



Title: A Study of Cultural Effects on Leadership Style (Saudi & America)

Course: EMGT 590/690

Term: Summer

Year: 1997

Author(s): K. Al-Kahtani and S. Al-alyan

Report No: P97039

ETM OFFICE USE ONLY

Report No.: See Above

Type: Student Project

Note: This project is in the filing cabinet in the ETM department office.

Abstract: This study was conducted to investigate how Saudi management leadership is different from the American management. The leadership style of Americans has been investigated in a previous study. In order to make a comparison between Saudi managers and American managers, we used the same leadership factors in our study. We use the Pair-Wise Comparison method to analyze the data we had from a sample of 25 Saudi managers. This method gave us the order of leadership factors according to their importance as they are perceived by Saudi managers. There were a significant difference in the ranking between the two groups. T-test was used to find out if there is a difference in perceiving leadership as a whole, and we could not draw a significant difference from this test. Finally, t-test was applied for every single factors of leadership by itself. The results showed a very significant difference (significance level =0.05) in four of the factors which are Empowerment, Direct and Control, Planning, and Character.

**A Study of Cultural Effects on Leadership Style
(Saudi & America)**

K. Al-kahtani, S. Al-alyan

EMP-P9739

A Study of Cultural Effects on Leadership Style (Saudi & America)

EMGT 590

Dr. Milosevic

By

Khalid Al-kahtani

Saleh Al-alyan

Summer 1997

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Introduction and Background.....	2
General Definitions.....	5-11
Methodology.....	11
Data Collection.....	12
Analysis.....	13
Pair-Wise comparison.....	13
T-Value Test.....	15
Discussion and Conclusion.....	18
Limitation.....	24
Bibliography.....	25
Appendixes.....	26
Appendix A	
Appendix B	
Appendix C	
Appendix D	
Appendix E.	

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate how Saudi management leadership is different from the American management. The leadership style of Americans has been investigated in a previous study. In order to make a comparison between Saudi managers and American managers, we used the same leadership factors in our study. We use the Pair-Wise Comparison method to analyze the data we had from a sample of 25 Saudi managers. This method gave us the order of leadership factors according to their importance as they are perceived by Saudi managers. There were a significant difference in the ranking between the two groups. T-test was used to find out if there is a difference in perceiving leadership as a whole, and we could not draw a significant difference from this test. Finally, t-test was applied for every single factors of leadership by itself. The results showed a very significant difference (significance level =0.05) in four of the factors which are Empowerment, Direct and Control, Planning, and Character.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The styles of management are different from one country to the other. There are some certain factors that need to be considered in any style of management regardless of the culture or the country. Leadership is one of the most important issues that is worth studying and analyzing to achieve organizational effectiveness [22]. In any organization, you need somebody to make the entire engine run, to support the complete structure, to direct and control, and to actually accomplish the objective in the end [4]. Moreover you need to understand the influence of the society and the culture on the people you are directing and motivating.

Saudi Arabia is one of the Arabian Gulf countries that have been experiencing a very rapid economical growth for more than two decades as a result of higher oil revenues since 1973[3]. In the beginning of this economical growth, most organizations have access to financial and technical resources but face a shortage in the availability of Saudi managers [3]. As a result, a significant proportion of managers in Saudi Arabia organizations were drawn from various other countries especially Europe and the USA. That helped Saudi Arabia to build the infrastructure but it was not giving the best results that we hoped for. The American managers understand what was important for a leader according to their American perspective that is very influenced by the American culture. The same thing could be said about the other Non-Saudi managers. Therefore, there was a big challenge that those managers are facing when they were trying to accomplish their objectives by working with employees who have a mix of social and cultural background. As of today a lot of Saudi managers have been taking over places in Saudi industrial firms as well as non-Saudi managers.

What would be considered the most important factor of leadership by a Saudi manager

might not be the same by an American manager. There have been studies that investigated the leadership factors in America and how American managers perceive those factors. Our study's objective is to determine what could be perceived as the most important factors of leadership by Saudi managers, how different Saudi managers perceive each one of those factors, and how the culture has influenced to create those differences.

