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ABSTRACT
In this study, we examine empirically the factors influencing employee job productivity in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). A survey was collected from 200 employees occupying different positions in their respective organizations. The organizations surveyed are of different sizes, activities, ownership, and come from different regions of the KSA. Results show that effective performance appraisal is a significant predictor of employee productivity, whereas job satisfaction is not a significant predictor of employee productivity. The fact that findings from this study contradict findings from research in other countries is due to the unique working environment in KSA, where expatriates represent a large portion of the workforce. This study is the first to explore this topic in KSA, and therefore, it entails a paucity of knowledge about what influences job productivity in KSA. The practical implications of the findings are discussed.
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To grow and thrive in today’s competitive environment, organizations must focus continually on enhancing their effectiveness and productivity. For this reason, organizations invest a great deal of resources in employment tests, job interviews, and training programs in an attempt to improve job satisfaction, and ultimately, improve employee productivity and job performance (Hooi, 2012; Aguinis, 2009; Shields, 2007; Judge et al., 2001). Considering that availing of human assets is the way to achieve organizational goals (Pulakos, 2009), employees are the most critical component that organizations can leverage to improve their effectiveness. There is therefore a persistent need to attract and preserve good employees by maintaining a satisfactory working environment, thereby helping to get employees to perform at their best and to improve workplace productivity (Sextona et al., 2005; Brown and Peterson, 1993). Currently, leading organizations depend heavily on human resource development in order to foster desirable workplace atmospheres and attitudes, including the key elements of job satisfaction and job performance (Bartlett and Kang, 2004).

The increasing use of the performance appraisal process (Nankervis and Compton, 2006; Millward et al., 2000) is motivated by an organizational desire to improve employee productivity, which leads to higher organizational performance (Aguinis, 2009; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991). This process is a consequence of creating an early set of organizational objectives, which support a clear performance target that employees must reach by a certain date. By the end of each evaluation cycle, employees are informed of the process outcome (Heneman and Werner, 2005). Those with high performance are rewarded for their efforts to sustain high productivity, whereas those with lower performance are provided with feedback to help them improve during the next evaluation cycle (Kuvaas, 2011).
Recently, companies have been placing increased emphasis on performance appraisal (PA) (Youngcourt et al., 2007; Kuvaas, 2007), and the central function of human resource management in this endeavor has remained an important topic of investigation among researchers (Jawahar, 2007; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991). The importance of the performance appraisal as a managerial decision tool relies partly on whether or not the performance appraisal system is capable of providing an accurate assessment of employee performance, in which rating precision is a vital element of the appraisal process. Therefore, properly performed performance appraisals can offer numerous positive organizational results (Pettijohn et al., 2001), including improvements in both employee job satisfaction and employee productivity (Anderson, 1993; Aguinis, 2009).

Performance appraisal and its implications on individual and organizational performance continues to be a critical topic of investigation among researchers. Some previous researches have therefore continued to examine the relationship between performance appraisal and employee job satisfaction and employee productivity for various organizations, but findings have generated mixed opinions on the effects of performance appraisal on employee job satisfaction and productivity (Brown et al., 2010; Coens and Jenkins, 2002; Fletcher and Williams, 1996). The fact that these relationships are mostly assumed rather than tested (Levy and Williams, 2004) can be due to several factors related to individual psychological or contextual issues (Fletcher, 2002). Investigations of contextual differences that may influence the relationship between performance appraisal and employee job satisfaction and productivity can identify conditions under which a performance appraisal is more or less effective, and which can yield results of practical relevance (Kuvaas, 2011; Pulakos, 2009). Among the many empirical studies on this relationship, no
literature studies have been undertaken in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Therefore, this study attempts to fill the gap in the existing literature by empirically examining the influence of effective performance appraisal and job satisfaction on employee productivity for a unique environment – that in the KSA.

