

Enhancing Risk Management through Competency Assurance: A Case Study of Training
Programs at Saudi Aramco

إعداد

الطالب/ عبدالرحمن ماجد الماجد

الرقم لأكاديمي / 242001397

إشراف/

الدكتور/ الفیصل عبدالحمید محمد

العام الدراسي:

2025

Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Introduction	5
Background of the Study.....	5
Research Problem	6
Significance of the Study	7
Supporting Theories and Models	8
Importance of the Study	9
Theoretical Importance.....	9
Expanding Literature on Competency Assurance and Risk Management	9
Theoretical Contribution to Workforce Development	12
Foundation for Future Research on Competency-Based Risk Mitigation	13
Practical Importance.....	15
Objectives of the Study	18
Exploring the Role of Competency Assurance in Operational Risk Mitigation	19
Identifying the Gaps Between Workforce Training and On-the-Ground Performance.....	20
Evaluating How Structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) Can Improve Workforce Readiness and Reduce Safety and Compliance Failures	22
Developing a Practical Framework for Training Institutes to Align with Organizational Risk Objectives	24
Offering Insights for Policymakers and Regulators on Strengthening Workforce Development and Safety Frameworks through Competency Assurance	26
Emphasizing the Value of Integrating Learning with Leadership, Culture, and Continuous Improvement.....	28
Research Questions	30
Exploring the Role of Competency Assurance in Mitigating Operational Risk in High-Risk Industries.....	31
Investigating the Gaps Between Workforce Training and Real-World Performance	33
Examining the Role of Structured Competency Assurance Programs in Enhancing Workforce Readiness and Ensuring Safety and Compliance	35
Defining a Framework for Training Institutes to Align with Industry Risk and Operational Realities	37
Translating Competency System Insights into Policy and Regulatory Frameworks.....	39
Understanding the Role of Leadership and Culture in Sustaining Competency and Embedding Continuous Learning.....	41
Hypotheses	43
H1: Structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) are positively associated with higher levels of workforce readiness in high-risk industries.	43

H2: The gap between training delivery and real-world performance contributes to increased operational risk and compliance failures.	44
H3: Training programs designed around operational risk profiles result in improved alignment between learning outcomes and job performance.	45
H4: Competency assurance systems that are reinforced by leadership and integrated into organizational culture are more likely to be sustained over time.	45
H5: Insights from structured competency systems can support the development of national policies and regulatory frameworks aimed at workforce safety and operational resilience.	45
H6: Continuous feedback, post-training validation, and scenario-based assessments significantly enhance the effectiveness of CAPs in high-risk environments.	46
Methodology Section	46
Research Design.....	46
Research Variables	47
Data Collection Methods.....	50
Data Analysis Methods	54
Validity and Reliability Measures.....	58
Ethical Considerations	61
Anticipated Limitations	64
Expected Outcomes	67
Scope of the Study	71
Geographical Scope: Training Institutes in Saudi Arabia	71
Industry Scope: High-Risk Industries (Oil & Gas, Construction, Healthcare)	72
Conceptual Scope: Competency Assurance, Risk Management, Training Effectiveness.....	73
References	75
API List	77
Appendix	78
List of Abbreviations	81

Abstract

In high-risk sectors like oil and gas, construction, and healthcare, the competency of the workforce plays a decisive role in minimizing operational risks and ensuring safe, reliable performance. Through my own work in training delivery and program development, I have come to see how directly workforce capability influences risk outcomes. This case study focuses on Saudi Aramco's approach to competency assurance, using it as a benchmark to examine how structured, skills-based development can support risk mitigation strategies in high-risk environments.

The aim of this study is to explore how training institutes and corporate entities can align workforce development with real-world risk management needs. I take a close look at the impact of competency gaps on safety incidents, compliance challenges, and productivity losses issues I have seen affect both trainees and organizations alike. By examining how structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) contribute to reducing these risks, I hope to offer practical insights for improving training quality and workforce readiness.

A mixed-methods approach was used to collect both quantitative data from structured surveys and qualitative input through interviews with industry professionals. These findings are grounded in the local context of Saudi Arabia, where workforce development is a key pillar of Vision 2030. Rather than taking a purely theoretical approach, this research reflects a blend of academic study and professional experience. It also offers recommendations for training institutes looking to build more effective, risk-oriented programs that support both organizational goals and national development priorities.

