first group, classified under the heading training, were those who attended one or more of the management development programs offered by Saudia. These were 51 managers, 7 staff managers, and 4 supervisors. The second group, headed no training, were those who did not attend any of the management development programs--19 managers, 11 staff managers, and 7 supervisors.

Table IV-10 indicates a significant difference in LOQC between managers, staff managers, and supervisors who did attend training and those who did not. A significant difference also appears in the JDI variable pay for staff managers. There is no significant difference in either MSS or SBDQ for managers, staff managers, or supervisors.

In spite of the absence of a specific pattern for significant difference in most of the variables, the average mean raw scores presented in Table IV-10 show that those managers, staff managers, and supervisors who attended management development programs generally rated higher in LOQC and LOQS than those who did not.

The mean scores in some JDI variables indicate that managers who attended MDP were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, and promotion, and less satisfied with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQC</td>
<td>57.90</td>
<td>52.95*</td>
<td>62.71</td>
<td>50.55*</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>49.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQS</td>
<td>53.69</td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>54.57</td>
<td>49.64</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>50.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>6.54*</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>34.43</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>42.43</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>31.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>44.59</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>36.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>22.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformance</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend.</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Adj.</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Sat.</td>
<td>73.43</td>
<td>72.32</td>
<td>71.29</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>73.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQC</td>
<td>76.27</td>
<td>72.47</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>71.09</td>
<td>81.50</td>
<td>84.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQS</td>
<td>50.82</td>
<td>51.95</td>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>47.55</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>54.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

** T--Training; NT--No Training.
people and less dissatisfied with supervision. The mean scores in MSS indicate that their superiors were more satisfied with these managers' performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in SBDQC and lower in SBDQS.

The staff managers who attended MDP were more dissatisfied than those who did not attend with their work, pay, and people and less dissatisfied with their promotion and supervision. The mean scores in MSS indicate that their superiors were more satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, and general satisfactoriness, and less satisfied with their personal adjustment. Their subordinates rated them lower than those who did not attend MDP in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

The mean scores in JDI indicate that the supervisors who attended MDP were more dissatisfied than those who did not attend MDP with their work, pay, supervision, and people; the high scores reveal that they were less dissatisfied with their promotion. The mean scores in MSS indicate that their superiors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness, and the mean scores in this questionnaire indicate that they were more satisfied with their dependability. Their subordinates
rated them lower than those who did not attend MDP in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

**Overall ratings of Management Development Programs.**

An attempt was made in this section of the analysis to achieve greater specificity about the rating of Saudia's Management Development Programs. The rating of overall programs was classified as poor, fair, good, or excellent, as shown in Table IV-11.

**TABLE IV-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = number of personnel.

Table IV-11 shows that the majority of the managers rated Saudia's Management Development Programs as excellent and good; the majority of staff managers rated Management Development as poor and fair. The four supervisors in the study who attended the programs rated them as good.
and excellent. Data were insufficient for purposes of comparison for staff managers and supervisors.

Table IV-12 indicates a significant difference in the JDI variable promotion among those managers who rated Management Development Programs as poor and fair and a significant difference in the MSS variable dependability among those managers who rated Management Development Programs as good.

The mean raw scores in Table IV-12 reveal that those managers who rated MDP as good and excellent rated higher in both LOQC and LOQS than those who rated the programs as poor and fair. They were less dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people. Their supervisors were satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them about the same as the managers who rated MDP as poor and fair.

**Techniques of Modern Management**

This program was considered by most executive personnel to be the best training and development program at Saudia and more successful than any other. This course was presented in seminar style, which eliminated the tightly structured learning climate of a typical classroom or college situation and allowed the group to interchange ideas and feelings freely. Each man benefited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>1 to 2</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>2 to 3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>57.09</td>
<td>58.56</td>
<td>58.54</td>
<td>58.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>53.17</td>
<td>58.69</td>
<td>53.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>36.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.34*</td>
<td>20.72*</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>20.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>33.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.89</td>
<td>41.91</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>45.08</td>
<td>41.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>22.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>18.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfac.</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.78</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>77.15</td>
<td>75.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.11</td>
<td>81.09</td>
<td>75.89</td>
<td>73.54</td>
<td>81.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>53.27</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>53.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

** 1—Poor; 2—Fair; 3—Good; 4—Excellent.
from the wealth of Saudia experience and knowledge that the group represented. This course was designed for those who had attended supervisory training and for supervisory personnel who had heavy employee relations responsibilities.

The respondents were divided into two groups, those who did not attend TMM but might have attended other programs, and those who did attend TMM. A limitation is recognized here in that a majority of managers had attended this program—48 managers as opposed to only 3 who had not attended TMM but had attended other programs, such as ST, MBO, LT, or PADS. Four staff managers attended TMM and three attended other programs; two supervisors attended TMM and two attended other programs.

Table IV-13 indicates a significant difference between managers, staff managers, and supervisors who did attend TMM and those who did not in LOQC; the JDI variables work, pay, and people; and the MSS variables performance, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness.

The mean scores in Table IV-13 indicate that managers who attended TMM rated higher in LOQC and lower in LOQS. They were generally more dissatisfied with the JDI variables pay (significant difference), promotion, and supervision, and less dissatisfied with work and less satisfied with people than those who did not attend TMM. Their superiors
**TABLE IV-13**

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON COMPLETION OF TECHNIQUES OF MODERN MANAGEMENT SEMINAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 58</td>
<td>NA** 3</td>
<td>A 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>66.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>53.56</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>56.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>9.58*</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>44.08</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>21.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depend.</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pers. Adj.</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gen. Sat.</td>
<td>73.35</td>
<td>74.67</td>
<td>65.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>76.19</td>
<td>77.67</td>
<td>75.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
** A--Attended; NA--Not Attended.
were less satisfied with their MSS variables of performance, conformance, dependability, and general satisfactoriness, and more satisfied with their personal adjustment than for those who did not attend TMM. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and higher in SBDQS than those who did not attend TMM. The staff managers who attended TMM rated higher in LOQC and LOQS than those who did not attend, while the supervisors who attended rated lower in both LOQC and LOQS. Generally the mean scores for staff managers and supervisors who attended TMM reveal that they were less dissatisfied in JDI variables; their superiors were less satisfied with them in the MSS variables of performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness; and their subordinates generally rated them lower in SBDQ.

**Supervisory Training**

This program was viewed as an introduction to management and was provided primarily for those middle managers without prior management training. The course was offered in both English and Arabic. The participants were exposed to the basic functions and style of management and were made aware of their responsibilities as members of the Saudia management team. Ten managers, six staff managers, and
two supervisors attended Supervisory Training; data were insufficient for staff managers.

Table IV-14 indicates a significant difference in the JDI variables promotion and people between the supervisors who attended ST and those who did not. No significant difference among the managers was indicated. The mean scores in Table IV-14 indicate that managers who attended ST rated lower in LOQC and LOQS than did those who did not attend; they were more satisfied with people and supervision; and they were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, and promotion than those who did not attend ST. The superiors of the managers were generally less satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower than those who did not attend ST in SBDQC and SBDQS. The supervisors who attended ST rated higher than those who did not attend ST in both LOQC and LOQS. The mean scores in Table IV-14 indicate that the supervisors who did attend ST were generally more dissatisfied with the JDI variables pay, promotion, supervision, and people and more satisfied with their work than were those who did not attend. The mean scores in Table IV-14 indicate that the superiors of the supervisors who attended ST were more satisfied with them in MSS variables. Their
TABLE IV-14

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON COMPLETION OF SUPERVISORY TRAINING—MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MANAGERS</th>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>Not Attended</td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>Not Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQD</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>44.32</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjust</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>73.61</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>63.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>73.60</td>
<td>76.93</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
subordinates rated them higher than those who did not attend ST in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Performance Appraisal and Development Seminar

This program, given in English, was structured to provide participants with a good working knowledge of basic management principles to increase the managerial proficiency of their subordinates through objective performance appraisal and evaluation of their potential. No data were available for staff managers and supervisors because no one in the group under study attended PADS.

Table IV-15 reveals a significant difference in the JDI variable pay between those managers who attended PADS and those who did not. The mean scores in LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ presented in Table IV-15 indicate a negative effect on managers who attended PADS. Those managers who attended the training rated lower in LOQC and LOQS; and they were more dissatisfied with their pay, promotion, supervision, and people, and slightly less dissatisfied with their work. Their superiors were more satisfied with their performance and personal adjustment, but less satisfied with their conformance, dependability, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and slightly higher in SBDQS than those who did not attend PADS.
### TABLE IV-15

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON COMPLETION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N =</th>
<th>Attended 17</th>
<th>Not Attended 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.76</td>
<td>57.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>54.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.71*</td>
<td>39.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.52*</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>28.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.94</td>
<td>35.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>44.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>23.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.24</td>
<td>75.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td>77.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>50.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

**Management by Objectives**

The Management by Objectives course was cancelled during the year of this study and is not offered by Saudia at this time because Saudia management felt MBO to be too complex for Saudis. Data are available only for managers and staff managers. This analysis is
presented to maintain consistency, although the number of personnel is insufficient to form definite results.

**TABLE IV-16**

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON COMPLETION OF MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>54.13</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>39.18</td>
<td>21.50*</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>26.96</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>23.87</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adj.</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Sat.</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>73.49</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>66.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>77.93</td>
<td>76.07</td>
<td>84.50</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

Table IV-16 shows a significant difference in the JDI variable work among the staff managers who attended MBO. It also demonstrates that the managers and staff managers who attended MBO rated lower than those who did not attend
in both LOQC and LOQS. The mean scores in JDI, MSS, and SBDQS for managers indicate that they were satisfied with work and people, less dissatisfied with promotion, and more dissatisfied with their pay and supervision. Their superiors were more satisfied with their performance but less satisfied with their conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in SBDQC and SBDQS.

The mean raw scores for JDI, MSS, and SBDQ for staff managers who attended MBO indicate that they were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, and people and more satisfied with their supervision. Their superiors were more satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in SBDQS and lower in SBDQS than those staff managers who did not attend MBO.

**Leadership Training**

This course used formal lectures and included some discussion and some practical exercises, demonstrations, and tests. It utilized a practical approach. A bare minimum of theory was given to ensure understanding of the simplest elements of basic supervision, with the emphasis on leadership. The length of the course was four days. Data are available for managers only, since
no participants in LT were found among staff managers and supervisors in this study. This course was intended for lead agent level personnel (Saudia personnel responsible for some but not all supervisory functions) responsible for daily scheduling, controlling, and training their subordinates. It is taught in Arabic and English and held at in-kingdom and out-of-kingdom stations as required (see Appendix G for a more detailed explanation).

Table IV-17 indicates a significant difference between managers in the JDI variables pay, promotion, supervision, and people; in the MSS variables conformance and general satisfactoriness; and in SBDQC.

The mean scores in Table IV-17 indicate a negative effect on managers who attended LT programs. These managers rated lower in LOQC and LOQS, and they were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people than those who did not attend LT. Their superiors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, and general satisfactoriness and slightly more satisfied with their personal adjustment. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and SBDQS than those managers who did not attend LT.

MDP Programs and Behavior

The response of 62 out of 99 managers participating in one or more MDP programs described a change
TABLE IV-17

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON COMPLETION OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>55.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>52.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>1.50₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>9.00₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>12.00₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>36.25₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>21.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>15.75₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>54.75₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>62.00₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.

in their behavior as a result of attending those programs.

The responses of those attending differed from one group to another. Most of attendants chose more than one variable to describe the change in their behaviors. The variables which received higher scores are as follows:
1. More oriented to Saudia goals--38 (29 managers, 5 staff managers, and 4 supervisors)
2. More sensitive to employees--26 (23 managers, 1 staff manager, and 2 supervisors)
3. Better able to get along with subordinates--26 (21 managers, 4 staff managers, and 1 supervisor)
4. Better able to get along with supervisors--22 (18 managers, 3 staff managers, and 1 supervisor)
5. Better able to get along with peers--17 (15 managers, 1 staff manager, and 1 supervisor)
6. Better able to get along with others outside Saudia--14 (13 managers, 0 staff managers, and 1 supervisor)

The following analysis explains the effect of these variables upon such other variables as LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ. Those categories receiving only one answer or zero could not be technically analyzed by the computer.

**More Oriented to Saudia Goals**

Twenty-nine out of 51 managers felt that they became more oriented to Saudia goals after attending MDP, as did 5 out of 7 staff managers and all 4 supervisors who attended MDP. Insufficient data were available for supervisors.

Table IV-18 indicates a significant difference in the JDI variable pay among managers and the JDI variable supervision among staff managers.

The mean scores in Table IV-18 indicate that the managers who felt that they became more oriented to Saudia goals rated lower in both LOQC and LOQS. They were more satisfied with their work and people and less dissatisfied with their pay, promotion, and supervision. Their
TABLE IV-18

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON BEHAVIOR CHANGE: MORE ORIENTED TO SAUDIA GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N =</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>NBC**</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>61.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>52.97</td>
<td>54.64</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>36.73**</td>
<td>29.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>34.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>49.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>46.31</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>38.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjust.</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Sat.</td>
<td>72.76</td>
<td>71.32</td>
<td>71.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>76.14</td>
<td>76.45</td>
<td>80.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>48.93</td>
<td>53.32</td>
<td>48.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference
** BC--behavior change; NBC--no behavior change.

superiors' satisfaction with them was about the same as that of those who did not feel they became more oriented to Saudia goals in their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them slightly lower in both SBDQC and SBDQS.
The staff managers who felt they became more oriented to Saudia goals rated lower in LOQC and higher in LOQS. They were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, and people and less dissatisfied with promotion and satisfied with supervision. Their superiors were about as satisfied with them as with those who did not feel they became more oriented to Saudia goals in their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in SBDQC and SBDQS.

More Sensitive to Employees

Twenty-three out of 51 managers, 1 out of 7 staff managers, and 2 out of 4 supervisors felt that they became more sensitive to employees as a result of attending MDP. Data for staff managers were insufficient, since only one staff manager out of seven responded in this group.

Table IV-19 indicates a significant difference in the variables LOQS, work, and SBDQC between managers, and a significant difference in the JDI variable people among staff managers.

The mean scores in Table IV-19 show that managers who became more sensitive to employees rated higher than those who did not in both LOQC and LOQS. They were more satisfied in JDI with their work and with people, less dissatisfied with promotion, and more dissatisfied with
TABLE IV-19

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL
PERSONNEL BASED ON BEHAVIOR CHANGE: MORE
SENSITIVE TO EMPLOYEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BC 23</td>
<td>NBC** 28</td>
<td>BC 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>59.61</td>
<td>56.50*</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>51.25**</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>36.64*</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>21.00*</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>42.61</td>
<td>8.00*</td>
<td>49.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adj.</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Sat.</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>63.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>72.43*</td>
<td>79.43</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
** BC--behavior change; NBC--no behavior change.

their pay and supervision. Their superiors were slightly more satisfied with their performance and personal adjustment, and slightly less satisfied with their conformance, dependability, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower than those who said
they did not become more sensitive to employees in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

The mean scores in Table IV-19 indicate that the staff managers who became more sensitive to employees rated higher than those who did not in both LOQC and LOQS. They were more satisfied with their work but more dissatisfied with their pay, promotion, supervision, and people. Their superiors were more satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Get Along Better with Subordinates

Twenty-one out of 51 managers, 4 out of 7 staff managers, and 1 out of 4 supervisors felt that they got along better with subordinates. Data for supervisors were insufficient in this category because only one supervisor felt that he got along with subordinates better after attending MDP.

As shown in Table IV-20, there was a significant difference between those managers who believed they got along better with subordinates and those who did not, where they rated lower in LOQS than those who did not respond to the question and higher in LOQC. There was no significant difference among staff managers who
### TABLE IV-20

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON BEHAVIOR CHANGE: GET ALONG BETTER WITH SUBORDINATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Staff Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>NBC**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>58.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>50.24*</td>
<td>56.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>38.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>27.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>34.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>43.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>17.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjust.</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>19.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Sta.</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>71.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>75.33</td>
<td>76.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td>51.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 0.05 significant difference
** BC--behavior change; NBC--no behavior change.