It is a good opportunity to make such a comparison between American managers and Saudi Arabian managers because there are a lot of fundamental differences between the two cultures. Most intercultural scholars tend to view the Arabs and Americans as cultural opposites [23].

To study the effect of some culture on its people, it is important to understand what differentiate this culture from another [23]. American culture contains certain qualities that we don't see in the Arabian culture [23]. Some of the unique American qualities are;

- - Americans are very informal. They treat everybody the same regardless of the age, their social position.
- - Americans are direct. They are more honest than a lot of other people specially when it comes to telling you what they believe or think. It might sound kind of impolite to some people but this is not the way for somebody who was born and raised in the American culture.
- - Americans are competitive. They are self-focused and goal oriented.
- - Americans are achievers. They emphasize accomplishments and keeping scores.
- - Americans are independent. It is the society of individualism and freedom.
- - Americans are questioners. They like to ask a lot of questions. They believe in freedom of speech and therefore asking questions which helps in improving a person's ability of

analyzing and creativity.

The Arabian culture on the other hand has its unique qualities that have their big effect on the Arabian Managers:

- - Arabs are traditional. They are very effected by the Islamic rules that influence every single matter of their life.
- - Arabs are family-oriented. They put a lot of emphases on the unity of a family and care about each member of the family.
- - Arabs value friendship. They share all aspects of their live with friends.
- - Arabs consider consultation as a wise thing to do especially with elders .
- - Arabs are not very pareicipative in making a decision. Important decision can made only by high level authorities.
- - Arabs rely on their intuition and instincts more than data and procedures and therefore they are conservative and risk avoiders
- - Arabian society and organization are more male-dominated than most of other societies.

We will be able to make a comparison between American managers and Saudi managers as they both perceive the leadership in organizations. The study will be helpful to find out if there is an influence of different cultures and different backgrounds on the leadership style. It well be also, helpful for non-Saudi managers who are willing to work In Saudi Arabia to recognize the different perception of leadership, and adopt the effective style that could achieve better results [22].

General Definition of Leadership

Depending on the leader, the situation in which he leads or the perspective of the observer, a number of descriptions of leadership arise. A leader is a person who is able to lead the group towards its goal. Such a definition requires identification of the group's goals and excludes a person who leads the group toward his own goals or towards goals that differ from the intent of the whole group. Negative leaders are not included in this definition.

Leaders such as Hitler or Stalin turn the goals of the group toward their own personal agendas but they were still leaders because they influenced or even controlled the behavior of many. A person who has influence on the group's mentality and changes it, is also a leader even if that change is negative. This definition allows for more than one leader in a group as each individual can influence the groups behavior to some extent. The group leader may be recognized as the person who exerts the greatest influence on the groups behavior, performance and goals [24]

Empowerment:-

Simons describes empowerment as "The ability to feel capable and motivated in pursuing a goal". It is having the self-assurance needed to carry out and fulfill any endeavor.

Empowerment can be self-initiated, or the result of attention and support of others [20].

Thus, in industrial work culture, individuals take responsibility for their own career development while leaders create a work environment that encourages others to achieve their human potential.

With a multi-cultural workforce and clientele, leadership provides vision, motivation, and reason

for commitment. The manager or the leader must build multi disciplinary team into cohesive work groups and to successfully deal with a variety of interfaces such as a functional department, staff groups, team members, clients, and senior management. This is a work environment in which managerial power is shared by many individuals. Effective managers empower their organizations because they believe in the potential of people and their ability to add value to a process or product.