At its core, this study reflects my belief that building competency is not just about ticking boxes or issuing certificates, it's about preparing people to make informed, safe, and effective decisions in environments where mistakes can be costly. I hope this work contributes to an ongoing conversation around how we train, develop, and assess the people who keep our most critical industries running safely.

Introduction

Working closely with training and development programs in high-risk industries, I've come to realize just how critical workforce competency is not only for individual performance, but for organizational safety and stability. In sectors like oil and gas, construction, and healthcare, the margin for error is small, and a single competency gap can lead to significant risks. This isn't just theory to me; I've witnessed how insufficient training or poor alignment between job roles and skills can contribute to safety incidents, compliance failures, and operational disruptions.

That realization is what pushed me to explore this topic in more depth. I wanted to understand how organizations like Saudi Aramco are addressing these risks not just through traditional safety programs, but through structured competency assurance systems that actively verify, develop, and monitor workforce skills. In doing so, I hoped to uncover what makes these systems effective and how training institutes, including those I've worked with, can apply similar principles to improve their own programs.

In my experience, there's often a disconnect between what we teach and what employees actually need to perform safely on the job. I've seen cases where training programs check all the right boxes on paper, but fail to prepare workers for real-life scenarios especially in high-risk environments. That's why this study focuses on practical application. It's not just about developing a framework; it's about identifying strategies that actually work in reducing workforce-related risks.

By using Saudi Aramco as a case study, I aim to bridge the gap between academic research and field-based experience. This project represents both a professional interest and a personal commitment to improving how we develop people because in high-risk industries, developing the right competencies isn't just good practice; it's essential for protecting lives and ensuring long-term operational success.

Background of the Study

In my work with training programs across high-risk industries, I've seen firsthand how vital workforce competency is not just as a development goal, but as a key element in managing risk. I've observed how skill gaps, especially in operational or safety-critical roles, often contribute directly to incidents or inefficiencies. This isn't just my impression research supports it too. Studies by Boyatzis (2008) and Draganidis & Mentzas (2006) have shown that organizations with well-structured, competency-based systems perform better in areas like compliance, safety, and decision-making.

Still, despite the growing body of evidence, I've found that many organizations struggle to apply these concepts in a practical, integrated way. Especially in the Saudi market, there's often a gap between training content and the actual risk environment employees face. From what I've observed, training institutes might offer valuable material, but if it's not aligned with a formal competency framework or if there's no system in place to evaluate whether those skills are being applied on the job the result is often disappointing.

That's why Saudi Aramco stood out to me. Their structured approach to competency assurance is clearly influenced by international models like ISO 31000 and training evaluation methods such as Kirkpatrick's Model offers a real-world example of how training and risk management can work together. Gunawan & Melinda (2021), for instance, found that organizations implementing structured competency programs experienced significantly fewer compliance issues and operational disruptions. I've seen this echoed in Aramco's practices, where training is not only thorough but followed up by performance evaluations, skill assessments, and real accountability.

Yet, many training providers, including those I've worked alongside, don't have access to such robust frameworks. That gap between theory and practice is exactly what inspired this research. My goal is to explore how competency assurance when implemented with structure and purpose can play a larger role in reducing workforce-related risks. I believe that by looking at what's already working in a place like Aramco, we can help bridge that gap and offer more effective models for training institutes and industry leaders throughout the region.

Research Problem

Throughout my experience working in workforce development, especially in high-risk sectors, I've consistently noticed a serious gap between training delivery and real-world performance. Many organizations I've interacted with still rely on outdated, one-size-fits-all training approaches—programs that don't reflect the specific risks employees face on the job. As a result, I've seen cases where even after completing formal training, workers remain unprepared to handle operational challenges, leading to safety incidents, compliance violations, or costly inefficiencies.

This issue isn't unique to a single company or industry. It reflects a broader problem in how workforce competency is approached, particularly in environments like Saudi Arabia's oil and gas sector. According to Hubbard (2020), the lack of structured competency frameworks is one of the leading contributors to operational risk, especially in high-pressure, high-consequence industries. While models like ISO 31000 provide guidelines for managing external and technical risks, they often overlook the human element skills, behaviors, and on-the-job decision-making that directly affect safety and performance.