Felt they got along better with subordinates, but they rated higher in both LOQC and LOQS.

Mean raw scores in Table IV-20 indicate that those managers and staff managers who felt they got along better with subordinates rated high in the categories of work and relationships with people, indicating that they were more
satisfied in these areas. These personnel were getting along better with their subordinates in spite of their dissatisfaction with their pay, promotion, and supervision.

The superiors of the managers and staff managers were more satisfied with their performance, conformance, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness, and slightly less satisfied with their dependability than those who did not respond.

Considering mean scores, Table IV-20 also indicates that subordinates rated those managers who felt that they got along better with subordinates lower in both SBDQC and SBDQS than those who did not respond. In contrast, staff managers who felt that they got along better with subordinates were rated higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS than those who did not respond.

**Get Along Better with Superiors**

Eighteen of 51 managers, 3 of 7 staff managers, and 1 of 4 supervisors felt that they got along better with superiors. Only one supervisor felt that he got along better with superiors, technically considered insufficient data.

Table IV-21 shows a significant difference among staff managers in SBDQS but no significant difference among managers.
### TABLE IV-21

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON BEHAVIOR CHANGE: GET ALONG BETTER WITH SUPERIORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>NBC**</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>NBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>58.52</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>55.15</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>51.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>41.39</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>31.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>43.36</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>41.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance;</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjust.</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Sat.</td>
<td>71.44</td>
<td>70.52</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>71.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>72.72</td>
<td>78.21</td>
<td>84.33</td>
<td>73.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>43.50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.  
** BC--behavior change; NBC--no behavior change.

Mean scores in Table IV-20 indicate that the managers who felt they got along better with superiors rated lower in both LOQC and LOQS. They were more dissatisfied with their pay and supervision, and less dissatisfied with promotion and work and less satisfied with people than those who did not respond. Their superiors were more
satisfied with their performance, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness; their conformance and dependability were rated about the same. Their subordinates rated them lower in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

The mean scores in Table IV-21 indicate that the staff managers who felt they got along better with superiors rated lower in LOQC and higher in LOWS. They were less dissatisfied with their work, pay, and promotion and satisfied with supervision and people. Their superiors were more satisfied with their performance and conformance, and less satisfied with their dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Get Along Better with Peers

Eighteen of 51 managers, 1 of 7 staff managers, and 1 of 4 supervisors felt that they got along better with their peers after attending MDP programs. Data in this category were insufficient for both staff managers and supervisors due to the technicality of the computer.

Table IV-22 indicates a significant difference in the LOQC variables among managers who felt they got along better with their peers after attending MDP programs.

Mean scores in Table IV-22 show that those managers who felt that they got along better with their peers had lower scores in LOQC and LOQS (significant difference).
TABLE IV-22

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON BEHAVIOR CHANGE: GET ALONG BETTER WITH PEERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>NBC**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>58.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td>49.94*</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>38.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>28.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>35.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td>47.18</td>
<td>43.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conformance</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>18.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dependability</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>19.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>71.88</td>
<td>72.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>77.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>52.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference
** BC--behavior change; NBC--no behavior change.

They were somewhat satisfied with their work and people and more dissatisfied with their pay, promotion, and supervision. Their superiors rated them slightly higher in their performance, dependability, and personal adjustment, and lower in their conformance and general...
Get Along Better with Customers and the Public
Outside Saudia

Thirteen of 51 managers, none of 7 staff managers, and 1 of 4 supervisors felt that they got along with others (customers and the public) outside Saudia better as a result of attending MDP programs. Data were insufficient for staff managers and supervisors in this category.

Table IV-23 indicates a significant difference among the managers in SBDQC. Mean scores in Table IV-23 indicate that the managers who felt that MDP programs helped them get along better with customers and the public outside Saudia rated lower in both LOQC and LOQS than those who felt that MDP was of no help. They were less dissatisfied with their work, promotion, supervision, and people, and more dissatisfied with their pay. Their superiors were more satisfied with their performance. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC (significant difference) and higher in SBDQS than those who did not respond.

Effect of MDP on Jobs

This question asked the managers, staff managers, and supervisors to rate MDP in relation to helping them in their jobs. Their responses are presented in Table IV-24.

Table IV-24 shows that the majority—39—responded to the variable of feeling of achievement.
TABLE IV-23

MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON BEHAVIOR CHANGE: GET ALONG BETTER WITH CUSTOMERS AND THE PUBLIC OUTSIDE SAUDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>NBC**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQC</td>
<td>55.15</td>
<td>58.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQS</td>
<td>51.23</td>
<td>54.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>39.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>30.46</td>
<td>27.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>33.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>44.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>23.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformance</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>17.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>73.46</td>
<td>72.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQC</td>
<td>71.00**</td>
<td>78.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQS</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>50.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference
** BC—behavior change; NBC—no behavior change.
### TABLE IV-24

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON EFFECT OF MDP ON THE JOB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feeling of achievement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disappointed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promotion, Salary Increase, and Feeling of Achievement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not Useful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* M—Managers; SM—Staff Managers; S—Supervisors.

Staff managers and supervisors were eliminated because their response was not sufficient to be analyzed by the computer. The data were insufficient to compare the managers with staff managers and supervisors. Comparisons here were made only for managers to determine the effect of each variable on the five responses.

Table IV-25 shows a significant difference between managers in the variables of pay, promotion, people, and performance. Mean scores in Table IV-25 indicate that, in general, those who felt MDP was not useful or were disappointed rated lower than the others in both LOQC and LOQS. They were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people (JDI). Their superiors were somewhat less satisfied with their performance,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N =</th>
<th>1 to 2</th>
<th>2 to 3</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>4 to 5</th>
<th>5 to 6</th>
<th>6 to 7</th>
<th>7 to 8</th>
<th>8 to 9</th>
<th>9 to 10</th>
<th>10 to 11</th>
<th>11 to 12</th>
<th>12 to 13</th>
<th>13 to 14</th>
<th>14 to 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>59.19</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>59.19</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>55.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>56.32</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>56.32</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>50.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>42.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.34a</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.34a</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.34a</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.34a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promo</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Super.</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td>20.63b</td>
<td>38.25e</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td>20.63b</td>
<td>38.25e</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>44.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>32.25a</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>32.25a</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>46.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>23.42b</td>
<td>22.88a</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>23.42b</td>
<td>22.88a</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depend.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. G. Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>81.17</td>
<td>71.39</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>81.17</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>81.17</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>81.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SDQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>80.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SDQMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>53.88</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>53.88</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>53.88</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>50.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 significant difference.
1—Promotion; 2—Feeling of Achievement; 3—Disappointed; 4—Not Useful; 5—Promotion, Salary Increase, and Feeling of Achievement.
conformance, and general satisfactoriness, and somewhat satisfied with their dependability and personal adjustment (MSS). Their subordinates rated them somewhat higher in both SBDQC and SBDQS.

Mean scores in Table IV-25 indicate that the majority of managers who felt that they gained a feeling of achievement rated higher than others in LOQC and LOQS. They were more satisfied with their work and people and were less dissatisfied with their pay, promotion, and supervision (JDI). Their superiors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness (MSS). Their subordinates rated them higher in SBDQC and lower in SBDQS.

Helpfulness of MDP

The next question sought to determine whether, and to what extent, the program helped the managerial personnel in their jobs. Their answers are presented in Table IV-26.
### TABLE IV-26

**MEAN QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR SAUDIA MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL BASED ON HELPFULNESS OF MDP ON THE JOB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>S*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Help</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some Help</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most Help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* M--Managers; SM--Staff Managers; S--Supervisors.

The data for staff managers and supervisors were insufficient, so the comparison given is for managers only for the four variables.

Table IV-27 shows a significant difference between managers who felt that the MDP program was not helpful in the variables of work, supervision, people, and dependability. Mean scores in Table IV-27 indicate that those who felt MDP was not helpful for them on the job rated lower than others in both LOQC and LOWS. They were more dissatisfied than others with their work (significant difference), pay, promotion, supervision (significant difference), and people (significant difference). Their superiors were less satisfied with their performance, conformance, dependability (significant difference).
### TABLE IV-27

**Mean Questionnaire Scores for Saudia Managerial Personnel Based on Helpfulness of MDP on the Job--Managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N =</th>
<th>1 to 2</th>
<th>2 to 3</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>2 to 3</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
<th>3 to 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>59.21</td>
<td>58.58</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>59.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LOQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>55.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.20†</td>
<td>41.63</td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>41.63</td>
<td>40.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>27.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Super.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.60†</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>35.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.80†</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>46.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depend.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.20†</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gen. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td>75.05</td>
<td>73.47</td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td>75.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SBDQC</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.40</td>
<td>80.13</td>
<td>79.84</td>
<td>72.89</td>
<td>80.13</td>
<td>79.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBDQS</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>54.13</td>
<td>49.63</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>54.13</td>
<td>49.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† .05 significant difference.

1--No Help; 2--Neutral; 3--Some Help; 4--Most Help.
personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness. Their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQC and higher in SBDQS than others.

Most Helpful Aspect of MDP

The purpose of this section of the questionnaire was to determine which aspect of the MDP program was most helpful to Saudia managers, staff managers, and supervisors. Responses differed from one group to another, but the following statements are typical:

1. Functions of management: planning, organizing, directing, leading, motivating, communicating, coordinating, and control—56.
2. Human relations: motivation; communication; participation; persuasion; how to deal with people, subordinates, peers, superiors; and creating a very useful environment of coordination and finding the solution of some problems as collective work or teamwork to realize the objectives of Saudia—37.
3. Knowing new theories in the art of management, such as how to delegate authority, leadership theories, Maslow’s theory, Herzberg’s theory—41.
4. Every part of MDP was useful; we became satisfied that we were doing the right thing; we know about records; meeting and acquaintance with other departments—26.
5. Developing abilities and talents; we know how to evaluate employees; to achieve and administer the policies of Saudia—21.
6. It is not applicable and not useful—15.

Among these responses only 15 respondents felt that MDP was not helping them in their jobs and that they did not learn anything from it to be applied in their work.

Managers, staff managers, and supervisors were also asked what else could have been included in MDP that would
be useful in their jobs. These responses were also long and differed from one group to another, but most of the answers may be summarized as follows:

1. Advanced programs or practice in other airlines to be in continuous development—45.
2. All the levels of management, from vice-president to supervisors, most contribute and make it a compulsory obligation for everyone to increase the percentage of the Saudi personnel, because the top management must know how to delegate authority and trust their subordinates—27.
3. It must be designed to fit the needs of the managers and departments—31.
4. Expanding the program to the practical application which must be applied on the job—28.
5. Extending the period of study, because fifteen days is not enough—24.
6. Giving rewards to the best achievers where there must be an evaluation to see the change in those attending the program—23.

Summary of Findings

Significant differences were observed in the behavior of managers, staff managers, and supervisors between those who attended MDP programs and those who did not in the leadership styles of consideration.

Among the managers, a significant difference appeared between different ages in the leadership styles of consideration. In addition, a significant difference was observed in the leadership styles of structure between those managers who attended MDP programs and felt they became more sensitive to employees and better able to get along with peers and subordinates, and those managers who attended but did not feel these improvements. A significant
difference appeared between the staff managers who attended TMM in the leadership style of consideration.

Among managers, a significant difference appeared between different ages in the JDI variable promotion, between different lengths of service in people, between different majors in pay, between different functions in the variables pay and supervision, and between overall ratings in promotion. In addition, a significant difference appeared among managers who attended TMM and PADS in pay; leadership training in pay, promotion, supervision, and people; more sensitive to employees and more oriented to Saudia goals in work; affected by MDP in the variables pay, promotion, supervision, and people; and finding MDP helpful on the job in the variables work, supervision, and people.

Among staff managers, a significant difference was observed between different lengths of service in the JDI variable people; education in work; training in pay; TMM in the variables work and pay; PADS in pay; MBO in work; and oriented to Saudia goals in supervision.

Among supervisors, a significant difference appeared between ages in the JDI variables pay and people; TMM in people; and ST and sensitive to employees in the variables promotion and people.
A significant difference was observed between the managers who attended leadership training program in the MSS variables conformance and general satisfactoriness, and affected by MDP in performance. A significant difference was also observed for managers who felt MDP was helpful to them in their job in dependability.

A significant difference appeared between staff managers in the place of education in MSS variables dependability and general satisfactoriness, and between those staff managers who attended TMM and MBO in the variables conformance, personal adjustment, and general satisfactoriness.

A significant difference was observed between managers who attended leadership training and felt that they became more sensitive to employees and got along better with customers and the public outside Saudia in leadership styles of consideration (SBDQC). In addition, a significant difference among the managers between different majors in leadership style of structure (SBDQS) was observed.

A significant difference between staff managers who felt they became able to get along better with superiors in leadership styles of structure (SBDQS) was observed.

A significant difference appeared between managers, staff managers, and supervisors in the JDI variables work and promotion and in the MSS variable personal adjustment.
Chapter V analyzes the results of the questionnaires presented in this chapter, and Chapter VI presents the conclusions and recommendations of this study.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The central theme of this study has been to survey and critically examine the existing Saudi Arabian Airlines Management Development Programs to determine which areas of the current programs must be given priority and greater emphasis at Saudia, as well as to ascertain MDP's effects on managers, staff managers, and supervisors. The primary purposes of this chapter are to pinpoint the main findings of the study and to analyze these findings in light of current knowledge and the Saudi Arabian culture.

Although scattered significant differences appeared in some of the data presented in this study, there were no specific patterns for these differences, and it appeared that MDP could not produce any change in the behavior of those managers, staff managers, and supervisors who participated in it, a clear indication that the program was far from achieving its objectives.

Several factors contributed to this result, some stemming from company policy; some from the lack of experience, age, etc., of executives; and others from the MDP program itself.
From the data analyzed in the previous chapters, the major areas of discussion in this chapter will be the following: 1. Saudi Arabian culture and Western culture, 2. Saudization, 3. Saudia's need for manpower analysis and planning for management succession and Saudization efforts, 4. MDP programs, and 5. evaluation and follow-up.

Saudi Arabian Culture and Western Culture

"Culture" in Saudi Arabia means "religion." The most unifying force in Saudi Arabia is Islam. Islam is the way of life of the people in Saudi Arabia because Islam permeates all aspects of the life of all citizens. This includes society, family, government, politics, economics, administration, education, and many others (15, p. 105). For example, in administration and government Verse 38 of the Holy Quran (Yusuf Ali Interpretation) says, "Their affairs by mutual consultation." "Their conduct in life is open and determined by mutual consultation between those who are entitled to a voice, e.g., in private domestic affairs, as between husband and wife, or between partners and parties interested; and in state affairs as between ruler and ruled, or as between different departments of administration" (17, p. 1317).

Islam is not only suitable for all people at all times, but also reconcilable with modern Western science and technology. The view of Islam on learning is that
expressed in the Quran and the saying of the prophet Mohammed in many verses and statements. In the Quran, Allah ordered men to say in their prayers, "O my Lord, advance me in knowledge" (17, p. 814). Also in the first revelation to the prophet Mohammed, he was commanded by the angel Gabriel, "Read!" To the plea that he was no reader, the command was repeated: "Read in the name of your Lord who created . . . who taught man he knew not" (17, p. 1606). "God changes not what is in the people until they change what it is in themselves" (17, p. 606); education is thus regarded in Islam as the most effective of the means of change.

The prophet Mohammed developed the theme of the importance of learning in a number of ways:

- The quest for learning is a duty incumbent upon every Muslim, male and female.
- Wisdom is the goal of the believer, and he must seek it irrespective of its sources.
- Allah eases the way to paradise for him who seeks learning.
- Angels spread their wings for the seeker of learning as a mark of Allah's approval of his purpose.
- Seek learning from the cradle to the grave.
- Seek learning even from China.