The government in KSA imposes many challenging employment regulations that are different from those in other countries, even close Arabic countries, such as unique labor relationships and employment laws to control the large number of expats – more than 55% of the total workforce (recent statistics from the minister of labor indicate that KSA contains close to 9 million expats). Currently, most businesses in KSA utilize a large number of expats to conduct daily operations, due to the lack of local skilled employees or to attract cheap labor from other countries. In addition, there are significant variations in salary scale for employees, based on many factors. This condition has pushed KSA government to draft new policy to force businesses to start hiring local Saudis to achieve certain percentage of the total workforce for each business category. This condition imposes significant pressure on businesses to reconstruct their operations; this in turns impacted the workplace environments and attitudes, including the key elements of job satisfaction and job performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Performance appraisal is a process in which a supervisor collects information to evaluate and judge the job performance of a subordinate (Walsh, 2003). In many cases, the appraisal is a formal routine and an important element of personnel management policy (Walsh, 2003). Management
views performance appraisal as a required process for a specific period of time during which part or all of an employee's work is evaluated and judged by a supervisor (Coens and Jenkins, 2002). To be a coherent process, the performance appraisal requires that the assessment of employee performance be based on predefined standards (Smither, 1998), to enhance the effectiveness of the appraisal in evaluating the quality of an employee’s performance (Grote, 2002).

Each element of the organization needs to be evaluated to check its performance and define procedures to improve it. Conducting employee performance appraisal has become standard practice in most organizations (Selden et al., 2001). Conventionally, the appraisal is conducted as an annual routine that involves social interaction between a supervisor and an employee to establish action plans through a discussion of the individual’s past job performance and future developmental requirements (Murphy and Cleveland, 1995), and therefore, the real value of performance appraisal comes from its effective application. Recently, the simple routine of recording and documenting an employee’s performance has changed into a more strategic and holistic approach to connect a corporate strategic map with department and employee performances (Fletcher, 2004).

The 360-degree feedback, peer-to-peer, and supervisor subordinate appraisal systems were created to enhance the effectiveness and quality of the evaluation process (Coens and Jenkins, 2002; Grote, 2002; Neal, 2001). These systems were developed to involve more participants in the evaluations process – those who have been working with employees and have the potential to provide important information to consolidate the appraisal process (Redman and Snape, 1992). The 360-degree feedback is conducted through an anonymous procedure to ensure confidentiality.
Although 360-degree feedback and supervisor-subordinate appraisals are the most popular types of appraisal (Ployhart et al., 2001), mounting evidence suggests that both types introduce subjectivity and variance into ratings (Judge et al., 2001). Subsequent investigation has introduced a new technique, Balanced Scorecard, which expands performance measures and evaluation. This technique includes multiple perspectives that involve financial, customer-evaluation feedback on internal processes and on learning and growth (Bach, 2005). The equity theory states that people in social exchange relationships believe that rewards should be distributed according to the level of individual contribution (Adams, 1963). This means that satisfaction is based on a person's perception of fairness. Utilizing this theory when conducting a performance appraisal involves balancing the assessment of an employee's contribution to his/her job with the rewards associated with his/her success.

Effective performance appraisal serves the function of enhancing the efficiency of employees by identifying their capabilities and interests and offering training and other career development opportunities. In practice however, implementing effective performance appraisal is a complex process with a potential for variation, mainly when the manager is obliged to execute subjective judgments on employee performance. These judgments have the scope to reduce the quality of the performance appraisal process because they are subject to emotion-induced bias (Treadway et al., 2007), which suggests that traditional appraisal systems can limit an organization’s ability to remain competitive (Brown et al., 2010). Many studies have identified the reluctance of managers to undertake appraisals (Heathfield, 2007), some managers avoid the process entirely, and many practitioners conduct appraisals in an arbitrary and a perfunctory manner (Pettijohn et al., 2001).
The negative attitudes of some managers toward the performance appraisal system are due partly to considering this system as an isolated activity unrelated to other activities within the organization, and to ignoring some of the contextual factors that influence the system.