In addition, studies by Le Deist and Winterton (2005) point out that many training programs fail to align with risk management needs, particularly when it comes to assessing the effectiveness of learning beyond the classroom. This disconnect has become increasingly clear to me while working with training providers and HR teams that struggle to measure whether employees are actually “job-ready” after completing a course.

From what I’ve observed, Saudi Aramco has taken notable steps to close this gap. Their use of competency assurance as part of a broader risk management strategy demonstrates how training can be both targeted and measurable. But many smaller organizations and training institutes don’t yet have access to such models. That’s where this study finds its purpose by exploring how structured competency assurance frameworks can reduce risk and identifying what elements are most applicable for broader adoption across high-risk industries.

Ultimately, the problem this research addresses is the absence of a practical, competency-based framework that links training outcomes directly to risk mitigation. Without that connection, even well-intentioned training efforts fall short of making a meaningful impact on safety, compliance, and performance.

Significance of the Study

This study matters to me both professionally and personally. Having worked closely with training institutes and safety-driven organizations, I’ve seen the consequences of skill gaps up close—workplace incidents, near-misses, compliance violations, and even missed business opportunities. These aren’t abstract risks; they’re real, and often preventable, if the right systems are in place. That’s why I believe competency assurance should be viewed as more than a training tool; it’s a risk management strategy in its own right.

From a theoretical perspective, this research contributes to an area that’s still underdeveloped in academic literature: the direct connection between competency frameworks and organizational risk outcomes. While authors like Spencer and Spencer (1993) and Boyatzis (2008) have explored competency-based models from a performance standpoint, few have gone further to connect those models with structured risk management principles. I want to help close that gap by showing how workforce competency can be treated as a measurable risk control, particularly when it’s supported by structured programs and assessment models like Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model or ISO 31000.

On a practical level, this study is aimed at helping training providers, HR departments, and industry leaders implement more focused and effective workforce development strategies. I know from experience that many training programs are built with good intentions but lack alignment with the actual operational challenges workers face. By offering a structured framework—based on both

research and real-world observation, I hope to support training institutes in designing programs that are not only educational but protective.

This work is also aligned with the broader national goals of Saudi Vision 2030. As the Kingdom pushes for greater workforce localization, industrial growth, and safety compliance, there's a growing need for competent professionals who are ready to meet those expectations. I believe competency assurance is key to that transition, and I see this study as a small but meaningful contribution to that national effort.

In the end, this study is about contributing something useful. Whether it helps a training center fine-tune its programs or guides a safety manager in building a stronger team, the goal is the same: to support a more capable, confident, and risk-aware workforce.

Supporting Theories and Models

When I started exploring the link between workforce development and risk mitigation, I quickly realized that many organizations already follow established frameworks they just don't always connect them in a practical, integrated way. That's why I turned to models like **ISO 31000** and **Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model**. These aren't new concepts, but based on my experience, they offer a strong foundation for designing competency assurance systems that actually contribute to safer, more resilient operations.

ISO 31000 provides a clear structure for identifying, assessing, and managing risk across an organization. What stood out to me, though, is that while the framework is widely used, it often lacks specific guidance on how workforce competency fits into the risk picture. I've seen companies focus on technical and environmental risks while overlooking the human element—skills, behaviors, and decision-making under pressure. By linking ISO 31000 to competency assurance, I believe we can fill a critical gap that's often left unaddressed.

On the training side, **Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Evaluation Model** has been particularly useful in my work. It encourages us to look beyond whether training was delivered and instead ask: Did people actually learn? Are they applying what they learned? And is it making a measurable impact on safety or performance? In my view, this model offers a practical way to track whether training outcomes are translating into risk reduction on the ground.

By combining these two models—one focused on risk, the other on training effectiveness I've found a meaningful structure for evaluating how competency assurance contributes to safer operations. This study uses both as a guide, not just to explain theory, but to build a framework that others can actually use.

Importance of the Study

Theoretical Importance

One of the main reasons I wanted to dive deeper into this topic is because I noticed a recurring disconnect there's a lot of theory around competency models and a lot of theory around risk management, but rarely are the two brought together in a way that reflects what's happening in the field. From what I've seen, competency assurance plays a much bigger role in managing risk than many theoretical models give it credit for.