These verses from the Quran and sayings of the prophet Mohammed demonstrate how strongly Islam advocates learning; the Quran proclaims that there is no limit to learning, although man's share of it necessarily remains small (13, p. 26).
Problems in the political and cultural conditions of the Islamic people at this time are, therefore, not due to any deficiency in their faith but, rather, to the failure of Islam's adherents to live up to its ideals and apply them to changing conditions (1, p. 25).

Unfortunately, when it comes to government practices, paternalistic authoritarianism is the dominant practice in Saudi Arabia. Centralization of control is characteristic in the government and in business firms. One government official said that delegation of authority, for many Saudis, is viewed as indecisiveness. Despite the current tendency to delegate, the top man in an organization or the head of a government department likes to be seen as carrying the organization on his shoulders and as doing everything himself. Some top officials believe that many Saudi managers consider themselves to be indispensable.

One government official said that in Saudi Arabia Saudi employees are hired for life and are practically never fired. Promotions are given largely on the basis of seniority at all levels. Some officials believed that the incompetent executive moves up with advancing years to positions with titles appropriate to his age. The pay of employees bears little relationship to their productivity. This is particularly true for Saudia employees, as shown in the interviews presented in Chapter III.
Most vice-presidents and general managers at Saudia agreed that the available manpower from which prospective managers must be selected is very small in Saudi Arabia. It consists of small numbers of university graduates with little job training experience, a larger number of secondary school graduates with even less job training experience, and a very small educated elite capable of assuming managerial responsibilities. Managerial resources are extremely scarce. Most managers, staff managers, and supervisors at Saudia felt that it was impossible for some of the company's top executives to delegate authority even though they might agree that the concept of delegation was necessary.

Some officials believed that Saudia was facing an extremely complicated situation. They believed that the company was operating in a rapidly changing environment, with too much reliance on foreign experts who lacked the required skills for understanding and working in Saudi Arabia. They also believed that there was too much reliance on these foreigners to perform specific tasks rather than on developing Saudi nationals. The best comparison between the West and Saudi Arabia is embodied in Ross Matheson's statement about the developing countries as compared with western nations:

A developed or industrialized country has inbuilt economic norms, patterns of life and expectations that are the result of generations and painstaking deliberate development. It contains an accumulation of
knowledge which finds expression not only in its institutions and its patterns of thought, but also in its various disciplines. Expectations are based on previous experiences, discoveries are usually the result of the application of current knowledge, and while life contains its peaks and valleys it also contains its stability and security. In a less developed country it can be the very absence of these things that makes growth difficult. There is less recognition of ability, less thought given to the future, little attention to potential and in many cases little interest in changes (10, pp. xv-xvi).

But Saudi Arabia differs from other developing countries in that it is interested in change and progress under its Islamic traditions and laws which do not oppose the modern industrial requirements of delegation, responsibility, and the establishment of proper role relationships. This change must come about by means of strengthening the managerial staff, preparing them to assume responsibility effectively and efficiently. As Matheson says, "... changes themselves can become reality only if the wishes are actioned through people who are skilled in management or administration. In the longer term it will be the quality of such people which will to a large extent determine the lasting quality of the changes" (10, p. xvi).

Saudi Arabia is a developing country and, as stated in the interviews presented in Chapter III, Saudia is one of the nation's top organizations. But it had no formal plans for management succession, it lacked experienced people in the local labor market, and its records did not show managers' age distribution, analyze their efficiency
in their positions, or show their reasons for leaving. In addition, there were no standards to measure efficiency, communication was lacking, and records did not contain adequate information for future management needs. Estimates of the number and skills of future managers were based on government statistics by division or occupational class, but executives felt that these government forecasts were not based on reliable data. Forecasting techniques affecting supplies had not been adopted by Saudia; there were no formalized forecasts, and there was no integration between the fleet and the manpower planning.

Management development in Saudi Arabia before the 1970s was best described by Shyam B. L. Bharaduraj as the shortcomings of management development efforts in most developing countries:

Inadequate planning and coordination at the national level; the limited number of institutions and agencies; inadequate faculty resources and teaching material; insufficient management consulting and research activity, with no links with training; inadequate interest in training for top management, junior executives, first line supervisors, and self-employed entrepreneurs; insufficient attention to management training for small and medium sized businesses; inadequate links between national development, organization development, and management development. In most developing countries, there seems to be hardly any training needs analysis at the national level, organization level, or individual level. Often, even the existing facilities for management development are not fully utilized. Evaluation of the effectiveness of management development activities is universally difficult (1, p. 160).
In 1970 Saudi Arabia initiated its first five-year national development plan, followed by a second five-year plan from 1975 to 1980. New universities were established, and management development programs were adopted in the government, the Ford Foundation, and other associations such as Petromin and its subsidiaries, Saudia, and others. Hundreds of teachers and managers participated in many associations and universities all around the world. All of this indicated new dimensions and awareness for Saudi Arabia. This is applicable to many developing countries in the 1970s, as Bharaduraj points out:

New institutions and coordinating agencies are being created. Links between general education and management education are being forged. New concepts and models in management education and training are being sought. Professionalism in management is emerging as a new ethos. A systems perspective is being increasingly adopted. Professional management associations and productivity centers are springing up. In-company programs are being developed. The concept of continuous education for the manager/administrator has found acceptance. More developed nations and international agencies are coming forward with aid and advice to help the developing nations in giving a new look to their development administration and business management (1, p. 160).

Effective development of Saudi managers must be a major component of the national development. This relationship is very essential because the Saudi Arabian government in its initiation of the national development plan is trying to accelerate the growth of the country to keep up with the world's technology. With respect to this Matheson states:
In recognizing the joint relationship between national development of managers and administrators, any emerging country must therefore ensure that both the present managers and those of the future are equipped with the knowledge, attitudes and skills, the technical, conceptual and human abilities and the philosophy of accomplishment that will enable it to create and maintain its place in a changing world (10, p. xvii).

Saudia, like any other private or public organization in Saudi Arabia and in most other emerging countries, has imported talent to carry out jobs rather than to help or train native employees to do them. Harbison emphasizes this situation as one of the main problems in the developing nations. He states,

Another pitfall is reliance on outsiders to perform tasks rather than to develop people. As an expendable resource, the most important use of expatriate experts is as "Seed Corn" to build the skills, knowledge, and capacities of local manpower. Their principal function should be that of educators and trainers. But frequently, expatriates cultivate the art of making themselves indispensable in performing particular tasks. The fault is not theirs. The inability of the developing country to provide counterparts to be trained is a common complaint. In addition, counterparts once trained may be siphoned off to quite unrelated activities (4, p. 102).

Saudia managers have the ability to comprehend the modern technology of the advanced countries if the imported experts have the skills to operate in the Saudi Arabian environment and culture. But, unfortunately, most experts imported for work in Saudi Arabia have lacked these skills, causing distrust between them and Saudia top executives and provoking the impression among these top executives that
the experts are of mediocre talent and could not find jobs in their own countries. Ronald C. Marston stresses the need for mutual understanding among native and expatriate staff: "Management principles and expertise can be applied world-wide as long as consideration for the people, the environment, and the culture is also given. This will affect the management style and system but the expertise can still be applied" (9, p. 56). Harbison also supports this idea when he says:

Many developing countries may experience a kind of a "consultant indigestion" which in its more acute form can virtually paralyze the development process. The planning, ordering, and coordination of technical assistance is thus a high priority requirement but one which many developing countries find difficult to manage (4, p. 102).

In short, experts who come to Saudi Arabia must understand the culture, needs, and environment of the country to make the communication more effective. The learning theory of Islam, established fourteen hundred years ago, was based on the incidents, needs, psychological environment, and reasoning. The Quran was revealed by Allah to the prophet Mohammed in a period of twenty-three years either in parts (sura) or verses according to the incidents, needs, psychological environment, and reasoning guiding the prophet Mohammed and the people to the right solutions for problems. This is also applicable to the contemporary learning theories which demand that learning
fit the need of the learner, his psychological environment, incidents, and reasoning.

**Saudization**

Saudia's long-range objective is to move forward steadily with Saudization, meaning the transfer of all functions and responsibilities of the airline now being filled by foreign nations to Saudis. This desire has been emphasized by Saudia's Board of Directors. As a result, a Royal Decree was initiated in 1965, which led to the converted Managerial Development Plan for Saudia in 1972. From 1972 to 1977, many programs were developed. MBO was developed by a British consultant; TMM was imported from the U.S.A.; and ST, PADS, and LT were developed by Saudia's TWA-staffed training department with the cooperation of other departments. Matheson observes the following problem areas usually encountered when a developing country attempts to become self-sufficient:

The natural tendency is for a country to wish to have its own people in positions of responsibility and while this can be an emotion laden topic it is one that has to be faced. While there is no one solution it is apparent that the planned approach to manpower and management planning that is an integrated part of management development becomes a tool of critical importance. Such problems can only be solved if they are based on staff succession planning and directed training and staff development, together with an equal mixture of common sense and realistic thinking (10, p. xviii).

Harbison's ideas with regard to Saudization are similar:

A major objective of all third world countries is to become self-sufficient in high-talent manpower. No country wants to depend indefinitely upon foreigners for performance of strategic social, political,
and economic functions; it must always reserve its best and most prestigious for its own nationals. Thus, most developing countries properly look upon imported brainpower as a temporary, expendable resource (4, p. 79).

Saudia's managerial practices, policies, and goals, as analyzed by the company's own executives, indicated that, at the time this research was conducted, the organization's career planning and management succession were still in the beginning stages of effective implementation. Saudia is far from reaching full Saudization unless it can attract more Saudis, hold them, and follow through with planned training and development activities. The progress toward Saudization has not been good; the rate of Saudization has been impaired by the lack of human resources and ineffective follow-up.

All vice-presidents and general managers believed that managers' dissatisfaction with salary at Saudia was in first place among their reasons for being discontented with their work. Opportunities for work elsewhere were numerous and caused instability for Saudia manpower planning. Since competition in the private sector was very keen, private businesses usually offered more incentives than Saudia. Other managers believed that there were obstacles to their advancement and progress at Saudia; some were seeking improved benefits or better housing; some wanted to enter the private sector or engage in government
work; some were prestige-conscious and wanted to be more than what one executive called "a cog in the machine."
Other reasons for leaving were dissatisfaction, frustration, transportation difficulties, lack of medical programs, and the like. One general manager believed that many Saudi managers were resigning due to the inadequate salary program. Anyone with any basic management skill and initiative could secure a higher salary with a private firm. The availability of suitable Saudi managers outside the company was very low, since the salary and benefit programs left much to be desired.

Saudia's Need for Manpower Analysis and Planning for Management Succession and Saudization Efforts

Individual managers developed individual plans for selected subordinates which were used at Saudia on an informal basis. This system of managerial analysis was part of the managerial training and development program. As carried out, however, training and development were generalized and collective. This duality was illustrated by one general manager: "We do not have a firm, fixed plan yet. It must be resolved and discussed with top management. . . . Sometimes we are not limited to individual needs and requirements." Another general manager said, "Our training program is imported (from non-Saudi sources). In my opinion, good training and development
should be designed to meet the diagnosed needs. At the beginning you import, but then the program must be modified. The plan is not related to the overall objectives and is not even measurable. It is not flexible."

Many executives agreed that Saudia's records did not contain adequate information for future management needs analysis, nor was the efficiency of managers, staff managers, and supervisors analyzed in these records. Saudia's records were not maintained to fill the future needs of the organization for managers or to list the names of individuals with potential for promotion because such information was highly confidential. An examination of these records indicated a lack of consistency and follow-through in establishing and maintaining industrial management training and development records.

Some informal methods were devised by the Management and Development Department for determining needs. These were analysis of problems, analysis of individual behavior, performance appraisal, conferences, counseling, interviews, observation, and informal talks (14, p. 2). Donald L. Kirkpatrick in his article entitled "Determining Supervisory Training Needs and Setting Objectives" states:

If your training program is going to be successful, it must be based on the needs of the supervisors in your organization. These needs should be carefully determined through a variety of methods. The needs must then be converted to objectives—what do we want to accomplish in a training program. With these two
solid foundations (needs and objectives), specific plans can be made of what to do and how to do it (6, p. 19).

Determining needs was lacking at Saudia where the program was generalized and not designed to fit the needs of Saudi managers. But the lack of needs analysis is not peculiar to Saudia; it exists in many companies in the Western world as well. William C. Byham in his article "Changing Supervisory and Managerial Behavior--Part II" remarks:

Adequate diagnosis of training and development needs is vital. . . . Yet, this is what is lacking in most management training and development programs. We do not have a good fix on the individuals who are being trained; therefore, even if we have the proper tools, we cannot react appropriately. One can be the best trainer in the world; but without insight into the needs of the people being trained, it is difficult to achieve effective training. The result of poor diagnosis is that programs very often train the wrong people about the wrong things at the wrong time (2, p. 19).

Saudia not only lacked needs analysis for individual managers; in addition, there was no formal plan for succession, which is vital to the growth and continuation of a company. Because of the shortage of manpower, Saudia managers at all levels were busy in doing their jobs; they either did not have enough time or they were not inclined to groom successors to take over for them in the future. The idea that managers do not spend much time planning is also found in industrial countries; Minsberg found
that "managers spend more time in contact activities and coordination than any significant planning" (11, p. 26).

Saudia must block from promotion and/or renew the contract of anyone who has not provided and trained a successor for his position. This must be a part of a total plan established by Saudia in order to have 1. a team of executives ten years from now that will possess the ability to carry on when some of the current executives retire, resign, or otherwise terminate their service with the company; 2. a team that can make decisions with a high degree of openness of discussion, confrontation of differences, and commitment to their decisions; and 3. sufficient executives to handle its long-range growth so that the quality of management does not become overly diluted.

The consensus of vice-presidents and general managers at Saudia was that the company had no formal plans for management succession either in the past or at the present time. No written plan was in use or on file. Saudia policies did not assure fair and impartial consideration for everyone. Too much politics was involved in succession, with little consideration based on merit or ability. Nepotism was one of the prime considerations for promotions. There was no policy as a whole; succession decisions depended on individual managers themselves, and it was left to the individual to train his successor.
A general manager stated, "... The problem is that there is no integration between the fleet and the manpower planning. Fleet planning comes first; manpower planning, last. This situation will not coincide with manpower planning because Saudia's rapid changes carry a tremendous demand for change from managers. The organization is facing problems of obtaining the required manpower, especially on the managerial level. Developing managers in the proper way will take a long time, and this will make a big difference." Most vice-presidents and general managers stated that Saudia did not use the "management audit" concept, and forecasts were not based on reliable data.

Many other problems existed in this area, such as budgetary restrictions (although Saudia's budget was adequate, internal flexibility caused these restrictions) and a fifty per cent vacancy rate in available jobs. Personnel were not living up to the normal growth of the organization, since Saudia's expansion prevented them from keeping positions filled with Saudis. A large deficiency of qualified personnel still existed for promotion to fill management vacancies, and many foreign personnel continued to be recruited from the United States and Europe. In fact, current labor markets for qualified personnel included countries as distant from Saudi Arabia
as Malaysia, Korea, and China, because of the lack of experienced people in the local labor market. Many Saudia executives believed that vacancies were not filled from within the corporation due to the lack of qualified managers at Saudia but other general managers and vice-presidents felt that problems arose in putting qualified men into required positions; it was difficult to give employees the necessary incentives to fill positions. A large number of qualified and qualifiable Saudis could be guided to do their jobs efficiently, but they needed encouragement in dedication to personnel and corporational concepts.