Communication:-

Communication is a process of circular interaction, which involves a sender, receiver, and message. In human interaction, the sender or receiver may be a person or group of people. The message may be relayed verbally, or nonverbally-words through pictures, graphs, statistics, signs, or gestures. Both sender and receiver occupy a unique field of experience, different for each person. Essentially, persons selectively perceive all new data, determine that which is relevant to, and consistent with their own perceptual needs. The effective communicator builds a bridge to the receiving world. When the sender is from one cultural group and the receiver from another, the human interaction is inter-cultural communication. Studies of what managers do each day indicate that 75% of their time is spent writing, talking and listening which is communicating. In fact all business ultimately comes down to transactions or interactions between individuals. The success of the transaction depends almost entirely on how well managers understand each other [20].

Motivation:-

Motivation deals with the question, 'what encourages people to do their best work [6]. A leader is someone who leads people. While this statement is obvious and oversimplified, it is basically true. People are led by ideas and actions. Usually there is some system of rewards and punishments that serves to motivate people or de-motivate them. The leaders and managers should recognize that motivation is one key to management functions. In fact, engineering performance is based on individual accountability, commitment, and self-actuating behavior. It is also based on the unification of various individual efforts into an integrated team effort, consistent with the overall goals of the department. All these factors point toward a more open and adaptable management style, which is often described as a 'team-centered' style. Such a management style is based on the thorough understanding of the motivational forces of people and an understanding of their interaction with the organizational environment[12].

Direction and controlling:-

Directing and controlling are two of the four basic management functions described by Henri Fayol. Directing is the management function that is concerned with giving guidance or instruction to those people with whom one shares the running of the organization. Controlling is addresses the question 'who judges results and by what standards directing is like the management function of motivating [6]. Motivating might be thought of as a humanistic approach to giving direction. Both directing and controlling are involved in the day-to-day activities associated with influencing, guiding, and supervising in accomplishing the engineering

objectives established through planning. The directing function is carried out by an engineering manager who is authorized by organizational policies to make a decision. Controlling is the activities of an engineering organization requires that objectives, goals, policies, procedures, feedback, information and performance standards to be in existence.

Team Building :-

The dictionary defines a team as a number of persons associated in some joint action. William Dyer notes that 'teams are collections of people who must rely upon group collaboration if each member is to experience the optimum of success and goal achievement. However, the global leaders facilitate the transcendence from past to futuristic operations by promoting team management approaches [20] The leader should know that technology and markets are changing and the team is the appropriate approach to work out with these changes. The team management is suitable for knowledge problems that require high-quality, creative solutions with rapid processing and high output. When complex problems are less structured, and past experience is unreliable, team management is necessary [21].

Planning :-

Planning is the process of examining the potential of future environments, establishing goals and objectives which accommodate the future, and designing a strategy outlining how goals and objectives will be attained. 'luck is a residue of careful planning' according to Jantsch. This statement explains the whole idea behind planning [6]. The leader should understand that planning deals with the futurity of present decisions but not with the future decisions themselves.

Planning helps us recognize and take the right risks, the acceptable risks. Drucker points out that the decision maker can, in fact, take greater risks through effective planning. By taking the right risks, he can maximize the return on his resources [6]. Planning is a decision making activity. The decisions are always made at present, even though they are based on the information from the past and assumptions about the future. Finally, planning is done to achieve the organizational goals and objectives in a systematic way [13].

Decision-making :-

A decision can be defined as the removal of uncertainty concerning an alternative course of action [6]. Some decisions are strategic, some operational. The leader should concede that his decision may affect people and the organization for a long time, for that, he should be careful when he makes his decision and he should to collect the information that help him/her to make the right decision. It is easy to make a decision when complete information is available about the outcome. But, not all the time the leader or the manager has access to such information ,except on very rare occasion, the leader or the manager is expected to make decisions with or without sufficient information . Every decision represents a risk for him/her and for his/her organization, because once a decision is made, he/she assumes responsibility for its outcome [12].