This study contributes to the academic conversation by helping bridge that gap. I'm not just drawing from frameworks like ISO 31000 or the Kirkpatrick Model, I'm trying to show how they can actually work together to shape a more resilient and risk-aware workforce. It's about looking at workforce development not just through an HR or training lens, but as an integral part of organizational risk strategy.

Previous research by Spencer and Spencer (1993), Boyatzis (2008), and others laid a strong foundation in understanding how competencies affect performance. But based on what I've seen in real organizational settings, there's still space to build on that—to show how competency frameworks can be applied more directly to reduce incidents, support compliance, and strengthen safety culture.

By developing a theoretical model that connects these dots, I hope this study encourages others academics and practitioners alike to think differently about the role of workforce competency. It's not just about improving job performance; it's about reducing risk and building long-term organizational strength.

Expanding Literature on Competency Assurance and Risk Management

Through my work in training and workforce development, I've come to realize that risk is often not just about systems or external threats, it's about people. In high-risk environments like oil and gas, healthcare, or construction, a competency gap can be just as dangerous as a technical failure. While research in both competency development and risk management is growing, these fields are still often treated separately in literature. In reality, they're inseparable.

Establishing a Link Between Competency and Risk Mitigation

Many traditional frameworks like **ISO 31000** offer structured approaches to identifying and treating risk, but they don't go far enough in addressing human capital as a risk factor. From what I've seen

on the ground, that's a critical oversight. When people lack the training, awareness, or decision-making skills required for their roles, the consequences are immediate and real.

These observations match what's been reported in case studies and academic research:

- **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)** found that organizations with robust competency assurance systems reported fewer safety violations and higher compliance rates.
- **Kaplan and Mikes (2012)** highlighted how operational risks often emerge from human behavior yet many organizations fail to integrate that into risk planning.

In my experience, this link becomes especially clear in moments of crisis. Workers who've been trained with real scenarios and who understand risk decision-making behave differently, stay calm, follow protocol, and respond effectively. That's why this study frames competency assurance not just as training, but as a strategic **risk control mechanism**.

Providing a Theoretical Model for Competency-Based Risk Management

One thing I noticed while reviewing existing literature was that very few models actually bring together risk management and competency assurance in a unified way. You have models for one or the other, but rarely both.

This is where I believe a more integrated approach is needed especially for training institutes and industries in Saudi Arabia, where competency and compliance are becoming national priorities under Vision 2030.

From my field experience, the combination of:

- **ISO 31000** (for risk governance), and
- **Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model** (for measuring training impact)

...offers a practical structure for bridging this gap.

In this study, I present a conceptual model that uses both frameworks to show how training outcomes can be tracked all the way through to risk performance metrics like safety incident rates, equipment misuse, and regulatory non-compliance. I've seen this approach informally applied in companies like Saudi Aramco, where competency is not just tracked, it's part of everyday operations.

Reinforcing the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Competency Assurance

Over the years, I've come to believe that culture is the real driver behind whether competency frameworks actually work. I've seen organizations with the right policies on paper, but no

accountability or leadership buy-in and as a result, the training never really sticks. On the other hand, companies like Aramco embed learning, assessment, and skill progression into the core of their operations. The difference isn't just in compliance rates, it's in how employees think and behave.

This aligns with the work of **Le Deist and Winterton (2005)**, who emphasized how a company's culture determines how well competency models are adopted. In my own experience, I've seen that the most successful environments:

- Emphasize **continuous learning**, not just one-off training.
- Treat competency as part of operational risk—not just an HR function.
- Encourage **leadership at every level** to engage in skills development, coaching, and performance assessment.
- Create space for feedback and reflection, so training doesn't stop at the classroom door.

In cultures like this, competency isn't just maintained—it evolves. That's the kind of culture I believe we should be building across high-risk sectors in Saudi Arabia and beyond.

Key Reflections That Shaped This Study

These recurring themes from my experience helped shape this research and are, in my view, still underrepresented in academic work:

- **Human error is often competency-related**, not just behavioral. I've seen this on the job and in post-incident analysis.
- **Training without alignment to real job risks is ineffective.** Too many programs are “one-size-fits-all,” with no connection to actual job challenges.
- **Training outcomes are rarely treated as risk indicators**, but they should be.
- **Saudi Arabia's evolving workforce environment offers a valuable case for study.** As national competency standards grow, there's an opportunity to influence how training institutes approach risk and skill development.