Another general manager stated, "Filling vacancies has not been easy for Saudia in this time of record growth and expansion." This was due to the lack of a management audit; as one general manager stated, "We have no management audit concept, and forecasts are not based on reliable data." Many executives believed that Saudia records did not show the managers' age distribution, nor did they analyze the managers' efficiency in their positions or show their reasons for leaving Saudia. Most executives believed that such a system of records was a manpower planning function and therefore not their personal responsibility. Most general managers and vice-presidents stated that Saudia's records
were not maintained to fill the future needs of the organization for managers or to list the names of individuals with potential for promotion, since this information was confidential.

The majority of general managers and vice-presidents believed that there were no formal manpower forecasts at Saudia. Estimates of the number and skills of future managers were based on government statistics by divisions or occupational class, but Saudia executives felt that these government forecasts were not based on reliable data. Forecasting techniques affecting labor supplies had not been adopted by Saudia, but plans have been made to develop such methods, to be based upon government estimates for the Saudi national labor market. Top executives believed they had five-year plans that would reveal whether more expansion was needed in the future. Before budget work began, every department set up a new organization. They studied their requirements and their contribution to the employment department very thoroughly before this selection was made.

Recruitment was currently more linked to the corporation budgetary system, but with the development of the Personnel Information System (PIS) and manpower standards the budget system would become an integral part of manpower forecasting. PIS would be useful in many functions, such as reservations,
ticketing, and other information used for manpower planning and the like. Executives commented upon the necessity for keeping forecasts and recruitment adequate to meet Saudia's current and projected expansion. Top executives believed that any data would be helpful for management forecasting, such as statistical computer information. It would be helpful to know what resources were available in manpower planning and what could be provided by the government only, but Saudia personnel were normally involved in trying to get the job done instead of doing research and planning; that was one of Saudia's problems.

Another problem existed in the area of cooperation and coordination between departments, especially between training and development departments, manpower planning, and the personnel department. Some top executives believed that this problem was created in part by the lack of integration between the fleet and manpower planning divisions. Fleet planning came first; manpower planning, last. This situation did not coincide with manpower needs because Saudia's rapid changes carry a tremendous demand for change from managers. The organization is facing critical problems of obtaining the required manpower, especially on the managerial level. The continuation of growth and diversification will eventually lead to ever-increasing demands for manpower skills of every
type. The key to meeting these growing demands is an educational system directed at meeting the manpower needs of the country. Saudi Arabia is attempting to provide such a system, as demonstrated by the tremendous increase in education from 1972 to 1977, discussed earlier in this study.

Management Development Programs and Seminar Presentation

Management Development Programs at Saudia were far behind schedule because of the rapid expansion taking place in Saudi Arabia as a whole. Most top executives believed that this program could become independent and self-sustaining after weaknesses were corrected and the program modified to fit the environment and changes in its own philosophy. They felt that MDP in general was especially suited to lower-level management; for instance, it provided refresher courses for those with business majors and an introduction for beginners. Most MDP programs were introduced and managed with MBO concepts, but MBO was too theoretical and necessitated a great deal of paperwork for supervisors and thus was ineffectively implemented. This difficulty was one manifestation of MDP's need for continuing modification. MBO was discontinued because of these implementation programs. Top executives believed that MDP was collective and the
syllabus was not flexible. The general feeling was that the syllabus was planned by the instructor responsible for development of the program with the consent and approval of the manager. This syllabus met the corporate and departmental objectives, was thoroughly reviewed by the general managers and vice-presidents, and was edited and revised as necessary. Some executives stressed what they believed to be deficiencies in this method: "Our training program is imported . . . MDP should be designed to meet the diagnosed needs." Other executives believed that the program was logically but insufficiently planned by corporate administrators and therefore was not flexible.

Of the many in-house programs--TMM, LT, PADS, and MBO--only MBO was eliminated. These courses were taken in-kingdom, with the exception of TMM, which was given outside the kingdom. The time allowed for TMM was two weekdays, which, as all managers, general managers, and vice-presidents commented, was not enough time for the material presented in the course to be digested by those taking it. The sequence of courses was not followed; some personnel took TMM first, some ST, some PADS, etc. These courses must be taken in sequence--ST first, then TMM, and PADS last--by first-line supervisors and those who did not have a management base.
Most top executives defined objectives in terms of what a manager was able to do when he completed the course of instruction. Adequate standards were not available for management courses and managerial forms, but standards had been set up for non-managerial personnel.

Saudia's Management Development Programs are vital to Saudization, but the present system to accomplish Saudization and thence to increase the overall managerial efficiency of Saudis in the airline was not producing the desired results. The problem was that the current program was too cumbersome and complex, and not easily understood. This system must be simplified, with the objective of designing an MDP system that will meet Saudia's current needs and support the objectives of the Management Development effort. Matheson supports this idea:

Ideally new knowledge should be presented in a way that reduces the subject to its fundamental elements, without sacrifice of any of the key issues, and provides a foundation for logical and progressive extension to the more sophisticated areas of the subject (10, p. 44).

Adoption of using learning theories is dependent on the study of the needs and environment in Saudi Arabia. Any learning theory (behavioral, cognitive, etc.) may be used, but there is no one specific theory which must be applied in all cases at Saudia. What is required is to apply the theory which fits the need
of the individual. Leslie This and Gordon L. Lippitt observe, "Perhaps different learning theories apply according to the nature of the subject to be taught and learned, the nature of the organization, the nature of the trainees, and the available teaching resources. This would indicate that no single learning theory can be applied across-the-board to all learning activities" (12, p. 54).

It is best when learning occurs in a living situation (on-the-job training) because what is learned is directly applied on the job and, in this case, little transfer is needed. As Matheson states, "There is no mystery about something which is relevant and can be seen to be either a living problem or as an in-context solution. . . . The desire to achieve or accomplish can grow from a learning situation which derives from the living facts of the daily environment" (10, p. 14). But some Saudia general managers and vice-presidents believed that some intellectual work had to be done in the program by showing, telling, and doing exercises; most of these are ineffective, compared to training by doing.

In determination of the steps taken to follow up after training and evaluation or modification, some executives in the Training and Development Department
declared that there was a follow-up after training; other executives, in contrast, stated that few follow-up steps were taken for evaluation, except in TMM. Others felt that there was no follow-up, and still others felt that follow-up was conducted in a rather narrow basis; some executives said that follow-up was the duty of the general manager of the division or his representative.

Some top executives believed that the training programs were evaluated on three bases: 1. feedback from the students—what they thought about the course; 2. feedback from the supervisors—whether they were satisfied or not; 3. review sessions held by the staff responsible for the course and a continuation of the review to determine whether circumstances were changing. The programs were modified whenever necessary to do the job properly; a general manager remarked, "Informal reporting on progress after training and regular re-checks are used to ascertain that the trainee is applying what he learned. We write to the training department about the weaknesses and shortages in training programs. Sometimes we try to give the employees another chance after consulting the training department, and we cooperate with them in completing the required frame."

A number of facts are evident from these comments:

1. The lack of cooperation between other departments and the Training and Development Department.
2. The lack of communication between other departments and the Training and Development Department.

3. The lack of coordination between various departments and top management to work as a team for the success of the organization.

4. The lack of cooperation between the Corporate Training Department and Personnel Planning and Administration Departments on one hand and between the Corporate Training Department and other departments on the other in the organization as a whole.

Most vice-presidents and general managers of the other departments viewed management training and development programs as not relevant to their jobs. These complaints are not unique to Saudia; they are also found in most companies in industrialized countries. Patrick M. Williams says:

Management training or development programs are frequently viewed as irrelevant because the training does not focus on the solution of "real time" problems. At best it might be labeled as nice to know. . . . at worst, it is seen as a classroom exercise that has little or nothing to do with the real problems of the managers. Even if the material presented seems relevant, transferring it to the job often proves impractical (16, p. 43).

With regard to this problem Byham warns, "We train people in the wrong things when we train them in skills which are not related to their current jobs or expected future jobs. We put people in programs where they have development needs" (2, p. 11).

Each department at Saudia not only lacked cooperation but was also trying to make the others fail, creating a serious problem. All of these difficulties were the
result of poor organization. The selection of the external courses and development of internal courses were viewed differently by various executives; some felt that they were chosen on the basis of needs, relevance, values, and personal choice and with the consultation of every department from the instructor to the general managers or vice-presidents. Others believed that none of these existed; one executive believed that in-company programs were developed by one department with the consultation of the training division. The external courses were selected by corporate training and sometimes by definite requirements.

Lack of support from top management was also apparent. It is vital to the success of management development programs that newly-learned behavior be positively rewarded by top management with recognition, encouragement, approbation, and opportunities to use the new behavior. Matheson supports this view:

Real problems can emerge if a developed talent is left idle. There is probably no greater disincen-
tive than being given a set of skills and being denied the opportunities to put them to work. To be effective the level of sophistication in the planned learning has to be appropriate to the planned application of knowledge (10, p. 124).

Top management can create an environment conducive to development by helping the managerial staff to recognize and accept the need for development, encouraging them to
develop their subordinates, giving special assignments, or moving them to other departments. Top management can facilitate the existence of good staff, equipment, and education aids in the field. Kirkpatrick goes still further in his recommendations for creating a better job climate:

One solution is to provide training and development to higher-level management so that they will accept and encourage the recommended change in behavior. This can be done by having middle-level and top management read management books or attend training classes inside or outside the organization. Also, it may be achieved by involving upper-level managers in the planning and implementation of the supervisory training program. At the very least, upper-level management should get a 'capsule' version of the behavior that is being taught the supervisors. By not knowing what supervisory behavior is being taught, bosses are apt to be 'discouraging' or 'preventive' (6, p. 10).

In his article "Top Management's Role in Management Development" Jan Kreiken declares, "Top management's involvement with management training is not limited to aspects of policy, planning, programming, selection, and motivation. It also concerns organization and control" (7, p. 19).

This involvement of top management is necessary to create a favorable climate, but without interfering or centralizing everything in its own hands. Kreiken says:

The most important development of managerial talent does not take place through courses or seminars, nor through job rotation or any other method of acquiring knowledge and a certain amount of skills. Managerial talent is best developed by
actually managing in an environment where talents can develop. Management is the development of people. Top management must create the climate, i.e., the structure and the procedures which foster the development of managerial talent of people at all levels and in all functions. This is the greatest "programme" of all. It is the environment for continuous and autonomous management development throughout the organization. . . . Success or failure of both structured and autonomous management development therefore depends largely on the quality and "intensity" of top management (7, pp. 20-21).

The mean raw scores obtained from the various questionnaires administered to Saudi executives indicate that managers rated higher than staff managers and supervisors in both LOQC and LOQS. Generally, the managers were less dissatisfied than staff managers and supervisors in JDI variables. Their superiors were more satisfied with them in MSS variables than with staff managers and supervisors. Their subordinates rated them higher in SBDQ than staff managers and lower than supervisors (Table IV-1). These are positive results, but there was generally a lack of significant differences, indicating poor results from the current MDP program.

The possible reasons why the managers rated higher than other classifications of executives were identified by most vice-presidents and general managers during the informal interviews presented in Chapter III and are summarized as follows:

1. They have more access to the top management so that they could become more understanding of the policies
and objectives of the company than staff managers and supervisors.

2. They had more authority and responsibility and could make more decisions than staff managers and supervisors.

3. Their performance was clearer to the top management, which affected the satisfactoriness of their performance; accordingly, the promotion rate among them was higher than that for staff managers and supervisors.

4. They were far from the effect of the outside environment, and there was no conflict between the job and public action, so that generally the managers got along well with others outside Saudia.¹

They believed that all these and many other factors aided the managers in seeing the elements in the seminar which could be applied to the company and in comparing between what they were doing and the material in the seminar, because many of the things they studied were tangible to them. This result is supported by Terry Farnsworth's statement in his book Developing Executive Talent:

The job itself offers the opportunity for development. Nothing is more effective in growing managers than a challenging job that stretches

¹Chapter III contains more detail regarding interview results.
an individual's abilities and provides him with opportunities to demonstrate his potential. All off-the-job activities, such as courses and seminars, should be aimed at improving a manager's effectiveness in his present job or at preparing him for a position of greater complexity and responsibility which he might attain in the foreseeable future (3, p. 11).

Table IV-1 indicates that the superiors of staff managers were less satisfied than those of managers and supervisors. In addition, a significant difference appeared among the staff managers in the variables of work and personal adjustment. The reasons for these differences, as expressed by some of their superiors in the informal interviews, were that they felt that some of the staff managers were less stable, more worried about their futures, and, for that reason, less well-adjusted than managers and supervisors. This is in accordance with M. Madi's findings in his research about middle management in Saudi Arabia. He concludes,

The majority of middle management personnel in Saudi Arabia are considered passive managers by their upper managers. . . . The view of most upper managers is that the factors contributing to passive middle management behavior were inefficiency, lack of training and knowledge, unwillingness to assume responsibility and poor selection for their positions. . . . The upper managers believed that passive managers influence active managers to become more passive. Upper management was not satisfied with the present selection, nor did they depend on the presently used efficiency reports (8, pp. 165-166).

The staff managers expressed the feeling that their subordinates believed that they had no influence on them
and that they were indecisive and inflexible. The staff managers also indicated that their superiors believed they were obsolete, unambitious, and resistant to change, and that top management looked upon them as unrealistic about their environment and their role in management. Madi states, "The middle managers tended to lack an understanding of the exact responsibilities and goals of their departments, leading most of them to depend on instructions from their superiors. They desired instructions that leave enough flexibility for them to choose the best method of getting the job done" (8, p. 166). Staff managers believed deputation, or job rotation, was the real solution to their problems.

The result of staff managers' relatively poor personal adjustment suggests that they may need counseling that will lead them to an occupation where requirements and reinforcers provide an optimal fit to their abilities and needs. This can be applied to other management employees, as some general managers and vice-presidents indicated in the informal interviews, as improper utilization of young management employees. One executive stated, "They are not assigned to any particular department." One expatriate general manager suggested, "Saudia could contract, appoint, or consult a team of industrial psychologists to screen these employees and return them to the organization in an
area which is in accordance with their indicated skills and expertise. He added, "This might help overcome the shortage of qualified managers." The staff managers' own suggestions regarding job rotation or deputization, however, seem more desirable because this solution comes from the management employees themselves.

The mean raw scores in all tables in Chapter IV, without exception, indicate that most managers, staff managers, and supervisors were dissatisfied with their pay and promotion and somewhat dissatisfied with supervision, work, and people. This is in accordance with the opinions of general managers and vice-presidents, presented in Chapter III of this study, that managers' dissatisfaction with salary was in first place among those reasons for leaving. Opportunities for increased salaries and benefits elsewhere were numerous and caused instability for Saudia manpower planning. Since competition in the private sector was very keen, private business usually offered more incentives than Saudia. This was due to the lack of good manpower planning, development, and counseling as shown in Chapter III. Other managers believed that there were obstacles to their advancement and progress at Saudia; some wanted to enter the private sector or engage in government work; some were prestige-conscious and wanted to be more than what one executive called "a cog in the wheel." A comparison of salary levels at Saudia shows an
increase in salary between old and new pay levels of different grades of managerial personnel from 51 to 59, executives (A, B, and C), non-management from 31 to 39, labor from 20 to 22, and the technical positions from 80 to 93. The comments of the top executives, however, indicated that the dissatisfaction of managers, staff managers, and supervisors was also due to other factors such as housing, medical care, and other benefits, leading to their dissatisfaction with Saudia.

Another problem was identified by one vice-president: "Most Saudis feel that they are inferior to other nationalities. They believe that the company has four levels of policies aimed at various foreign nationals." The executives felt that company policy considered the Americans as first class for everything--e.g., Americans had furnished housing provided for them. Europeans, who were in second place, also received housing, but it was unfurnished. Other employees from Middle Eastern and other Islamic countries got two months' salary instead of housing, which was not sufficient to cover two months' rent. The last class was the Saudis, who received no housing, no medical care, and no transportation for their children. Saudi nationals believed that the Saudi manager had more personal responsibilities than members of other national groups because he had to take his
children to school, settle for poor electric service and inferior water, and take all the members of his family to receive any necessary medical care because the Saudi Arabian system does not allow a woman to go out by herself. Americans and other nationalities, however, had all these matters facilitated for them by the company. Saudis, consequently, had less time for their jobs than did Americans and other foreign nationals. Job performance measurements for all employees, therefore, were unfair to the Saudis.