Influence:-

Use of the influence concept marked a step in the direction of generality and abstraction in defining leadership. Then the definition of leadership as an influence concept will be, “ The activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable

[11]”. The leader may be considered an individual who exercises positive influential acts upon others or who exercises more important influential acts than any other members of the group or organization. The influence concept recognizes the fact that individuals differ in the extent to which their behaviors affect activities of a group-It is important for the managers to distinguish between authority and the ability to influence others. Managers with authority have the power to influence subordinates by giving orders and controlling salaries and promotions. Generally, the most effective managers are able to influence others without ‘commanding ‘them or making issue of their superior-subordinate relationship. In fact, managers who rely solely on their legal authority are often relatively ineffective at influencing people [13].

Character :-

There are many characters traits that the leaders should have to be good leaders. Here we will list some of the most important characteristics that the leader should have, the leader should be; flexible and adaptable, confident, effective communicator and integrator, able to balance solutions with time, cost and human factors, will organized and disciplined , able to identify problems and to make decisions [7],[11].

Employee Relations :-

The relationship between employees and leaders is very important aspect of leadership style. The leader start and end with his people. The leader should try to achieve high performance by building an effective work group. He or she should pay attention to the worker’s needsto help them to achieve their goals. He or she should focus on team development,

participation, individual accountability, and self direction and control. In particular, he or she must be an active listener and active communicator with employees. The leader should to be people oriented. The leader teaches coaches people. Employees like the leader who respect them and respect their ideas. If the leader succeeds to understand his employees, then he or she would gain their loyalty and then the organization will benefit of that [13].

Vision :-

A leader is suppose to have the ability to discover and articulate the common vision that will propel and excite the organization. He should have the ability to create value-related opportunities for people to act in behalf of the vision. The leader should have the ability to empower people to make organizational members feel stronger and in control of their own destinies [11].

METHODOLOGY

Part of this study used the results of a previous study that has been done to measure the priority of leadership factors from the American manager's point view. The other part is measuring the priorities of the same leadership factors as Arabian managers see them, and compare both results. In order for us to have a good quality comparison, we had to use the same method of gathering information that has been used for the previous study. Pair-wise comparison method was used for this purpose, It is a measurement used to have the quantification of subjective values. This is done by the constant -sum method ,using a series of pairwise comparison among the decision elememts (factors of leadership) [6]. First, the $n(n-1)/2$ pairs are

randomized for n elements, then you are asked as a manager to distribute a total of 100 points between the elements with respect to each other. After all the comparison made, the values would be used to see how important each factor for each individual and they will be ranked according to their importance for the whole sample using the PCM software. T-test was applied also to investigate the second and the third hypotheses..

To help in completing this study, we had to do enough literature research to see what has been done regarding the effect of culture on the leadership style. We, also had to search particularly for studies that have been conducted to see how Arabian culture effects the leadership style. The report combines a literature search along with a practical search of culture affect on leadership styles that exist in different countries workplaces.

DATA COLLECTION:

Questionnaires were sent to few friends in Saudi Arabia who were interested in helping us by distributing and gathering the surveys again. There was a copy in Arabic translation with each questioner (appendix B). We made sure to explain to those people who are going to distribute and gather the surveys not to mention that there is going to be a comparison based on these responses. We also made sure to explain what PCM is to make it clear for people who are not familiar with this instrument. surveys were sent to as many managers as possible and then they were gathered again by the same friends who distributed them. They were able to send us about thirty five surveys by fax. We used only twenty five of them after excluding the ones that need to be excluded for the sake of accuracy.

ANALYSIS

PAIR-WISE COMPARISON:

We got thirty different responses from four different organization in Saudi Arabia. We made sure to get our responses from more than one company. One of those companies is considered to be one of the biggest oil companies in the area(The Middle East area). The distribution of the responses was as follows; 8 responses from an oil company, 7 responses from the Saudi Arabian basic industries company, 7 responses from a recycling company, and 6 responses from a constructions company. The work experiences range for the respondents was between one to more than fifteen years, with 2 respondents who had less than two years of experience and more than 6 respondents who had more than fifteen years of experiences

Pair-wise comparison method (PCM) was used to analyze each individual response, since we had eleven different leadership factors, we needed to ask every respondent to make fifty five pair-wise comparisons (appendix A). Pair-wise comparison method enabled us to analyze the data and determine the weight for each factor, moreover, those weights were normalized to a total of 1. From the means of those leadership factor we could find out the relative ranking for those factors were factor #1 has the highest mean and therefore considered to be the most important factor. On the other hand, factor#11 has the lowest mean and considered to be the least important. Planning was the highest weighted factor by the Saudi managers, and employees relationship was the lowest weighted factor among the eleven factors (table#1).