**Effective Performance Appraisal**

Effective performance appraisal symbolizes a critical function of human resource management and has persevered as a central topic of investigation among organizational researchers (Coens and Jenkins, 2002; Dulebohn and Ferris, 1999). Performance appraisal is the process of evaluating an employee performance on the job and establishing a plan of improvements; whereas effective performance appraisal is the process that enhances employees’ perception of a useful appraisal system. If performance appraisal is conducted properly, it can be a useful managerial decision tool to provide correct information on employee satisfaction (Brown et al., 2010) and productivity (Aguinis, 2009). Due to the significant value of performance appraisal, practitioners and researchers alike are keen to investigate factors that make it an effective system (Al-Dmour and Awamleh, 2002; Bach, 2005). Lindholm (1999) suggests the following three elements that could enhance employees’ perception of a useful appraisal system: employee involvement in the objective-setting process; opportunity for employee training and development; and feedback on job performance. These elements provide a foundation for employee satisfaction since they support employee career development and organizational commitment (Kuvaas, 2006). To sustain it as a valuable system, performance appraisal should be designed to capture past performance effectively, provide reflection points, and support a developmental roadmap for employee
improvement at a personal and professional level (Coens and Jenkins 2002). Since the effectiveness of the appraisal system relies on the wider organizational and managerial context (Narcisse and Harcourt, 2008), some of the organizational and managerial context should be included in the process – such as top management support, organizational policy concerning the use of appraisal information, job characteristics, and supervisory behavior.

There is an increasing body of information confirming the relationship between performance appraisals and increases in employee performance and productivity (Rodgers and Hunter, 1991; Schay, 1988; Taylor and Pierce, 1999). For example, Aldakhilallah and Parente (2002) propose that, to enhance employee productivity, managers reshape the performance appraisal process to make it consistent with a high-quality management organization. Other researchers propose that the increasing use of the performance appraisal process be arranged by organizational desire to enhance employee productivity (Nankervis and Compton, 2006; Wiese and Buckley, 1998). Thus, an effective performance appraisal should identify poorly performing employees and provide feedback to improve their productivity Aguinis (2009), and perhaps allow them to partake in training activities in order to enhance their performance.

**H1. Effective performance appraisal improves employee productivity.**

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction, viewed as the degree of pleasure a worker obtains from his or her job (Spector, 1997), has been intensively studied both empirically and in the literature. Job satisfaction may also
be expressed as an employee's general attitude towards the job (Robbins and Coulter, 1996). Others identify it as the pleasant emotional state resulting from a positive appraisal of an individual’s performance (Price, 2001). An effective and high-quality performance appraisal likely enhances employee feelings of self-worth, achievement, attitudes and positive standing in the organization (Lind and Tyler, 1988). Fried and Ferris (1987) suggest that a high-quality performance appraisal process produces higher levels of job satisfaction, whereas a low-quality performance appraisal leads to lower levels of job satisfaction (Campbell et al., 1998). It is expected therefore that employees in KSA would enjoy a high level of job satisfaction if performance appraisals were implemented effectively in the workplace:

**H2. Effective performance appraisal promotes Job Satisfaction.**

**Employee productivity**

Employee productivity can be related to that of one’s peers on several job-related outcomes, where it includes both efficiency and effectiveness (Babin and Boles, 1998). Generally, high productive employees improve an organization’s efficiency and productivity (Kuvaas, 2011). Several measurements are used to define employee productivity: goal attainment for the organization, service, professional growth, meeting productivity goals, meeting deadlines, being well organized, accomplishing a large amount of work, accuracy, and problem solving. In practice, improving employee productivity requires management support in resolving issues related to the above measurement factors (Kuvaas, 2006).
Studies point out that job satisfaction is determined by a number of organizational factors such as relationships with colleagues and managers, income status, chances of promotion and advancement, interest in the job, independence at work, job stability and security, and fairness at work (Fischer and Sousa-Poza, 2009). Satisfied employees work hard to sustain the high level of satisfaction, leading to higher employee productivity. In this study, we anticipate that job satisfaction increases an employee’s productivity, as presented in Figure 1, which shows the theoretical framework and proposed hypothesis.