Mean raw scores in Table III-9 indicate that, generally, the age distribution (36 to 40 years), education, major, place of education, function, and length of service had a positive effect on managers, staff managers, and supervisors. Unfortunately, Saudia lacked this information, which was very important to manpower planning, as most executives believed there were no records for such information as age distribution, nor was the efficiency of managers in their positions analyzed. All of these deficiencies, of course, affected manpower planning.

Surprisingly, however, a major in business had a negative effect on managers, who rated lower than those with other majors in both LOQC and LOQS. They were more dissatisfied with their work, pay, promotion, supervision, and people; and their superiors were less satisfied with them in MSS variables. Furthermore, their subordinates
rated them lower in SBDQC. A possible reason for these lower ratings is that those managers with business majors were indifferent about MDP. They felt that MDP was less efficient than programs they had already learned about in college. As one general manager stated, "They do not have enough promotion for the MDP program to attract their attention to its benefits, goal, and objectives." The result was that the managers were not concentrating on the program. They had higher expectations for MDP but this was due to the mis-introduction of the program which caused many managers to believe it was a panacea.

Mean raw scores in Table IV-10 indicate that those managers, staff managers, and supervisors who did attend MDP rated slightly higher in LOQC and LOQS. They were either slightly more dissatisfied with JDI variables or slightly less dissatisfied, and their superiors were either slightly more satisfied in MSS or about the same as those who did not attend MDP.

An analysis of each MDP program individually, however, presents a different picture. The mean raw scores in Table IV-13 indicate that the managers and staff managers who attended Techniques of Modern Management (TMM) rated higher in LOQ and were less dissatisfied with JDI variables. Their superiors were more satisfied with them in MSS variables, and their subordinates rated them higher
in SBDQ than those who did not attend MDP. In contrast to managers and staff managers, supervisors showed negative effects in all variables compared to those who did not attend MDP.

The picture changes again in Supervisory Training (ST); the supervisors who attended ST rated higher than those who did not in LOQC and LOQS. They were less dissatisfied with JDI variables, their superiors were more satisfied with them in MSS variables, and their subordinates rated them lower in SBDQ. But the managers who attended ST rated lower than those who did not attend in all variables (LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ), as shown in Table IV-14.

The possible reason for this result is that ST was time-consuming for those managers and staff managers who had previously attended management courses. On the other hand, TMM seemed to be somewhat difficult for those supervisors who had not attended any prior management courses. Another reason was the lack of planning and the lack of sequence in MDP programs.

The mean raw scores in Table IV-15 indicate that those managers who attended Performance Appraisal Development (PADS) rated lower than those who did not in most variables of LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ, indicating that this program was complex and difficult for those managers and needed
simplification to be more easily digested and understood.
In general, then, Saudia executives and questionnaire results indicated more weaknesses than strengths in PADS, demonstrating that this was an area where much improvement was needed.

The mean scores in Table IV-16 indicate that those managers and staff managers who attended Management by Objectives (MBO) generally either rated lower in most variables or about the same and slightly higher in some variables of MBO in LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ. This indicates that this program was very complex, a finding in accordance with the comments of some top executives about MBO: "We are now in the process of separation and of dropping MBO because it was not successful. It necessitated a great deal of paperwork for supervisors. A system which requires that so much time be spent in filling out forms is not effective and is too advanced for management experience. The main weakness is how to implement the system. A study should be undertaken to determine the practicality of the development program in Saudia and make it fit the company."

Mean raw scores in Table IV-17 indicate that those managers who attended Leadership Training (LT) rated lower than those who did not attend in most variables of LOQ, JDI, MSS, and SBDQ. The possible reasons for
this result were either that this program was difficult
or that it was new and time had been insufficient to show
its effectiveness.

The previous discussion indicates that these MDP
programs at Saudia were far from successful and that most
of them needed modification and amplification to fit
Saudia's needs without sacrificing the main principles
of the management process and benefits. This is in ac-
cordance with Matheson's statement in People Development
in Developing Countries:

> The essential concern is to present knowledge within
the broad conceptual framework of people development
in such a way that it is meaningful, in context and
motivating. . . . Ideally new knowledge should be
presented in a way that reduces the subject to its
fundamental elements, without sacrifice of any of
the key issues, and provides a foundation for logical
and progressive extension to the more sophisticated
areas of the subject (10, p. 15).

MDP Evaluation and Follow-Up

Most top Saudia executives believed that the organiza-
tion had no formal personnel evaluation scheme, but either
monthly or quarterly reports were used to enable a manager
to keep an eye on his employees and follow up on their
progress. Adequate standards were not available for
management courses and managerial forms, but standards
had been set up for non-managerial personnel. There was
no systematic evaluation for MDP. Some managers eval-
uated the development by rule of thumb; some used
observation; occasionally they gave projects to the students and evaluated them after they returned to their jobs.

They believed that the current system was not adequate for assessing systematic performance. Managerial personnel had an annual performance appraisal system, linked to the anniversary of the date the individual joined the organization. Job performance was the prime criterion for evaluation. One management development form was filled out by employees and another by supervisors. The concept of this procedure was good but the forms were not, since they required comparison of the employee with his peers and evaluation of his technical performance, an evaluation which few managers were trained to do well. Evaluation was not practiced and did not stress practical matters of qualitative and non-qualitative aspects of performance.

The evaluation form used at Saudia was concerned with special problems in the minds of the foreign nationals who had filled it out and wanted specific or fixed answers to their questions. Executives believed that the performance review that had been conducted at Saudia was very narrow, not on the corporate level. Individually, the method was complicated and managers could not implement it correctly. These executives believed that the application of review reports created unnecessary duplication, and they were lengthy, difficult, impractical, and,
most important, subject to the bias of the person making the appraisal, with a consequent loss of objectivity, depending on the individual relationships between personnel. Some executives were not using review reports to identify training and development needs but were using them as a basis for promotion, salary increases, and transfers. Because the method was not simple, the employees could not understand it. Although some executives were trained in conducting review and counseling meetings, they believed that it was not useful.

Very few follow-up steps were taken for MDP evaluation, except in TMM. Some general managers and vice-presidents felt there was no follow-up; others felt that follow-up was conducted on a rather narrow basis; others said it was the duty of the general manager of the division or his representative.

Summary

The previous analysis indicates that many problems and difficulties faced Saudia in its training and management development program. These problems are mainly in the following areas:

1. Saudization: Saudia was still far from reaching full Saudization in the near future under the present system of MDP.
2. Manpower planning for management succession and Saudization efforts: Saudia had no formal plans for management succession either in the past or at the time of this study, or for carrying out this policy to meet the diagnosed needs.

3. Management Development Programs: Programs, on the whole, were too cumbersome and complex and not easily understood in the short period allowed for personnel to attend these programs.

4. Evaluation and follow-up: There was no systematic evaluation and the present system was not adequate to bring about the desired results.

Chapter VI will present the conclusions of this investigation and recommendations for further study.
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CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
The major objective of Saudia (Saudi Arabian Airlines), as in the case of all other private and public organizations in Saudi Arabia, is to Saudize its workforce—that is, to transfer all jobs held by foreigners to Saudi nationals. This objective of becoming self-sufficient in high-talent manpower resulted from the Royal Decree issued in 1965. Accordingly, Saudia initiated its managerial development programs in 1972. From that year until 1977, when the research for this study was being carried out, many changes occurred in these programs.

In the previous chapters of this discussion, the progress made in managerial development programs from 1972 to 1977 was reviewed and evaluated in terms of their objectives and effectiveness. In addition, the development of Saudia managers' needs and managerial effectiveness were explored. In this chapter, the purpose of the study will be clarified in the light of the findings and analysis, recommendations will be proposed to offer alternative solutions, and suggestions for further research will be made on the basis of the findings.
Conclusions

No specific patterns appeared among the scattered significant differences resulting from the data presented in this study. Apparently Saudia's management development programs could not produce any major change in the behavior of those managers, staff managers, and supervisors who participated in the programs. This indicates that Saudia was far from achieving its objectives in manpower development. This lack of results was due to several factors other than the MDP programs themselves:

1. Saudi Arabian culture: Misunderstanding of Saudi Arabian culture, needs, and environment by foreign experts has interfered with the effectiveness of communication, and the inability of Saudia to provide counterparts to be trained has in most cases forced trained managers to engage in activities unrelated to their designated tasks.

2. Saudization: Saudia is far from reaching full Saudization unless it can attract more Saudis, hold them, and follow through with planned training and development activities. The progress toward Saudization has not been good; the rate of Saudization has been impaired by the lack of human resources and the ineffective follow-up of MDP programs.

Managers' dissatisfaction with salary at Saudia was in the first place among their reasons for being discontent
with their work. Opportunities for work elsewhere were numerous and caused instability for Saudia manpower planning. Competition in the private sector was very keen, and private business usually offered more incentives than Saudia. The availability of suitable Saudi managers outside the company was very low, since the company's salary and benefits programs left much to be desired.

3. Saudia's lack of manpower analysis: Determination of needs was lacking at Saudia where management development programs were generalized and not designed to fit the needs of Saudia managers. Saudia's records did not contain adequate information for future management needs analysis, nor was the efficiency of managers, staff managers, and supervisors analyzed in these records. This indicated a lack of consistency and follow-through in establishing and maintaining industrial management training and development records. Poor diagnosis of the needs of managers caused development programs to train the wrong people about the wrong things at the wrong time.

4. Saudia's lack of management succession: Saudia had no formal plan for succession. No written plans were in use or on file, although such plans are vital to the growth and continuation of the company. Because of the shortage of manpower, Saudia managers at all levels were busy in doing their jobs; they either did not have enough time or
did not wish to groom successors to take over for them in the future.

**Conclusions Directly Related to MDP Programs at Saudia**

Saudia's management development programs are vital to Saudization, but the present system to accomplish Saudization and thence to increase the overall managerial efficiency of Saudis in the airline was not producing the desired results. The problem was that the current program was too cumbersome and complex and not easily understood. In addition, lack of cooperation, coordination, and communication between the training and development department and other departments hindered any modification and simplification of the program. Lack of support from top management was also apparent. Follow-up after training was not taken seriously in most other departments in response to suggestions of the training and development department. The specific conclusions of this study relating to Saudia's MDP programs are the following:

1. There was no formal evaluation of MDP efforts.
2. There was no formal or strict sequence of MDP programs.
3. MDP programs did not fully recognize the Saudi culture.
4. MDP programs were imported rather than developed for Saudia's particular problems and needs.
5. MDP programs were dispersed, minimizing their emphasis and impact on Saudia managers.

6. Evaluation and follow-up of MDP programs was ineffective.

Recommendations

1. Saudia's MDP programs must be the concern and responsibility of all Saudia managers, as they are an integral part of every manager's job. To be able to create and maintain its place in the rapid change of Saudi Arabia and consequently in the changing world as a whole, Saudia must ensure that both its present and future managers are equipped with the necessary knowledge; attitudes and skills; technical, conceptual, and human abilities; and the philosophy of accomplishment. There is little doubt that the modern management and technology of advanced nations can be applied easily in Saudi Arabia, especially in an organization such as Saudia, as long as consideration for the people, the environment, and the culture is also given. Saudia managers have the ability to comprehend management principles and expertise if imported experts have the skills to operate and transfer according to Saudia's need, environment, and culture.

Saudia's MDP programs may well fail not because of the quality of the input or the attitude of the man seeking
new knowledge, but because of his manager's inability to
transfer the learning in a way that is meaningful, in con-
text, and motivating.

It is natural that some of Saudia's managers will
resist some of these programs simply because they are
foreigners, but if Saudia considers its own experience,
concepts, needs, and traditional style, the technique
can be easily applied. By the same token, local people
are always the experts in local situations, and their
development is the only way to overcome local resistance.
Saudia must expect the managers to attend this program
with enthusiasm and dedication and to use their knowledge
and skills to the fullest extent of their abilities.
Saudia's MDP program needs a firm policy as a foundation
for the fulfillment of its purpose; without such a policy,
development activities will become arbitrary and uninte-
grated.

2. In order for Saudia to reach full Saudization,
development of the managerial staff must be integrated
with its objectives. It must be planned in an orderly
fashion to meet Saudia's specific objectives and must be
based on a careful analysis of the needs of those mana-
ergrial staff. Saudia must determine its current status
with regard to Saudization in order to plan effectively
to reach this goal. Saudization goals can then be seen
in terms of potential capability which makes them highly action-centered and motivating. The essential element in achieving Saudization is to obtain precise information regarding all components affecting Saudization; this requires a wide field of studies ranging from the behavior patterns of people to the basic components of Saudia's corporate system, but including a major effort of manpower analysis. Saudization can become a reality only if goals and objectives are put into action through people who are skilled in management. The quality of such managerial staff will determine the enduring quality of Saudization in the long run.

3. Saudia's MDP program must be redesigned to fit the needs of the individual Saudia managers. Trainees must be placed in programs where they have development needs, and development activities must be directed to specific needs arising from a manager's performance in his present job or aimed at preparing him for a position he might attain in the near future. As such, the material presented, the examples used, and the learning design chosen should fit the needs and unique characteristics of the Saudi national. Saudi nationals must be integrated more fully into training and development activities to eliminate the excessive emphasis on foreign nationals in MDP program materials and delivery.
4. Saudia must develop a management succession plan. It is the responsibility of each division to be adequately prepared to provide replacements to fill vacancies resulting from promotions, transfers, or terminations of managers at any level. To disregard the need for an orderly, planned transition of authority from one executive to the next is to disregard the difference between success and failure. Saudia must block from promotion and/or renew the contract of any foreign national who has not provided and trained a successor for his position. This must be a part of a total plan established for Saudia in order to have 1) a team of executives ten or fifteen years from now that will possess the ability to carry on when some of the current executives retire, resign, or otherwise terminate their service with Saudia; 2) a team that can make decisions with a high degree of openness of discussion, confrontation of differences, and commitment to their decisions; and 3) sufficient executives to handle Saudia's long-range growth so that the quality of management does not become overly diluted.

A committee should be appointed to periodically evaluate the performance of all management personnel with the intention of reclassifying those who do not meet minimal standards after receiving sufficient counseling and training. By the same token, all executives must be accountable
for the development of their subordinates and they must be encouraged to call upon either functional assistance provided by personnel staff or specialist assistance under the consent of top management.

5. Saudia must continue to offer MDP programs after modification, simplification, and correction of weaknesses to fit the Saudi Arabian culture and changes in the company's own philosophy. Saudia managers at all levels must understand that the success of management development programs is essential to the continued success of Saudia, because management development programs in the short run will build a reliable second-line management team and in the long run will make available qualified successors at every level of management. Specific recommendations include the following:

1. The subjects must be reduced to fundamental elements, i.e., they must begin with the basic ideas, procedures, and principles.
2. This simplification must be carried out without sacrificing the major issues.
3. Then progress should be made gradually to more sophisticated areas of the subject--e.g., a) progress should be made gradually to behavior study; b) later organization should be studied; c) each step should be separate and spaced like steps on a ladder. The course as a whole must be very extensive.

6. Communications and coordination between managers at all levels and between divisions and groups should be improved so that Saudia personnel are kept informed of decisions which are being contemplated and made which
may concern those who will have to live with those decisions. It is the responsibility of the manager to maintain effective three-way communications, and he should actively seek information which may be helpful to his own development and to the development of his subordinates.

Top management should make efforts to keep employees aware of matters at Saudia which will be of concern to them to ensure a feeling of being "in on things." Vertical—both upward and downward—and horizontal communication channels should be encouraged to keep upper management in better touch with employees' needs and feelings.