For the American managers, character was considered the most important factor for a leader, and direction was considered the least important factor.

AMERICAN MANAGERS WEIGHTING SAUDI MANAGERS WEIGHTING

Character	0.131	Planning	0.106
Empowerment	0.113	Communication	0.104
Communication	0.098	Direct& Control	0.103
Team building	0.097	Decisiveness	0.100
Vision	0.096	Character	0.091
Decisiveness	0.086	Team building	0.090
Planning	0.084	Influence	0.089
Motivation	0.082	Motivation	0.081
Influence	0.073	Vision	0.080
Employee Relation	0.071	Empowerment	0.079
Direct& Control	0.068	Employee Relation	0.076

TABLE# 1 - AVERAGE WEIGHTS

Consistency of individual responses is an important consideration when the pair-wise comparison method is applied for data analysis. The smaller the inconsistency, the more accurate the information that we can get out of the data. The inconsistency for the whole group of thirty respondents was reasonable except for five respondents who have very noticeable high inconsistencies. There inconsistencies were above (0.100), we excluded those five responses and kept the other twenty five responses who have inconsistencies that are not higher than (0.088) (appendix A).

Comparing the results of leadership factors that were found for American managers with the results that we just found for the Saudi managers, we could see some significant differences

as far as the ranking of the factors importance goes (see the figures).

T-VALUE TESTS:

(A)

The first t-value test was applied to find if there is a difference in percieving leadership as a whole between American managers and Saudi managers. We had to calculate the mean of the twelve leadership factors for each respondent and consider that to be an average of how this person perceive leadership. Then we calculate the t-value for two samples of Saudi and American managers (appendix C). The null and the alternative hypothesis were:

Ho: Leadership is perceived differently by Saudi and American.

Ha: Leadership is perceived differently by Saudi and American managers.

The result of this test showed that we can not reject the null hypothesis (table#2)

VARIABLES	T-VALUE	SIGN. LEVEL	CONCLUSION
S leadership & A leadership	0.77	.452	no significant difference

TABLE# 2

(Significant level=0.05)

(B)

Applying the (PCM) enabled us to find out the order of leadership factors and which factor is more important than the other. We just found out that the order is different between the two groups, and we can see clearly “motivation” the factor that has the same ranking in the in both groups, we also can see that some other factors are very close order when we compare the

two groups, for example, communication is the third important factor for Saudi managers and it is the second important for the American managers, moreover, employee relationship is the least important for the Saudis and it is the second least important for the Americans. The similarities or close to similarities in both groups does not necessarily mean that those factors are perceived the same by both Saudis and Americans. On the other hand our first t-test did not show us a significant difference between Saudi leadership and American leadership as a whole. At this point and to be sure of our results, we evaluated the differences in perceiving each single leadership factor by both groups, the t-test was applied to the mean results of both samples (appendix D) The null and the alternative hypothesis were:

Ho: The two factors are not different.

Ha: The two factors are different.

The test interval of confidence was 95% for all of the t-values. The critical t-value was (+2.064) and (- 2.064) which means that the t-value of a factor has to be greater than (+2.064) or less than (- 2.064), in order to reject the null hypothesis and say that there is a significant difference in perceiving this factor from both Saudi managers and American managers. The null hypotheses was rejected for four different factors, which are empowerment, that has a significant difference at (00%), direct and control is the second factor and it has a significant difference at (.1%), the third factor is decisiveness that has a significant difference at (1%), and the fourth factor is communication with a significant difference at (4%). The rest of the factors the we used for this study did not show t-values that fall in the rejection area of the null hypotheses (table#3)

....