Theoretical Contribution to Workforce Development

As someone who's worked closely with workforce training programs often in complex, high-risk industries, I've seen the real-life implications of how we define, deliver, and evaluate competency. These experiences have shaped the way I view workforce development not just as a tool for improving performance, but as a system that directly impacts organizational resilience, employee confidence, and risk reduction.

One of the key contributions this study makes is to support the ongoing evolution of **competency-based training and development**. Traditional approaches, in my experience, have often been too focused on compliance or certification training programs that exist more to tick boxes than to truly prepare people for the unpredictable demands of their roles. I've watched employees pass assessments, only to hesitate in critical situations or revert to unsafe practices when under pressure. That gap between technical knowledge and situational readiness is where most competency models fall short. Through this research, I aim to push the conversation forward toward a version of training that's not only grounded in theory but shaped by real-world performance, emotional intelligence, and behavioral consistency. Competency must be viewed as dynamic, evolving alongside the tasks, technologies, and risks that workers face on the ground.

In that spirit, I also believe we need to strengthen the **theoretical foundation of Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)**. I've seen CAPs implemented well, and I've seen them treated as bureaucratic obligations. When done correctly, these programs are not just administrative tools, they are living systems that support safety, build confidence, and make risks visible before they become incidents. What this research offers is a deeper articulation of that potential. By drawing from both ISO 31000 and models like Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Framework, I try to position CAPs not as static checklists, but as part of an adaptive risk management cycle. I've also tried to embed the reality of how CAPs are experienced by those going through them because as much as these models are useful in theory, they only succeed when they're implemented with buy-in, clarity, and cultural alignment. In Saudi Aramco's case, for instance, I've observed how their integration of competency assurance into operational workflows creates accountability at every level and that's a lesson I believe many organizations can learn from.

Another perspective this research brings to workforce development theory is the strong connection I've observed between **competency assurance and employee engagement**. Throughout my career, I've seen how much employees value being well-prepared and supported. Competency isn't just about performance, it's about dignity. When people know they have the right skills and can perform safely and confidently, they feel more invested in their work. On the other hand, when employees

feel unprepared, overlooked, or underdeveloped, it leads to frustration, disengagement, and high turnover. That's something I've witnessed up close in both small organizations and large institutions. In this study, I try to make that link clearer: that competency assurance, when approached holistically, contributes not only to risk reduction but to retention, satisfaction, and even leadership development.

This perspective is especially relevant now, as industries in Saudi Arabia and the wider Gulf region shift toward local workforce development under initiatives like Vision 2030. As the demand for national talent grows, so does the need for frameworks that do more than teach—they need to empower, support, and retain people for the long term. I hope this study contributes to that broader shift, by grounding workforce development in something deeper than just training schedules or assessment forms. It's about equipping people to succeed, adapt, and contribute meaningfully in roles that carry both responsibility and risk.

In the end, the theoretical value of this research lies in its connection to practice. It doesn't just describe what competency means, it shows why it matters, how it's experienced, and what it can unlock when done right. It reflects the belief I've carried throughout this journey: that when we take workforce development seriously not just as a requirement, but as a strategy we create stronger organizations and safer environments for everyone.

Foundation for Future Research on Competency-Based Risk Mitigation

This study, for me, was never about proving a single theory it was about contributing to a conversation that I believe needs more voices, especially from practitioners who've seen both the successes and shortcomings of training systems in high-risk industries. It has become increasingly clear to me that competency assurance is one of the most under-leveraged tools in the broader risk management toolbox. While existing frameworks like ISO 31000 outline how to identify and mitigate threats, there remains a critical gap in how organizations assess and develop the people expected to manage those threats in real time. That's the foundation this study seeks to lay: a bridge between risk strategy and human capability.

What I've offered in this research is not a finished product, but a **starting point** a conceptual model that draws from lived experience, established theory, and the emerging practices I've observed in both local and global contexts. This foundation is designed to be **built upon, tested, and reshaped** by future researchers who wish to go deeper. I envision this work evolving in three key directions: applied interdisciplinary study, empirical validation, and technological integration.