\textit{H3. Employee job satisfaction promotes employee productivity.}

\textbf{Figure 1.} The theoretical framework and proposed hypothesis
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METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted by a field survey distributed to employees working at various levels in their respective organizations. These organizations are of different sizes, activities, and ownership, and operate in different regions of KSA. A sample of 280 employees from several organizations in KSA was selected to receive the survey. In total, 200 participants returned the survey, representing 71.25% usable response rate.

The scale used in measuring the effectiveness of performance appraisal consists of nine items, adapted from Timperley (1998). Job satisfaction was adapted from a scale developed and validated by Al-Dmour and Awamleh (2002), which has six items. For employee productivity construct, a single item, adopted from Kemerling (2002), was used. The demographic profile included questions relating to both the characteristics of the participants as well as their organizations. The Appendix shows the survey and measurement items used. The data collected were analysed using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), to check for Confirmatory Factor Analysis and test hypotheses about relations among observed and latent variables (Hoyle, 1995). SEM is a multivariate technique incorporating measured variables and latent constructs, and explicitly specifies measurement error.

RESULTS
The demographic variables of the participants are presented in Table 1. The table shows that 63% of the participating firms engage in manufacturing activities, 19% work in the service industry, and the remaining 18% partake in both activities. About 57% of firms are private, and 16% are publicly owned. Most of the firms are large, with more than 500 employees, and 30% of them are mid-size. Over 42% of firms have operated for more than 10 years, and 43% have existed for less than 5 years. Of the participants, 6% are top managers, 22% are middle managers, 20% are supervisors, and 51% occupy various positions. Nationality-wise, 76% of participants are non-Saudi, and 24% Saudi. Experience-wise, 71% of participants have less than 5 years experience, and the rest have over 6 years. More than 65% of participants have a post-high school degree.

Table 1. Demographic variables of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100 – 500 60 30.0
More than 500 120 60.0

**Organizational Age**
- 5 Years or Less 86 43.4
- 6- 10 Years 28 14.1
- Over 10 Years 84 42.4

**Occupational Position**
- Top manager 12 6.1
- Middle manager 44 22.4
- Supervisor 40 20.4
- Other 100 51.0

**Employee Age**
- 25 years or less 32 15.8
- 26-35 years 88 43.6
- 36-45 years 60 29.7
- 45 years or over 22 10.9

**Nationality**
- Saudi 48 24
- Non-Saudi 152 76

**Employee experience**
- 5 years or less 144 71.3
- 6- 10 years 22 10.9
- Over 10 years 36 17.8

**Employee Education**
- Less than university 70 34.7
- College graduate 38 18.8
- University degree 80 39.6
- Postgraduate degree 14 6.9

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted as illustrated in Figure 2. In full measurement dimensions CFA, Chi square value was found to be 149.6, with degree of freedom 75, CFI value was 0.867, TLI value was 0.981, and GFI value was 0.913, suggesting a good fit of the measurement model to the data. In addition, the RMSEA was 0.071, well below 0.08, which suggests that the model fits well. The good fit was achieved by dropping 20% of the total measurement items, as suggested by Hair et al. (2010). When the model fit does not achieve the good fitness of the model to solve this issue, the maximum drop of the items should not exceed
20%. Therefore, 20% of the items where dropped to achieve a good fit of the model, specifically (q-6 from job satisfaction and q-2 from effective performance appraisal) items were dropped, as illustrated in Figure 2.