LEADERSHIP FACTORS	T-VALUES	SIGN. LVL.*	CONCL**.
Empowerment	-4.42	0.000	S.D
Direct&Control	+3.84	0.001	S.D
Planning	+2.80	0.010	S.D
Character	-2.09	0.048	S.D
vision	-1.70	0.102	N.S.D
Decisiveness	+1.64	0.114	N.S.D
Influence	+1.40	0.174	N.S.D
Communication	+0.82	0.422	N.S.D
Employee Relations	+0.50	0.622	N.S.D
Team building	-0.42	0.677	N.S.D
Motivation	+0.36	0.721	N.S.D

TABLE#3

(Significant level=0.05)

* Significant Level

** Conclusion

S.D= there is a significant difference

N.S.D=there is no significant difference

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The first hypothesis of this study was designed to investigate if there is a difference between how Saudi and American managers rank the importance of leadership factors. We were able to see a significant difference in the ranking for most of the factors, meanwhile, there was not a significant difference in a few other factors. Saudi managers consider planning to be the most important factor for a leader and that there is an influence by the Saudi culture and society. Interestingly, communication was the second important factor while it is the third important factor for American. Saudis seem not to care much about empowerment. It was the second least important in their ranking, and it was the most important factor for Americans. Our goal of this study was not only to find the difference in the importance ranking. Since we have eleven different factors, it was not an easy task to draw a final conclusion from the ranking results. We wanted to go further and investigate each single factor and find out how and why it is perceived differently. Before investigating that, we wanted to see if our samples will enable us to show a proof that there is a difference between Saudi and American managers in perceiving leadership as a whole. We could not prove that there is a difference. If the sample that we used for this study was bigger, then we might have a different conclusion for this specific hypothesis.

For the last hypothesis of this study, we find a remarkable difference in four different areas. **Empowerment** has the biggest difference in the way each group perceives it, Saudis do not think of this managerial concepts as one of the most important ones. In a society where there is only one person who could make a decision of hiring, firing, and promotion, it would be difficult for a manager to give an authority for one of his employees and ended up responsible for a

possible mistake that this employee could make. A Saudi manager would prefer to keep all his authority and responsibility to avoid the risk of being in confrontation with the one decision maker “his boss”. In At -twaijri and Al Muhaiza study of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions in the GCC* countries, they found out that Saudi Arabia as one of the GCC countries is a strong uncertainty avoidance country. Saudi Arabia as well as the rest of the GCC countries has higher Uncertainty avoidance index (UAI) of 91 comparing to the Hofstede’s UAI of 68 for the Arab group[17]. At-twaijry states” GCC managers are characterized by certain features that lead to the conclusion of classifying them as risk avatars”. Middle eastern managers as reported by Badaway(1980), and Saudi Arabian managers , as reported by At-Twajiry(1989), made their decisions at the highest level of management [17]. Another reason for not considering Empowerment as important as Americans do is the lack of qualified people who understand the new managerial concepts. If we ask the question “why is there a lack of qualified people who understand new managerial concept?”. The answer will have to include the process of hiring and the affect of culture on this process. The process of hiring and filling the position does not consider the qualification of a person who is looking for a job as much as who he knows and how close he relates to some important people in the organization, this was also found by Badawy in his research where he states “ manpower policies in the middle east heavily relay on personal contacts and getting individuals from the “ right social origin” to fill major positions”[19].

GCC= Gulf Cooperation Council Countries [Saudi Arabia , Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, and U.A.E.]