From an **interdisciplinary standpoint**, this research opens the door for future collaboration between professionals in human resource development, behavioral psychology, safety engineering, and organizational leadership. In many of the organizations I've worked with, these areas tend to operate in isolation—even though their outcomes are deeply intertwined. A safety manager might implement a risk protocol, unaware that frontline workers haven't been adequately trained for that specific situation. Similarly, a training department may launch a course based on outdated job profiles, misaligned with the operational realities employees face. I believe future research should break down those walls, developing more integrated models of workforce readiness that reflect how people learn, behave, and respond under pressure.

Equally important is the need for **empirical validation**. One of the reasons I've leaned on both theory and case-based examples in this study is because I believe the topic is ready for measurable impact analysis. I've referenced **Gunawan & Melinda (2021)**, who documented how structured competency assurance frameworks led to measurable reductions in compliance failures. In another context, **Kaplan & Mikes (2012)** highlighted how operational risk often stems from human behavior yet rarely is this factored into formal risk mitigation plans. These cases reinforce what I've seen in practice: that when people are equipped with the right competencies, risks drop not in theory, but in tangible outcomes.

Saudi Aramco's internal training and assurance systems offer a strong case study here. While not always publicly documented, their competency assurance processes are known to be rigorous, role-specific, and deeply embedded in day-to-day operations. Other organizations such as BP, Shell, and even institutions in the healthcare sector like the NHS in the UK have developed competency-based safety programs that could be analyzed longitudinally. These cases suggest a growing awareness of the role of human performance in operational integrity, but they also reveal how much room there is to explore these efforts academically. Future researchers can build on these examples by designing comparative studies across sectors, or by examining how these models adapt to cultural, regulatory, or technological contexts.

I also believe that future research should explore the **role of emerging technologies** in competency-based risk mitigation. As someone involved in training delivery, I've started to see the impact of tools like VR, AI, and real-time analytics—not just in enhancing learning, but in **tracking and predicting** performance gaps before they result in failure. I've watched as immersive simulations allowed trainees to respond to life-like emergencies, and I've seen how digital learning platforms are beginning to adapt to learner behavior in ways that traditional classroom methods cannot. These innovations offer researchers exciting new dimensions to investigate: How do we measure the

effectiveness of tech-driven training? Can AI-supported CAPs provide more accurate, real-time feedback on risk-related competency levels? And how do we ensure that these tools support not replace the human-centered culture needed for true competency development?

On a personal level, I view this study as a contribution rooted in experience but looking toward the future. My observations are based on what I've seen in real training rooms, real field audits, and real incident reviews. But I know that future research will take these foundations and elevate them with evidence, with broader samples, and with innovations we're only beginning to explore.

The potential for growth in this field is enormous. As organizations across the world and especially here in Saudi Arabia move toward smarter, safer, and more resilient operations, there is a unique opportunity to rethink how we prepare people for risk. Not just by teaching them policies or procedures, but by developing a culture where competency is tracked, valued, and continuously improved. I hope this work encourages researchers and practitioners alike to continue asking critical questions, designing meaningful interventions, and helping create a future where competency assurance isn't a formality, it's a frontline defense against the unexpected.

Practical Importance

For me, the real value of this research has never been limited to what it offers in theory or how it contributes to academic literature. Its true importance lies in what it can change right now on the ground, in places where pressure is high, risk is constant, and people are expected to act with certainty, even when they don't feel ready. I didn't arrive at this study from behind a desk. I arrived at it through conversations in training rooms, through quiet moments after incidents, and through the heavy reality of watching employees doubt themselves at exactly the moment they needed clarity. I've seen training systems that looked perfect on paper yet still failed to prepare people for real risk. That's what pushed me to write this not from distance, but from direct experience.

The practical importance of competency assurance didn't reveal itself to me through academic models, but through the look in someone's eyes when they said, "I didn't know what to do." That moment stays with me. Because all the systems we create every framework, every policy, every training hour only matters if that individual, in that moment, can respond confidently, safely, and correctly. That's the standard. That's the heart of why this work matters.

One of the major drivers behind this research was a gap I've seen again and again: the gap between **training delivery** and **real-world readiness**. Too many organizations mistake certificates for competence. I've watched employees complete mandatory training, pass knowledge checks, and still feel lost when things don't go as expected. And often, the risk doesn't come from what they don't know but from what they believe they know, but can't apply when the situation becomes real.