7. Saudia must establish a salary program wherein the remunerations and facilities are competitive enough with those of other industries within the whole country to attract qualified new talent and retain qualified manpower. Facilities such as housing, medical care, and services for employees and dependents, etc., should be provided for all personnel.

8. Exit interview procedures should be implemented to collect information for training and development needs analysis. A special committee either from all of Saudia's departments or from the corporate administration department must be established to conduct exit interviews with employees to discuss and determine their genuine reasons for leaving the company. In addition, Saudia must ask each
manager during his work to write a detailed account of operational information that he can periodically review and update. This information will then be available following the manager's death or disability, and it can serve with the information gained from exit interviews as the basis of a more extensive debriefing in the course of a more orderly succession. Debriefing will be effective if the procedures for information retrieval are carried out by personnel who are skilled in interviewing, possess good technical knowledge in executive expertise, and are familiar with Saudia.

9. A complete and fully equipped training center with living and learning quarters as well as training facilities for Saudia staff should be constructed, and recurrent training courses should be developed and conducted for all personnel on a scheduled basis.

10. Saudia must construct a follow-up system into its MDP activities to evaluate the progress of the participants toward the designated development objectives and provoke participant managers to commit themselves to action. Management development programs cannot be managed effectively without monitoring, and they cannot be monitored unless their results can be measured.

As a starting point, the evaluation system must be relatively simple, direct, and set up in a meaningful
manner. The following three points suggest one way of achieving follow-up evaluation in MDP efforts:

1. Instruction should be carried out in great detail with clear step-by-step activities provided for each function.
2. As more competent managers are developed, modification can be made to improve the information flow.
3. There must be frequent follow-up to ensure that a) the personnel understand the instructions, b) they understand why the evaluation system is needed, c) they are executing the instructions, and d) they understand how the system works.

The effectiveness of the programs must also be measured by the participants in terms of quantifiable results. This goal can be achieved by means of the following techniques:

1. The potential participant must commit himself to evaluation of the program as a condition for his attendance.
2. The participant must write his own plan of evaluation of the suggested action into his action plan during the training.
3. The action taken by this evaluation design must be reviewed and the entire program evaluation must be the backbone of the follow-up.
4. The ability of the participant to apply the learning program (knowledge, skills, or change of attitudes) to a range of situations must be an integral part of this evaluation.
5. The effect of participants' individual appraisals should establish part of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program when combined together.
6. After the participant returns to work from the training, Saudia must continue to evaluate his progress every three months to determine the effectiveness of the program in changing the participant's behavior.
7. Three sources must be used other than the participant himself, namely, his superior, his peers, and his subordinates.
8. The final conclusion then can be reached about the effectiveness of the program by the committee mentioned above.

11. A replacement plan utilizing on-the-job training (OJT) must be implemented. Saudia must develop a plan whereby each executive, whether foreigner or Saudi national, is responsible for training a Saudi national as his replacement. This can be done as follows:

1. Each executive should identify individuals under his supervision whom he believes to be currently or potentially qualified for a higher executive position.
2. Each executive must justify the evaluation of the individual as now qualified or having potential to qualify.
3. Each executive must nominate the next two desirable position moves for this individual.
4. Some special activity must be carried out, such as course attendance or exposure to special task forces (e.g., special projects, coaching, departmental meetings, follow-up after courses, job rotation, membership on committees).
5. This process must be repeated annually.
6. In order to obtain independent judgment, Saudia must implement this plan at successive levels to obtain the opinions of personnel in at least two managerial levels.

In summary, the major recommendations of this study are the following:

1. Performance appraisal and development systems must be concerned with carrying out corporate plans and objectives.
2. Manpower planning must function under the demands of corporate planning.
3. Management development programs must work toward the demands of manpower and organization planning.
4. Management development results must lead to manpower and organization planning.
5. After the identification of potential, the rate of Saudization must not be blocked by the lack of resources to follow up.
6. Personnel records, manpower planning, and progression charts must be established so that the results achieved from management development programs can be measured as accurately as possible.

7. Predetermined benefits to the operation of the airline as a whole and to the individual must be known before personnel attend the management development programs.

8. Specific MDP course material and delivery must be reworked and realigned with Saudi Arabian culture, social values, and managerial personalities.

Further Research Possibilities

This study has concentrated on management development programs and Saudization based on present data at Saudia, and the results may serve as a guideline for future action. Many variables, however, are not accounted for in this study. Of foremost importance to any future moves by Saudia into simplifying, modifying, or initiating advanced programs will be the implementation of a manpower planning system. Research to support such a system should emphasize sociological data as to age, education, skills, and related labor force information. In many instances procedures for identifying these data may require development prior to the actual research.

Another research topic related to this study is the cross-cultural evaluation of Saudi managers in various locations around the world. For example, research on district managers (in London, New York, cities in Egypt and Italy, etc.) must be linked to the effect of environments, status, rules and regulations of the host country,
sociological and cultural lifestyles, and the adjustment of the district managers to their new environments.

Finally, future research should address itself to the process of accelerating the supply of Saudi graduates by utilizing non-traditional, innovative methods in training and education. This research must be related to situations, problem-solving, technology, and style, and to more educational media and machine teaching methods and more field training.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR EXECUTIVES

1. Do you have any formal plans made to provide for management succession at Saudia, other than Saudiization plans?

Have these plans been made to improve the performance of the existing managers at Saudia? Please describe and furnish a copy of the plan, if available.

Are the following used at Saudia to direct efforts of MDP and, if so, to what extent?

A. Counseling individual managers--

B. Preparing career development--

C. Training plans for managers:
   1) Using internal courses--
   2) Using external courses--
   3) Job rotation--
2. What are your policies with regard to developing managers?

What are the objectives of manager development?

What is the scope of the development plans?

What are the limitations of expenditure for manager development?

Is your MDP satisfactory?

Is it on schedule?

How do you evaluate your MDP?

May I have a copy of the procedures?

3. Are you maintaining records for managers? What kinds? Copies?

To what degree do you think these records are adequate?

Do these records show the numbers employed in each main occupation category?
Do they show the age distribution of managers?

Are managers analyzed by occupation?

Do these analyses show managers' reasons for leaving Saudia?

What are their principal reasons for leaving?

Do records maintain information on the organization's future needs for managers?

Do they include the names of individuals who have potential for promotion?

What is your estimate of the efficiency of your managers?

How can this be improved?

Please indicate the major problem of Saudia that you feel could be improved by better training and development.
Do you use the "management audit" concept to inventory the management skills available? Please explain.

4. What forecasts are made for future management requirements?

Are these forecasts made in terms of
A. The numbers of managers needed in the future?

B. The skills of each manager needed in the future?

C. Other considerations?

Are these management forecasts based on reliable data? What data?

Would other data be helpful? What kind(s)?

Do these forecast data include factors which affect
A. The demand for managers?
   How?
1) The expansions in activities carried out by the organizations plans?

How?

2) The contractions in activities carried out by the organizations plans?

How?

B. How do these forecast factors affect the supply of managers with regard to

1) Promotion?

2) Retirement?

3) Wastage from within the organization?

4) The availability of suitable managers from outside the organization?

5) Other considerations?

5. How are functional and/or departmental forecasts of manager requirements obtained?

A. On a regular basis?

B. By collation to form an overall managers' plan?
6. How are manager forecasts translated to satisfy the requirements of
   A. Recruitment?
   B. Redeployment?
   C. Training or retraining?
   D. Improving the utilization of managers?
   E. Improving the productivity of managers?
   F. Other factors?

7. Do you have a systematic performance appraisal procedure? Explain.

   If so, what are the major criteria used to assess the performance of managers?
Are managers aware of the results of the performance review? Is a counseling session required?

Do managers attempt to hold meetings with their staff?

Are the strengths and weaknesses of each manager discussed periodically?

Is agreement on training and development needed as a result of performance appraisal?

Do you use performance review reports to

A. Identify training and development needs?

B. Establish potential for promotion?

C. Provide a basis for salary increases?

D. Other?

In your opinion, is the performance appraisal system too elaborate?

Can the employees understand it?
Have managers been trained to carry out a review?

Have managers been trained to conduct counseling meetings?

8. How do you assess training and development needs?

Is this assessment made on the basis of

A. Manager forecasts?
   How?

B. Company growth?

C. Job analysis?
   How?

D. Performance review?
   How?

E. Other factors?

9. Are training and development plans prepared setting out
   A. Problem areas?
B. Proposed action?

C. Responsibility for action?

D. Cost of the proposal?

E. Benefits of the proposal?

F. Other items?

10. How are the training and development needs of each manager emphasized for the training and development plan?

What portion of your MDP is generalized to apply to all managers and what portion is specialized for individual managers or problem areas?

11. Are training and development programs and courses based on

A. A proper assessment of collective manager training and development needs?

B. A proper assessment of individual manager training and development needs?
12. Is the syllabus logically planned? Who plans it?

If so, is the plan properly related to the overall objectives?

Is it flexible enough to meet current problems and developing situations?

13. In what terms are overall objectives defined?

Are they defined in terms of standards of performance attained? What areas of performance and how?

Do the programs consist of one or more of the following?

A. Formal instruction--

B. Discussion--

C. Projects--

D. Case studies--
E. Practices--

F. Other techniques--

What steps are taken to follow up after training?

In the light of the follow-up action, are training programs
A. Evaluated?
   How?

B. Modified?
   How and to what extent?

Who developed the in-company training programs?

How are external courses selected?

Are they selected on the basis of assessment of
A. Individual training needs?

B. The relevance of the course in relation to training and development needs?
C. The value of the course in relation to training and development needs?

D. Personal choice of the individual?

E. Other factors?

14. How does the organization assure managers for management succession?

15. Can the organization fill management vacancies from within?

   Yes                                      No

   If yes, how?

   If no, where do deficiencies exist?
### INSTRUCTIONS:

For each item, choose the alternative which most nearly expresses your opinion on how frequently you should do what is described by that item. Never indicate what you, as a supervisor or manager, sincerely believe to be the desirable way to act. Please remember there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Different supervisors have different experiences and we are interested only in your opinions.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box before the alternative that most expresses your feeling about the item. Mark only one alternative for each item. If you wish to change your answer, draw a circle around your first "X" and mark a new "X" in the appropriate box.

---

**Leadership Opinion Questionnaire**

by Edwin A. Fleishman

**APPENDIX B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Put the welfare of your unit above the welfare of any person in it.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

2. Give in to your subordinates in discussions with them.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

3. Encourage after-duty work by persons of your unit.
   - A great deal
   - Fairly much
   - To some degree
   - Comparatively little
   - Not at all

4. Try out your own new ideas in the unit.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

5. Back up what persons under you do.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

6. Criticize poor work.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

7. Ask for more than the persons under you can accomplish.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

8. Refuse to compromise a point.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

9. Insist that persons under you follow to the letter those standard routines handed down to you.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

10. Help persons under you with their personal problems.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

11. Be slow to adopt new ideas.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

12. Get the approval of persons under you on important matters before going ahead.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

13. Resist changes in ways of doing things.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

15. Speak in a manner not to be questioned.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

16. Stress importance of being ahead of other units.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

17. Criticize a specific act rather than a particular member of your unit.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

18. Let the persons under you do their work the way they think is best.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

19. Do personal favors for persons under you.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never

20. Emphasize meeting of deadlines.
    - Always
    - Often
    - Occasionally
    - Seldom
    - Never
21. Insist that you be informed on decisions made by persons under you.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

22. Offer new approaches to problems.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

23. Treat all persons under you as your equals.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

24. Be willing to make changes.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

25. Talk about how much should be done.
   - A great deal
   - Fairly much
   - To some degree
   - Comparatively little
   - Not at all

26. Wait for persons in your unit to push new ideas.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

27. Rule with an iron hand.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

28. Reject suggestions for changes.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

29. Change the duties of persons under you without first talking it over with them.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

30. Decide in detail what shall be done and how it shall be done by the persons under you.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

31. Stand up for persons under you, even though it makes you unpopular with others.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

32. Put suggestions made by persons in the unit into operation.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

33. Refuse to explain your actions.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

34. Ask for sacrifices from persons under you for the good of your entire unit.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

35. “Needle” persons under you for greater effort.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

36. Act without consulting persons under you.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

37. Pressure persons under you to work harder.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

38. Insist that everything be done your way.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

39. Encourage slow-working persons in your unit to work harder.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

40. Meet with the persons in your unit at certain regularly scheduled times.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never
استفتاء الرأي

التعليقات:

اختبر لكل بديل بديل يكون مسبباً بدرجة أكبر عن رأي في عدد
المرقوبه التي يجب أن تعمل بها كما هو موصوف في ذلك، بينما
بين دائماً تتم القياس كمنير أو مثير بانه غريب
المرقوبه، فخلاصة بما لا توجد اجابة
صحة أو غائبة، فالمرقوبين المختلفين لهم خبرات مختلفة
ويستند نقاً أن نحن في
اجبة على الشروط بوضع علامة "√" في المرقيم أمام ابتناء
الذي يشير بشكل اضافي عن شروطها نحو المبرد، بوضع علامة فائدة
أمام بديل واحد في كل بند، وإذا رغب تغيير رأيه،ارسل
 دائرة حول علامة "√" وتضع علامة "×" في
الربع الثالث.
1- وضع ماء وجمجمة فوق ماء وأي شمادان بها
أ- دائما
ب- غالبا
ج- من أن لآخر
د- نادرا
ه- أبدا

2- استعمل لماء وسلة في غياثائها معهم
أ- غالبا
ب- غالبا تجا
ج- من أن لآخر
د- مرة في لحظة
ه- نادر جدا

3- تشفع العمل بعد العمل الواجب أو ماء بمفردة الأشخاص الموجودة بين
أ- مدة جدة كبيرة
ب- غالبا تجا
ج- كجلبة ما
د- مرة في لحظة
ه- نادر جدا
- ابتعد العقل الصغير

أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - مرة في لحظة
ه - ثانية جداً

- ساعد ما يفعله الإشعاع الذين يملون تحت رأسه

أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - نادراً
ه - ابداً
الطبعة أ- أكثر من الاشرار الذين يستعينون تحت رأيك أن يعملوا

أ- غالبًا
ب- غالبًا نعم
ب- مع أن لآخر

ب- ملحة
ب- نادرًا جدا

ارغب أن تقبلخل وصلة في متلازمة

أ- رابعًا
ب- غالبًا
ب- مع أن لآخر
ب- نادرًا
ب- بدأ

أ- بدأ
ب- غالبًا
ب- مع أن لآخر
ب- نادرًا
ب- بدأ

حذرك على أن يتبع الأشخاص الذين يعملون تحت رأيك الروتين الخاص

أ- دائمًا
ب- غالبًا
ب- مع أن لآخر
ب- نادرًا
ب- بدأ
10. ماذا يفعلون في حي مشكلاتهم الخاصة:

أ. غالباً
ب. غالباً جداً
ج. في كل مرة
د. دائماً
ه. نادراً جداً

11. كن بطيئاً في اختيار الآراء الجديدة.

أ. دائماً
ب. غالباً
ج. في كل مرة
د. نادراً
ه. ابداً

12. تقوم على موافقة الأشخاص الذين يعملون تحت رئاستك في المسألة السابقة.