Direct and control is the second area that has a significant difference in the way it is perceived by Saudis, They believe that it is one of the important factors for a successful leader, even Americans thinks that it is the least important area, this supports the findings in this field

where middle eastern including Saudi Arabian found to be authoritarian societies [19] [3][17]. A review of a literature by Barret and Bass(1976) demonstrates that traditional cultures tend to favor direct and authoritarian styles of management, Yucelt(1986) suggests that highly industrialized nations tend more toward participative management and less toward autocratic, while in less -industrialized nations the opposite tends to hold true. Saudi Arabian society is a traditional society that has a bigger influence of the tribal and family system more than most of the other Arab countries. In either a family or a tribe there is always a hierarchical patterns that is not supposed to be challenged. Moreover, Saudi Arabia is one of the countries that are ruled by families. This kind of political system always emphasized the concept of the hierarchy and encourages the presence of the tribal system in order to keep harmony between the little groups of tribes and the one big tribe which is the whole society. This social structure has its strong effect on the Saudi managers who believe in a strong “direct and control”. Our findings supported by Hofstede’s study where it categorize Arab countries as large power distance countries, power distance measures the extent to which a society accepts the unequal distribution in institutions and organizations [10]. The PDI range goes from zero to 100 and a PDI that is more than 50 represent a large power distance, in At-twaijry study of the PDI in the GCC area, Saudi Arabia had the highest PDI score of 61 [17].

Planning is the third area that found to be perceived differently by Saudi and American managers. From the order table of the leadership factors (table#1), we can see how planning is the most important factor for Saudi managers. The tendency of Saudi Arabians to avoid a risk is a big drive for considering planning as a number one important factor for successful leadership.

The country has been practicing a very fast economical change and growth in a very short period of time. The rapid growth in Saudi Arabia is providing a lot of business opportunities, if you are not ready for those opportunities, and if you are not having a good planning to take the advantage of those opportunities then you lose the chance. Moreover. The major resource of revenue in Saudi Arabia is the oil [17]. The oil prices have been fluctuating according to the oil demand for the oil, and according to the political stability in the area. The Middle East is one of the least stable region in the world. Combining the fast growth and the oil prices fluctuating with the fact that Saudis are risk avoiders, we can understand why they strive for planning as the most important leadership factor.

Character is the last area that has a significant difference when it is perceived by Saudis and American managers. This factor was considered to be the most important for a successful American manager. For the Saudis character was not considered to be as important for the manager as American would think, although, character is not one of the least important factors. It was the fifth most important for Saudis (table#1). They believe that other factors are more important such as; planning, communication, direct and control, and decisiveness. To be trustworthy, honest , and enthusiastic is what we meant by character in this study. To be a Muslim means to have all those qualities whether you are a manager or not. If you live in a country where Islam is the religion of 100% of the population, then you would assume that everybody has the Islamic qualities. This of course does not mean that you forget about the importance of this factor, but when you are not suffering the lack of having certain factor, then you would underestimate its value. It is true that Saudi Arabians at the current time are not as strong Muslims are the people who were in the same place in the old days of Islam. Eventually the influence of the Islamic religion could be seen very clearly in every activities in the country. The culture is

changing like the other culture, but the change is much slower than most of other Islamic countries. This confirms what Hofstede(1987) called “ the law of conservation” old values do not disappear overnight , and often survive on new settings [9]

For the rest of the eleven leadership factors, we could not show a significant difference in the way each one of them is perceived by Saudis and American. In spite of the big cultural difference between the two nations, and in spite of the some literatures that mention that Arabian and western cultures are totally opposite, the significant difference were found only in four areas out of the eleven. This could be explained by the fact that there were a lot of Saudi managers who studied in American universities, and therefore, they were influenced by the behavior of American managers, although they still have the Arabian cultural influence in their leadership style. More than a fourth of the Saudi respondents were from ARAMCO which is the first Saudi oil company that was established by American companies, and the influence of the first American managers in this company could been seen very clearly on the ARAMCO's Saudi managers. ARAMCO spends big portion in training its employees and most of the managers would be sent to American institutes only for training. This confirms Al -jafary studies where he reported that the Saudi Arabian manager is influenced by both modern management practices and the norms of traditional society.

LIMITATION

To have a clear and complete picture of how this study was conducted, we think that it is important to explain some of the limitations that might have some kind of effect on the accuracy of this study.