**Figure 2.** The proposed model variables and measurement items

---

**Structural Equation Modeling**

Because all the indices in the measurement model fit show overall goodness-of-fit, all the direct relationship effects were tested simultaneously in the structural equation modelling. Figure 3 presents a model that assumes a causal structure among a set of latent variables, and that assumes the observed variables are indicators of the latent variables. Because the observed variables are measures of job satisfaction and effective performance appraisal and productivity, a structure model was then conducted to estimate the parameters. The relationships between latent variables with the items are shown by the one direction arrow (Figure 3).
Figure 3. The structural equation modeling for the model variables

Figure 3 indicates that the hypothesised models of the structural equation modelling fit well to the sample data. The outcome of the findings, however, demonstrates that the main relationship between effective performance appraisal and productivity is significant relationships, with p value of .048, as shown Table 2. However, the relationship of effective performance appraisal and job satisfaction is not significant with p value of .904. The same case of job satisfaction and productivity, where the relationship is not significant with p value .611. Effective performance appraisal as a construct is a strong factor influencing productivity. The results of these analyses will be discussed in more detail in the discussion section.

Table 2. The significant relationship between model variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effective performance appraisal → productivity</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-1.978</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective performance appraisal → job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job satisfaction → productivity</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The findings demonstrate that hypothesis 1 is supported, an outcome in line with that of previous studies (Aguinis, 2009; Kuvaas, 2006; Coens and Jenkins 2002; Taylor and Pierce, 1999), where the role of effective performance appraisal was evident to enhance employee productivity. However, the results demonstrate that hypothesis 2 and 3 are not supported, a finding that contradicts the outcome from other studies (Brown et al., 2010; Masterson et al., 2000; Fletcher and Williams, 1996), where mostly show a positive relationship between effective performance appraisal and job satisfaction on the one hand, and relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity on the other. This variation might be due to the peculiarity of the working environment which is different from that for previous studies conducted in Western environments. For example, the number of working expats in KSA represents over 35% of the total workforce, and they come from various countries to work temporarily in the rich oil state for periods of from one year to several years. Each firm in KSA could contain employees from many countries, all from different working environments. Some employees come from developed counties that have a high standard of employment practice, others from poor countries that lack the minimum
conditions for good employment standard. No doubt, the unique working environment in KSA has an impact on the findings of this study.

The results indicate that although the performance appraisal exercise was conducted in KSA organizations, it did not lead to employee satisfaction. This negative finding can be due to firms’ not providing a constructive feedback for employees and not helping them to improve their performance for the next evaluation cycle. This dissatisfaction had lead to weakening of the relationship between employee satisfaction and productivity. Such an environment signals a major issue in utilizing the performance appraisal system in KSA, where its implementation did not consider the background of workers and their perception of the appraisal’s implications. This can be further verified by additional studies to investigate how different expats interpret job satisfaction based on their country of origin.

Results confirm eight determinants of effective performance appraisal in KSA. The practical implication of this indicates that to achieve the intended results of performance appraisal, management should incorporate those eight features in their performance appraisal exercise, and ensure that all employees have a clear understanding of their implications. Note that the levels of effective performance appraisal, employee productivity, and job satisfaction do not vary among most of the demographics in Saudi firms.

CONCLUSION
It can be concluded from this study that employee job satisfaction is not influenced by effective performance appraisal in KSA. In addition, job satisfaction has no direct impact on employee productivity, or subsequently on organizational performance. In general, however, employees in KSA are productive in their jobs to meet job requirements and renew their contract. This study provides the first empirical evidence about the impact of an effective performance appraisal on employee productivity in KSA; but findings and implications are not restricted only to the KSA environment, but could expand to other Arabic Gulf Countries, which share similar working environment. Thus, this study fills a gap in our understanding of the relationship between effective performance appraisal and employee productivity within a highly diversified working environment.

**PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS**

As performance appraisal becomes an important part of human resource management, the results of the performance appraisal process is the foundation for many human resources decisions. It is crucial therefore to have an effective application of the performance appraisal system. In practice, organizations face challenges when conducting a low-quality performance appraisal process because it generates a low-performance appraisal experience for employees, leading to lower job satisfaction and lower productivity. To increase the effectiveness of performance appraisal, a certain level of interaction between managers and employees beyond formal appraisal activities is required, to enable appraisers to alter the performance appraisal at the requests of individual appraises. This issue becomes critical for a highly diversified working environment, such as in the KSA, where workers from different cultures and backgrounds operate in one organization. To
facilitate the performance appraisal process, organizations can utilize standardized formats consisting of detailed manuals on how appraisers should conduct performance appraisals effectively, and try to modify them after a few rounds of testing to capture the unique working environment in KSA. Standardized methods can be selected for various purposes based on the organization structure and on how collected information will be used. The unique nature of employment in KSA requires managers to take extra steps to increase the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process and ensure it meets organizational objectives in increasing employee productivity.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

One limitation in this study is that it revolved around three variables include effective performance appraisal, employee job satisfaction and employee productivity. However, in future research more psychological and contextual variables can be added to our model as a moderator, in order to obtain a deeper understanding of the phenomena. Also, being a cross-sectional study, this study examines the influence of the independent variables over a limited time. However, since the working environment in KSA is changing continuously, due to altering government regulations, the impact of different variables could be different overtime. Another limitation could arise from having a majority (76 percent) of the respondents as non-Saudis; this may skew the perception of the general employees with respect to all the three variables. To mitigate these limitations, further studies could replicate this study by collecting data using larger sample, targeting employees occupying
different organizational levels and relatively equal number of Saudis and non-Saudis respondents to ensure more generalization of the findings.
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Effective Performance Appraisal System

- Please rate the following according to their importance, in what you believe to be an effective staff appraisal system should possess:

  Rating scheme for each item (Irrelevant / Not Important / Neutral / Important / Essential)

  1. Identifies staff development needs
  2. Gives senior staff information about staff performance
  3. Gives staff evaluative information on their own performance
  4. Identifies company development goals
  5. Does not threaten staff
  6. Enhances collegiality
  7. Determines staff promotion
  8. Identifies staff for competency proceedings
  9. Holds staff accountable

Employee Productivity

- Please indicate your perception on the following:
1. My productivity, defined as ability to meet or exceed my agreed upon job objectives as satisfactory (Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neutral / Agree / Strongly Agree)

Job satisfaction

- Please indicate your perception on each of the following about your job:

  Rating scheme for each item (Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neutral / Agree / Strongly Agree)

1. I find that my opinions are respected at work
2. Most people on this job are very satisfied with their work.
3. I am satisfied with the recognition I get for the work I do.
4. I am satisfied with my pay compared with that for similar jobs in other firms.
5. I am satisfied with the workplace relationship between my boss and his/her employees.
6. In general, I am satisfied with this job

Demographic Variables

- Your organization can be classified under?
  [ ] Manufacturing   [ ] Services   [ ] Both

- What is the nature of your organization's ownership?
  [ ] Private   [ ] Government   [ ] Joint

- How many employees in your organization?
  [ ] Less than 100   [ ] 100-500   [ ] More than 500

- How many years has your organization has been operating?
  [ ] 5 years or Less   [ ] 6-10 years   [ ] Over 10 years

- What level do you occupy in your organization?
  [ ] Top manager   [ ] Middle manager   [ ] Supervisor   [ ] other

- What is your age?
  [ ] 25 years or less   [ ] 26-35 years   [ ] 36-45 years   [ ] 45 years or over

- What is your nationality?
  [ ] Saudi   [ ] Non-Saudi

- How many years have you been working in your current organization?
  [ ] 5 years or less   [ ] 6-10 years   [ ] Over 10 years
• What is your educational qualification?
  [ ] Less than university
  [ ] College graduate
  [ ] University degree
  [ ] Postgraduate degree