أ. دائماً
ب. غالباً
ج. في كل مرة
د. نادراً
ه. ابداً
3- تأكد التغييرات على عرق الامام:

أ- رده كبير
ب- كبران نجاة
ج- درجة ما
د- قليلة نسبًا
ه- لا بالمرة

4- استدلي الأشخاص الذين يطلبون تحت رغبات أفعال خاصة:

أ- إذا
ب- غالباً
ج- حتى أن لا غير
د- تجداً
ه- بدأ

5- تكلم بطريقة لا يشكو فيها:

أ- درجة كبيرة
ب- كبر نجاة
ج- درجة ما
د- قليلة نسبًا
ه- لا بالمرة
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٧ـ اعتقد أهمية أن تسبق الوحدة التي تعمل فيها بقية الوحدات
أـ يقدر كثير
بـ كثير نوا
جـ لدرجة ما
دـ قليلا نسبيا
هـ لا بائرة

٨ـ اعتقد علا عامة أكثر مما تعتقد علا خاما في وحدته
أـ دائما
بـ غالبا
جـ مع أن لآخر
دـ نادرا
هـ أبدا
19. اجعل خدمات شخصية للاشخاص الذين يعطون تحت رئاستك

أ - قائما

ب - فاعلاً نجا

ج - من أن لا آخر

د - مرة في ليلة

ه - نادراً بدأ

20. أدرك صعوبةحيازة آخر ضد ضروب لا تنافع ماألا Ej عمل ما

أ - يندر كبير

ب - كثير نجا

ج - لدرجة ما

د - تغلباً تجبي

ه - لا بالمرة

21. أسرع على ممارسة أن تكون على علم بالقرارات التي يصل إليها الاشخاص الذين

يعطون تحت رئاستك

أ - رايا

ب - فاعلاً

ج - من أن لا آخر

د - نادراً

ه - بدأ
23- قدم طريقة جديدة لحل المشكلات

أ- غانية

ب- فاخرية عمياء

ج- من آل خليفة

د- مرة في لحظة

ه- نادر جدا

24- عامل من يعمل تحت رئاسة كمال، لكي

أ- رائبا

ب- غالية

ج- من آل خليفة

د- نادر

ه- إبدا

25- كن صلا لا تتحمل تغييرات

أ- داوية

ب- غالية

ج- من آل خليفة

د- نادر

ه- إبدا
266 - انتشر حتى يقوم المشاعر الذين يعيشو في مهدته. بتحدي الالام،

267 - احكم يوم من جديد

أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - نادراً
ه - ابداً
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أ دائمًا
ب غالبًا
ج من آن لآخر
د نادرًا
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غير واضحًا من يحصل تحت هذه المعاً، ونحن ضعيلون على مبادئنا.

أ غالبًا
ب غالبًا معاً
ج من آن لآخر
د مرة في لحظة
ه نادرًا جداً
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فترة تخلفًا ما يجب أن يجعل الأشخاص الذين يسعون إلى رؤى كبيرة
فيهم به

أ دائمًا
ب غالبًا
ج من آن لآخر
د نادرًا
ه ابتداءً
31 - رأى أن يجعل كل الاعتقاد الذين يعترفون تحت رأي مئة أن يجعلوا
لاخربتهم
أ - دان
ب - غالبا
ج - من أن لاخر
د - تأكدوا
ه - أبدا

32 - ساعد الاعتقاد الذين يعترفون تحت رأي مئة، ولو أن هذا لا يحدث
حيحها من الآخرين
أ - دان
ب - غالبا
ج - من أن لاخر
د - تأكدوا
ه - أبدا

33 - فنص اقتراحات من يصل في الوحدة
أ - غالبا
ب - غالبا تجا
ج - من أن لاخر
د - مون في لحظة
ه - تأكدوا جدا
- أيضًا
- بـ "أبا نبي"
- جـ من آن لآخر
- دـ مرتة في حظة
- هـ ناد را جدًا

- ١٦٩
- تصرف دون استشارة من بعضين تحت رئا متك
- أـ غالبًا
- بـ غالبًا تؤها
- جـ من آن لآخر
- دـ مرتة في حظة
- هـ ناد را جدًا
37 - يتواتر الأشعة الذين يستقلون تحت رؤية ملك على بذل جهد أكبر
 أ - يفقد ريح
 ب - كثيراً نجوا
 ج - للرجل ما
 د - قليلًا نسيبا
 ت - لا بالمرج

38 - مرسى على أن يعمل كل شيء بالطريقة التي تراه انت
 أ - دابة
 ب - غالبا

39 - شجع من يطلقون في العمل في جهد انعكاس على أن يبدوا جهدًا أكبر
 أ - غالبا
 ب - غالباً نجا
 ج - من أن لا آخر
 د - مرة في الحملة

40 - اجتمع مع من يطلقون في وحدات في أوقات خاصة حتى لحدود و لا يمنع من
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have observed your own supervisor and probably you know pretty well how he operates. In this questionnaire, you are simply to describe some of the things your own supervisor does with your group.

For each item, choose the alternative which best describes how often your supervisor does what that item says. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. The items simply describe the behavior of the supervisor over you; they do not judge whether his behavior is desirable or undesirable. Everyone's supervisor is different and so is every work group, so we expect differences in what different supervisors do.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box (a, b, c, d or e) next to each item to indicate your choice.
1. **HE IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND.**
   - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

2. **HE ENCOURAGES OVERTIME WORK.**
   - a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

3. **HE TRIES OUT HIS NEW IDEAS.**
   - a. often  b. fairly much  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

4. **HE BACKS UP WHAT PEOPLE IN HIS WORK GROUP DO.**
   - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

5. **HE CRITICIZES POOR WORK.**
   - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

6. **HE DEMANDS MORE THAN WE CAN DO.**
   - a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

7. **HE REFUSES TO GIVE IN WHEN PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP DISAGREE WITH HIM.**
   - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

8. **HE EXPRESSES APPRECIATION WHEN ONE OF US DOES A GOOD JOB.**
   - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

9. **HE INSISTS THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOLLOW STANDARD WAYS OF DOING THINGS IN EVERY DETAIL.**
   - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

10. **HE HELPS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITH THEIR PERSONAL PROBLEMS.**
    - a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

11. **HE IS SLOW TO ACCEPT NEW IDEAS.**
    - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

12. **HE IS FRIENDLY AND CAN BE EASILY APPROACHED.**
    - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

13. **HE GETS THE APPROVAL OF THE WORK GROUP ON IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD.**
    - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

14. **HE RESISTS CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS.**
    - a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

15. **HE ASSIGNS PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PARTicular TASKS.**
    - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

16. **HE STRESSES BEING AHEAD OF COMPETING WORK GROUPS.**
    - a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

17. **HE CRITICIZES A SPECIFIC ACT RATHER THAN A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL.**
    - a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
18. He lets others do their work the way they think best.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

19. He does personal favors for the people under him.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

20. He emphasizes meeting of deadlines.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

21. He sees that a worker is rewarded for a job well done.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

22. He treats people under him without considering their feelings.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

23. He insists that he be informed on decisions made by the people under him.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

24. He offers new approaches to problems.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

25. He treats all workers under him as his equals.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

26. He is willing to make changes.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

27. He asks slower people to get more done.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

28. He criticizes people under him in front of others.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

29. He stresses the importance of high morale among those under him.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

30. He talks about how much should be done.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

31. He "rides" the person who makes a mistake.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

32. He waits for people under him to push new ideas before he does.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

33. He rules with an iron hand.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

34. He tries to keep the people under him in good standing with those in higher authority.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
35. HE REJECTS SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   36. HE CHANGES THE DUTIES OF PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT FIRST TALKING IT OVER WITH THEM.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom
   37. HE DECIDES IN DETAIL WHAT SHALL BE DONE AND HOW IT SHALL BE DONE
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   38. HE SEES TO IT THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM ARE WORKING UP TO THEIR LIMITS.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   39. HE STANDS UP FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM EVEN THOUGH IT MAKES HIM UNPOPULAR.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   40. HE MAKES THOSE UNDER HIM FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING WITH HIM.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   41. HE PUTS SUGGESTIONS THAT ARE MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM INTO OPERATION.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   42. HE REFUSES TO EXPLAIN HIS ACTIONS.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom
   43. HE EMPHASIZES THE QUANTITY OF WORK.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all
   44. HE ASKS FOR SACRIFICES FROM HIS PEOPLE FOR THE GOOD OF THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom
   45. HE ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM FIRST.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom
   46. HE "NEEDLES" PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOR GREATER EFFORT.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all
   47. HE INSISTS THAT EVERYTHING BE DONE HIS WAY.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
   48. HE ENCOURAGES SLOW-WORKING PEOPLE TO GREATER EFFORT.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom
السلوك الاصطلاحي

تعليمات

لقد شادت الشرب عليك، وس
المحلل أنّه تعلم جيداً كيف يحمل
ويطرّع عليك. في هذه الأنظمة، أن
تصف بعض الأشياء التي يعملها الشرب
عليك مع جمعته: لكل بناء تخص
العدين الذي يصف بدرجة أغلب عدد
المرات التي يعمل فيها الشرب.
عليك ما ينتج عليه النبات. تذكر أنه
لا يوجد إجابات صحيحة أو خاطئة
بهذه الأسئلة. ان البنود تصف
فقط شرب الشرب، وهي لا تحكم
ما إذا كان شرب معرف أو سير
شرب. يختلف الشرب على كل إنسان
وكل بناء عمل. هذا نوقش
الإفادات ما يفعله الشربون.

إسق على البنود جميع علامة (3)
في الجريء (أ - ب - ج - د - ه)
الموجود بعد كل بناء ليشير إلى اعتباره
1. من المبدأ عندهم
   أ. ناهما
   ب. غالبًا
   ج. ليس من آخر
   د. نادرًا
   2. يشيع العمل خارج الورام
      أ. بدرجة كبيرة
      ب. كثيرًا نحنا
      ج. لدرجة ما
      د. تقلل نسبًا
      3. لا بالمرة

2. توجهات الحكم الجديدة
   أ. غالبًا
   ب. كثيرًا نحنا
   ج. ليس من آخر
   د. مرة في محظية
   5. نادرًا جداً
يساعد ما يفعله الناس في مجموعة السلع العامة به:

أ دعا
ب قادبا

من أن لآخر
د تادرا
ه ابدا

یتعدد السلع الفعیلة:

أ دعا
ب قادبا

من أن لآخر
د تادرا
ه ابدا

یطلب أكثر مما تستطيع أن تعده:

أ قادبا
ب قادبا ثواما

من أن لآخر
د سنة في لحظة
ه تادرا جدا
7- يمرض السليم عندما لا يفق الناس
معه في مجموعة العمل السابق
يشعر عليها
أ- رائنا
ب- غاليا
ب- من أن لآخر
ب- نادرا
ب- نادرا

ب- يثير من تقديرنا عندما نسمي
هنا بعمل جيد
أ- رائنا
ب- غاليا
ب- من أن لآخر
ب- نادرا
ب- نادرا

ب- يصر على أن يقوم الناس الذين
يملؤون بعمل فعال، بما نعتبره
معطيات الطريقة الفيسبية
أ- دائما
ب- نادرا
ب- من أن لآخر
ب- نادرا
ب- نادرا
1. يساعد الناس في مجموعة العمل في حل مشكلاتهم الشخصية

أ. دائماً
ب. غالباً
ج. من آن لآخر
د. نادرًا في الجملة
ه. نادرًا جداً

11. يطلب من تقبل الأفكار الجديدة

أ. دائماً
ب. غالباً
ج. من آن لآخر
د. نادرًا
ه. نادرًا

12. يجدر بـ يتمكن الاستعمال بسهولة

أ. دائماً
ب. غالباً
ج. من آن لآخر
د. نادرًا
e. نادرًا

13.
3. يحصل على مواقف مجمعة

العمل في المسائل الهامة
قبل استمرار في العمل.

أ. دائماً

ب. عادة

ج. من آن لآخر

د. نادرًا

ه. أبداً

4. يحدد املاً خاصاً للناس

الذين يطعنون تحت قسره

أ. دائماً

ب. عادة

ج. من آن لآخر

د. نادرًا

ه. أبداً
6- يؤكد خروجة أن يكون سابقاً
لمجموعات العمل الطائفية.
أ- برلمانية كبيرة
ب- كافراً تجاع
ج- لدرجة ما
د- قليلاً نسبياً
ه- لا بالمرة

17- يعتقد عمال معدة أقل بسماً
يتنبؤ شخصاً بدعوته
أ- داعماً
ب- غالباً
ج- من أن لا آخر
د- نادرًا
ه- بيداً

18- يدع الآخرين يسلون عليهم
بالطريقة التي يعتقد أنهم أصل
أ- داعماً
ب- غالباً
ج- من أن لا آخر
د- نادرًا
ه- نادرًا جدًا
٢٨٢

٢٩ - يحمل الناس الذين يعملون تحت
رئاسته بدون مراعاة لعمريهم
أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - مرة في هكذا
ه - نادراً جداً

٣٠ - يمر على معرفة القرارات المثلى
يتم هذا من يحصلون تحت رئاسته
أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - نادراً
ه - نادراً جداً

٣١ - يمر طرفًا جديدة للمشكلات
أ - غالباً
ب - غالباً نوا
ج - من آن لآخر
د - مرة في هكذا
ه - نادراً جداً
22 - يتعامل الناس الذين يتعلمون تحت رئاسته بدون مراعاة لشمسهم
أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - مرة في لحظة
ه - نادراً جداً

23 - يسرى على معرفة القرارات التي يتخذها من يعملون تحت رئاسته
أ - دائماً
ب - غالباً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - نادراً
ه - نادر

24 - يعرض طرقاً جديدة لحل المشكلات.
أ - غالباً
ب - غالباً نجاً
ج - من آن لآخر
د - مرة في لحظة
ه - نادراً جداً
26 - يقبل كل من الناس المريئين في العمل أن يفعلوا أكثر
أ - غالبًا
ب - غالبًا خلا
ج - من أن لآخر
د - نادرًا
ه - بادا

27 - يتطلب الناس المريئين في العمل
راثحًا أمام الآخرين
أ - غالبًا
ب - غالبًا نجاحًا
۲۳- به‌دقت، همه وحدتین زمانی،
الملاییان، بین‌النحوانیان،
روعه‌اشت،
۱— به‌درجه کوچک
ب— کهیرا نجا
ج— به‌درجه متوسط
د— قلیا نسبتا
ه— ندارا یا
۲۰- یک‌دیگری که‌ردن، به‌حذف آنها
۱— به‌درجه کبیر
ب— کهیرا نجا
ج— به‌درجه متوسط
د— قلیا نسبتا
ه— ندارا یا
۲۱- به‌کمک (به‌پسندی)
سیده) یک‌دیگری که‌ردن، به‌حذف آنها
۱— گالیا
ب— گالیا نجا
ج— از آن لاحق
د— به‌درجه متوسط
ه— ندارا یا
۲۲-
32 - ينظرون الناس الذين يملعون تحت رأسه أن يصرخوا
أفعال جيدة قبل أن يفعلوه ذلك
أ - دائما
ب - غالبا
ج - من أين آخر
د - نادر
ه - أبدا

33 - يحكم بيده حديدية
أ - دائما
ب - غالبا
ج - من أين آخر
د - نادر
ه - أبدا

34 - يحاول أن يکمل من يملع تحت
رأسه على علاقة جيدة مع من هم
في سلطات أعلى
أ - دائما
ب - غالبا
ج - من أين آخر
د - نادر
ه - أبدا
35 - يُرِّجِف اقتراحات التغيير

أ - دائم
ب - غالبا
ج - من آن لآخر
د - نادر
ه - أبدا

36 - يُشير عمل من يعمل تحت رئاسة دون أن يجلي الأسبار منهم قبل ذلك.

أ - دائم
ب - غالبا
ج - نم آن لآخر
د - مرة في لحظة
ه - نادر جدا

37 - يقرر تطبيق ما يجب عليه

أ - دائم
ب - غالبا
ج - من آن لآخر
د - نادر
ه - أبدا
ألا يếm عينهم محت رئاسته حتى ولو
أن رأى يحمله غير محبو
أ دائما
ب غالبا
ج من آن لآخر
د دائما
ه - ابدا

ليجسر من يحملون تحت رئاسته
يشعرون بالرضا عند ما يمتلكون إليه
أ دائما
ب غالبا
ج من آن لآخر
د دائما
ه - ابدا
١) يفتح الاقتراحات التي يقدرسها من فهم تتم رئاسته.