- Location; Since we are here in U.S.A. and the questionnaires had to be send to Saudi Arabia, it was harder for us to have the chance and meet some of the respondents and get more feedback to help us in the discussion and conclusion.
- Lack of studies; There were few studies that have been conducted about the same topic.
- Familiarity of (PCM); pair-wise comparison method is not a method that is very well known, so we were not sure that all of the respondents have a complete understanding of this method.
- Backward translation; We translated the survey in arabic before distributing it but we did not do the backward translation by asking somebody who speaks Arabic to translate it back to English. This process is important to make sure that our translation is accurate.
- Time; Time was a big constraint in conducting this study. We had not more than eight weeks to finish the whole study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] A. Ali and M. Al-shakis. "Managerial Value Systems for Working in Saudi Arabia".
Group & organizations Studies, Vol. 10 No.2, June 1985 135-151
- [2] A. A. Al-Gattan. "Test of the path-goal Theory of leadership In Multinational Domain",
Group & Organization Studies, Vol. 10 No. 4. December 1985, pp429-445.
- [3] A. A. Al-jafary. "leadership styles, Machiavellianism, and needs of Saudi Arabian
Managers ". *Business Ethics: concepts and Cases*, 1982.
- [4] A. E. Focke. "Engineering Leadership", Ohio, American Society of Metals, 1983.
- [5] B. J. Bailey, "Pair-wise Comparison Software", Version 1.4, June 4, 1991
- [6] D. I. Cleland and D . F. Kocaoglu, " Engineering Management." New York, NY:
McGraw-Hill, 1981
- [7] D. Glass, 20 Trails that add up a good leader, " Notions Restaurant News", vol 3pp33.
- [8] G. Bohrnst and D. Knoke. " Statistics for Social Data Analysis", Itasca, Illinois, F. E.
Peacock publishers, Inc., 1994
- [9] G. Hfstede. "Cultures and Organizations software of the mind". England, McGraw-Hall,
1991.
- [10] G. Hofstede. " culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related
Values, Beverly Hills, California, 1980.
- [11] G. Yukl. "Leadership in Organizations", New jersey, Prentice Hall, 1989
- [12] H. J. Thamhain " Engineering Management; Managing Effectively in Technology based
Organization" 1992.
- [13] J. M. Nicholas " Managing business & engineering projects : concept and

implementation” 1990.

- [14] J. Yukino. “Intercultural Communication”, New York, Harper& Row, 1973.
- [15] L. Haskins and K. Jeffery. “Understanding Quantitative History”, London, MIT, 1990.
- [16] M. At-Twajjry. “ Cross-Cultural Comparison of American-Saudi managerial values in US”, *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 1989. Pp58-73.
- [17] M. At-Twajjry. “Hofstede’s cultural Dimensions in The GCC countries”, *International journal of values -Based management*, 1996, pp 121-131.
- [18] M. At-Twajjry. “ The negotiating Style of Saudi Industrial Buyers”, *Int. J. Value-Based management*, Vol. 5. No. 1. 1992.
- [19] M. K. Badawy. “ Styles Of Mideastern Managers”, *California management Review*, Spring 1980, pp51-58.
- [20] P. R. Harris and Robert T. Moran. “ Managing Cultural Differences” *Leadership Strategies for a New World of Business*, fourth edition 1996.
- [21] P. R. Scholtes. “ The Team Handbook”. 24th printing, April 1995.
- [22] R. Cox. “ Leadership Qualities of Engineering Project management”, *EMP-PSU*, May 1995.
- [23] R. S. Zaharna. “Understanding Cultural Preferences of Arab Communication Patterns”, *Public Relations Review*, fall 1995..
- [24] S. Maruim . “ Group dynamics; the Psychology of Small Group Behavior”. 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill 1981.
- [25] W. Mclean and W. Weitzel. “Leadership, Magic, Myth, Method”, New York, American Management association, 1991.