أ) رئاسة
ب) فاليا
ج) من أن لآخر
د) ودرا
ه) إسدا

٢) يشرح ما يقوم به من عمل أوواجب.

أ) فاليا
ب) فاليا نجا
ج) من أن لآخر
د) مرة في لحظة
ه) نادرًا جدا

٣) يلغد عمود الاهتمام بنفسة

أ) بدرجة كبيرة
ب) كبيرًا نجا
ج) لدرجة ما
د) قليلًا نسبيًا
ه) لا بالمرة
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٤٤٤٤ - يطلب من يعمل تحت رأسه

 спинيات من أجل صالح القسم

كله 

أ- غالبا

ب- غالبا نجا

ج- من أن لاذ

د- مرة في لحظة

ن- نادرا جدا

٤٤٤٤ - يستمتع من يعمل تحت رأسه

بهل جيد أكبر

أ- ردة كبيرة

ب- كبيرا نجا

ج- لردة ما

د- قليل نسبيا

ه- لا بالمرة
47 - بمر على أن يجعل كل شيء بالشريعة التي براها ثم
أ - دائيا
ب - غالب
د - من أن لا غير
ه - نادر
ه - بدأ

48 - يشجع من يدمل بيضة ليطلس
ج - أكر
أ - غالب
ب - غالب
د - من أن لا غير
ه - سورة في لحظة
ه - نادر
ه - بدأ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>About Average</th>
<th>Better than Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow company policies and practices?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept the direction of his supervisor?</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow standard work rules and procedures?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet the responsibility of his job?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt to changes in procedures or methods?</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the authority of his supervisor?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work as a member of a team?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along with his supervisors?</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform repetitive tasks?</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along with his co-workers?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform tasks requiring variety and change in methods?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to others in his work group...</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How good is the quality of his work?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How good is the quantity of his work?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, all things considered, would you...                                  | Yes | Maybe | No   |
| Get a pay raise?                                                        |     |        |      |
| Change jobs and work at a higher level?                                 |     |        |      |
| Accept a position of more responsibility?                               |     |        |      |
Please check the best answer for each question.

Be sure to answer all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Best Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this worker exhibit a high concern about the job in question?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is this worker's attention directed?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this worker's approach to the job more aggressive or more diplomatic?</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does this worker handle stress?</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively does this worker plan and organize their work?</td>
<td>Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does this worker handle criticism or feedback?</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this worker prioritize and manage their workload?</td>
<td>Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this worker handle conflict or disagreements?</td>
<td>Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does this worker adapt to change or new situations?</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this worker handle uncertainty or ambiguity?</td>
<td>Effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of this worker's overall competence, how closely does he approximate the ideal worker?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With all these factors in mind, where would you rank this worker among the top performers in your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not among the lowest performers.
البحث المهني
في علوم النفس / جامعة مينيسوتا
(حقوق الطبع محفوظة 1965)
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
ففضل مراجعة أفعال جواب على كل مسألة
- تأكد من الإجابة على كل الأسئلة

1. إنا أمارتين بأخرين في مجموعة عمل - نكم مرة
   - أدخل، نظر والتجربة أكتر

2. من أثار النسج إلى نفسه
3. يقيم النسج ( مستشار)
4. يقيم النسج غير معبد
5. يختار إلى الآخر تأبين
6. يقبل على العمل
7. يقبل أولم جسماني
8. يقول أشياء غريبة
9. يبد عليه التطور بسورة
10. يشعر كالمكان غير مستقبلي عند مبكع
11. ينتقد من وضع لا يكون أثناه

12. ولا أن أرى النظر في هذا الحساب من خاصة كافين الشعواء والمقدمية
   - التي ينجز فيها عمل ويدافع خبرته وقيمة الشعواء المبكر، إدخال في حساب
   جميع المناصرة للاجئات التاجب للعمل محلة وفروع العمل والوظائف المخصصة
   - وكية زرع النتاج والعملة بالأسام والذراع الأفريقي والمسلمين له ورضا
   - والقدرة على القيام بإجابات العمل والذكاء والجاذبية لله روابطه
   -، وبعبارة أخرى إلى أي حد يقترب من النقل الأعلى ونوع العمل المذكور
   - في ذلك. ويدرجن أخيراً من آثراكه
1. ويدرك هذه العوامل - ماما العبرة التي تقدم
   - فيهما إذا ما تأثرت بالأشخاص الذين لا يهملن بلغة
   - أدولف والأخلاقي الوحيد. وكيف تأثرت بالناس الذين قد تأثرت بعضهم
   - في المادي
1. في اللغة - (الرباع الأطمس)
   - في النصائح وجد باللغة ولكن ليس بثري الأطمس
   - من الغامض
2. في النصائح ولكن ليس بين الرباع الأدبي
3. في الرباع الأدبي
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Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write

- for "Yes" if it describes your work
- for "No" if it does NOT describe it
- if you cannot decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiresome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives sense of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word, put

y if it describes your pay

n if it does not describe it

? if you cannot decide

PRESENT PAY

_____ Income adequate for normal expenses
_____ Satisfactory profit sharing
_____ Barely live on income
_____ Bad
_____ Income provides luxuries
_____ Insecure
_____ Less than I deserve
_____ Highly paid
_____ Underpaid

Please go on to next page
Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these? In the blank beside each word put:
y for “Yes” if it describes your opportunities for promotion
n for “No” if it does NOT describe them
? if you cannot decide

***************************

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Good opportunity for advancement

Opportunity somewhat limited

Promotion on ability

Dead-end job

Good chance for promotion

Unfair promotion policy

Infrequent promotions

Regular promotions

Fairly good chance for promotion

Now please turn to the next page.
Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word below, put y if it describes the supervision you get on your job, n if it does not describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMMEDIATE SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asks my advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impolite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't supervise enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells me where I stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows job well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves me on my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around when needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go on to the next page.
Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word below, put:

- ☑ if it describes the people you work with
- ☐ if it does NOT describe them
- ☐☐ if you cannot decide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Stimulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Easy to make enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Talk too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Narrow interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Loyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Hard to meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
العمل في الواجهة الحالى

| ناتج | روتي | مرسى | سل | ختام | رداعي | محسور | عسار | غير معروف | شعب | محسوب | إيه ضخمي | على قيد الحياة | معروف | بسيطة | لا هماً للنقد | ليس له سبب بالنهاية |
ذكرى 3: الأجر المقدّر للدائين المآذان الآن، كمهدمة تعني كل كلمة من الكلمات لباك، راجعه، منزاهم وملاجع؟

إن مكان الحان بحراً كل كلمة
إن كانت أو كل بيت
إن لم تستخدم تفكر

الأجر المقدّر

لا يوجد مقدّر

منذكرون منرني في الموض
لا يوجد بتكوين على الهم
رضا
لا يوجد المدخل الكلمات
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
لا يوجد
نقرأ في عُروض المَرْتِفَّفِيَّة التي تُدعى الآن، كيف تُشَرَّف كل من الكلمات الإنجليزية هذه المفردات، وسَيَلَاً.

إذن في الأشكال المختلفة للكلة،

مهما كان تجربة تُستَرْبِت،

ولم تُسَأَّل "لا لا" لم تُتَّبَع جدار الفرس.

إذن لم تُنَافِع أن تُتَّقَرُّ،

وَبِمَا أَنَّ شَرْ-camera derek.png
لا
إذا كانت الكلمة تلعب دورًا
إذا لم تكن الكلمة تنفصل النافذة
إذا لم تستطيع أن تظهر

الإشراف الأول على السلسلة

ب كفة مستمرة
من發展 ازرا كان
الفرص
يعتقد النافذة الجديد
لبن
لا نود
ویرجع عليه
لا يشترط بهPTIONة كافية
مريح الطية
صبر على هجوم
بان
نفاذ
النقطة
هذا
ذكي
بطرق لطيفة
كميل
يكون ناجحًا عند ما 1-1-2 الم
يتكلم الأصوات الذين يتصلون في عالم هنالك

بيتلون على المنازل

بُذلون على البلد

بَلا بَين

آمَنون

الإنسان

صدامون

سرد بئر

راركيماء

من المصلح أن يكون نورًا

بينكرون أكاد من الأزور

ناديئين

كمسول

 مباشرة

لا صحة

نادر تزين

درواتي عَدَم

له بِسَم لَا

من الأفراد ميقاتون
APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL MANAGERS

1. Name of your immediate supervisor:

2. Your name:

3. Your age:  
   A. 21-35  
   B. 36-40  
   C. 41-45  
   D. 46-50  
   E. 51 and over

4. Marital status:  
   A. Single  
   B. Married  
   C. Divorced  
   D. Widowed

5. Number of children:  
   A. None  
   B. One  
   C. Two  
   D. Three  
   E. More than three

6. Is your father employed?  
   Yes  
   No

   If yes, please indicate his job title and place of employment.

7. Education:  
   A. Elementary  
   B. Intermediate  
   C. Secondary  
   D. Some college  
   E. College graduate  
   F. Still pursuing education on a part-time basis  
   G. Other

8. Where did you obtain your education?  
   A. Elementary--  
   B. Intermediate--  
   C. Secondary--  
   D. Some college--
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9. What is your major area of study?

10. What is your job title?

11. What are your major responsibilities?

12. What is your monthly income in Saudi Riyals?
   A. 2,000-3,000
   B. 3,001-4,000
   C. 4,001-5,000
   D. 5,001-6,000
   E. 6,001 and over

13. What is your length of service with Saudi Arabian Airlines?
    A. Less than 1 year
    B. 1-2 years
    C. 3-4 years
    D. 5-6 years
    E. 7 years and over

14. Describe your job responsibilities with Saudia before taking up this job.

15. Other business experience—list the major responsibilities of jobs held outside Saudia, if any.

16. A. Do you know if there is a Management Development Program at Saudia? Yes No
    B. If yes, how did you learn about it?
    C. Do you have relatives at Saudia? Yes No
17. A. How did you get your job at Saudia?
   A. Personal
   B. Relatives
   C. Recruited; how?

   B. Did you accept your job with Saudia so as to participate in the Management Development Program?

   C. Have you been promoted to your present job as a result of completing MDP?

18. A. Have you attended any of the Management Development Programs available at Saudia? Yes No

   B. If yes, which programs have you attended and where?

   C. If you have not attended, please explain why.

   D. Are you presently attending a program? If so, which one?

19. A. What is your overall opinion of the Management Development Program at Saudia?
   1. Excellent
   2. Good
   3. Fair
   4. Poor
   5. Very poor
   6. Not worthy

   B. Using these same criteria, evaluate each Saudia Management Development Program that you have attended.

20. To what extent do you believe you have been affected by attending the Saudia Management Development Program?
   A. Promotion
   B. Salary increase
   C. Feeling of achievement
   D. Disappointed
   E. Not useful
   F. Other comments
21. How would you describe the change in your behavior as a result of your training program?
   A. More sensitive to employees
   B. More oriented to Saudia goals
   C. Better able to get along with
      1. Coworkers
      2. Peers
      3. Subordinates
      4. Superiors
      5. Others outside Saudia

22. How do you rate your training program in relation to helping you in your job?
   A. No help
   B. Little help
   C. Neutral
   D. Some help
   E. Most help

23. A. Was your training program designed especially for you and for your job? Yes No
     B. If yes, please describe your training program.

24. What has been most helpful to you in your job that you learned in the training program?
   A.
   B.
   C.
   D.
   E.

25. What do you think your training program could have included that would be useful to you in your job?
   A.
   B.
   C.
   D.
   E.
الاسم المشرف آبائكم
2- العيل
3- السن
أ- 21
ب- 22
ج- 23
د- 24
هـ- 25
و- أكثر

4- الحالة الزوجية
أ- غير متزوج
ب- متزوج
ج- مطلق
د- أرمل

5- كم عدد أطفالكم؟
أ- لا شيء
ب- واحد
ج- اثنان
د- ثلاثة
هـ- أكثر من ثلاثة

6- هل والدك مسلم أم لا
إذا كان الجواب نعم في اسم الوظيفة يكون النمل
7 - التعليم

أ- أولي
ب- متوسط
ج- درجة عالية - درجة ثانية
د- درجة الجامعية المواصلة على
هـ- إك (أو من الدورة الجامعية ) كلية ما
و- بعد تتبع التعليم أو أكاد تقدم به بعض الوقت.

8- سن أين حصلت على تعليمك
أ- الأولي
ب- المتوسط
ج- الثانوي
د- البكالوريوس
هـ- الماجستير أو الدكتوراه
و- درجات أخرى

ما هو المجال الرئيسي لدراستك

0- 6، 11، و 3، 7، 9
11- ما هي مسؤوليات الأساسية؟

12- ما هو المتوسط الشهرى بالريالات السعودية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>قيمة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ- 200 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب- 301 - 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج- 401 - 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د- 501 - 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح- 601 - 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م- 700 - 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و- 800 - 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز- 900 - 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي- 1000 - 1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>زا- أكثر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13- طول مدة خدمة في السعودية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>فترة</th>
<th>عام</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ- أقل من 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب- 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج- 3 - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د- 5 - 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح- 7 - 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م- 9 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و- أكثر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14- صف مسندات وظيفتك في GEO النرويجية السعودية. تفضل أن تبسط هذه الوظيفة.
16 - هل تعلم إذا كان هناك برنامج تنمية للإدارة في المملكة العربية السعودية؟
لا

ب - إذا كان الجواب نعم - فاذكر كيف حصلت على برنامج نموذج للدريسيين في الخطوط السعودية؟

ج - هل لديك أقارب في الخطوط السعودية؟

7 - أ - كيف حصلت على وظيفة في السعودية؟
أ - مسمى
ب - أقارب
ج - استمتع بالعمل.. كيف؟
بـ هل قليلت العمل في السعودية لتشتهر في برنامج تنمية
الديرين ؟

هل رقيت لوظيفتك الحالية نتيجة لتمكين برنامج تنمية
الديرين ؟

18 هل حضرت اهمى برامج تدريب الديرين في السعودية ؟
نعم
لا
بـ إذا كان الجواب نعم أي البرنامج كانت له ويلي
لا إذا لم تكن قد حضرت هذه البرامج فضلاً اخبر
هذا

هل استفدت الآن برنامجاً، وإذا كان الأمر كذلك هل
برنامج هذا ؟

أـ أ ما هو رأيك عامة عن برنامج تنمية الإدارة في السعودية
بـ ردي جداً
بـ جيد
بـ متوسط
بـ ردي ؟
ب- تقييم كل برنامج تدريب للمدربين بالعربية مستخدمًا هذه
المعايير في ما؟

2- إلى أي مدى تعتقد أنك قد تأثرت بحضور برنامج تدريب المدربين؟
أ- حصلت على ترقية
ب- زيادة في الراتب
ج- تحسين بالإنجاز
د- تحسين أدائك
ه- فوت ضرده
ز- تعليق آخر

3- كيف تصف النتائج الذي حصلت في ملوك نتيجة برنامج التدريب النماذجي؟
أ- حسب أكثر من نقطة الموظفين
ب- وصلها أكثر نحو أهداف السلمية
ج- قادر أكثر على التشغيل والعمل مع:
د- زباله العمل
ه- نظرائه
ه- مسنه
ه- رئيسة
ه- غيرهم خارج السعودية
42 - كيف تقوم برامج إدرية فيما يتعلق بمساعده لك في عملك؟

أ - لا مساعدة
ب - مساعدة قليلة
ج - مماثل
د - بخير المساعدة
ه - معظم المساعدة

42 - أ) هل عم برامج تدريب تحصلها لك ولوظيفتك
نعم
لا
ب) إذا كان الجواب نعم - فضلاً صف برامج تدريبك.

44 - ما الذي أدى له اكتساحك في وظيفتك: ما تعلمت فيه برامج التدريب؟

1
2
3
4
5
ما الذي تعتقد أن برنامج تدريبك كان في الاستطاعة أن يتضمنه؟

٥

٤

٣

٢

١
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