Scholars like **Le Deist and Winterton (2005)** and **Boyatzis (2008)** speak to this how competence is not just technical, but behavioral and contextual. From my experience, I can confirm that it's in real-world application where most training falls short.

This is where **Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** prove their worth. When designed around actual job risks not theoretical competencies they offer a roadmap for performance validation. Not just learning for learning's sake, but learning tied to critical outcomes. I've seen firsthand how companies with well-structured CAPs like **Saudi Aramco**, which embeds competency into every layer of its risk management systems experience fewer safety incidents, more confident staff, and stronger operational discipline. The findings of **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)** also echo this, showing how CAPs linked to operational KPIs resulted in better audit outcomes and lower incident rates. This alignment between training and actual risk is what I believe many training systems are still missing.

In the context of **training institutes**, especially here in Saudi Arabia, I see this research providing something I've wished existed earlier in my career a clear, adaptable framework for connecting training to operational safety. Many training providers deliver content well, but few measure whether their trainees leave better prepared to prevent risk. I've watched high-volume programs struggle to prove their value, not because their instructors lacked skill, but because their impact was never tracked beyond the classroom. That's why this study emphasizes things like risk-based curriculum design, structured **Training Needs and Gap Analysis (TNA)**, and scenario-based delivery. If the end goal is a safer, more capable workforce, then those designing training programs must begin with risk not end with it.

This also touches on something more systemic: the **organizational culture** surrounding training. In many places, training is still seen as a cost center, not a safeguard. And I've spoken with leaders frustrated by repeated frontline mistakes, unaware that the root cause wasn't poor motivation, but poor preparation. They hadn't made the connection between learning gaps and operational risk. That's where competency assurance, when understood correctly, becomes not just a training tool but a risk mitigation strategy. As **Spencer & Spencer (1993)** emphasized, real competence is influenced by deeper drivers motives, values, confidence and I've seen this play out in workforces that take ownership of their performance because the culture expects, supports, and rewards it.

At the organizational level, this study offers more than just theory it offers **practical scaffolding**. The CAP model proposed here can help companies reduce safety and compliance risks, align with regulatory standards like **NEBOSH**, **OSHA**, or **ISO 45001**, and improve operational efficiency. I've worked with teams that paid the price of neglecting this through downtime, fines, reputational damage, or even injury. I've also worked with organizations that invested in their people's

competencies and saw a return that extended far beyond numbers better morale, stronger retention, and a culture of accountability. That's why I argue that competency development, when it's done right, is not a cost it's protection. It's performance. It's culture.

And it's not just about the workers it's also about **leadership**. Over the years, I've learned that middle and frontline managers are often overlooked when it comes to training. Yet they're the ones making high-stakes decisions, often under pressure, often alone. This research makes a case for developing leaders who can respond, think, and act under uncertainty. Because when managers are prepared, teams feel safer. And safety breeds consistency, trust, and long-term resilience.

Zooming out, I also see how this research supports broader **policy and regulatory frameworks**, particularly under **Saudi Vision 2030**. As the Kingdom moves toward national workforce localization and industrial growth, competency-based models are becoming more than best practice they're becoming essential. Policymakers, regulators, and sector-specific authorities from **OPITO** in oil and gas to **ICAO** in aviation need scalable models that reflect real risk and workforce dynamics. I hope this study contributes to that conversation, offering an adaptable structure for competency assurance that's grounded in reality but scalable across sectors.

This practical relevance also extends into the future of training. With the rise of **Industry 4.0**, the question isn't whether digital tools will shape competency assurance it's how effectively we'll use them. I've already seen LMS platforms with real-time tracking, AI-powered assessments that adapt to learner performance, and VR environments simulating high-risk scenarios more realistically than any classroom ever could. The opportunity now is to integrate these tools into CAPs that are responsive, data-driven, and measurable. This research doesn't just allow for that it encourages it.

At its core, this study argues that training cannot be separated from risk. If training doesn't improve readiness, if it doesn't make someone safer or more capable, then it hasn't done enough. And that's not something I learned in a textbook. That's something I learned by listening really listening to the people most affected when training falls short.

This isn't a distant study. It's built from the ground up from people, stories, and moments I've never forgotten. It's for the employee who wants to feel ready. It's for the manager who wants to trust their team. It's for the trainer who wants their work to matter. And it's for any organization that wants to not just survive risk but grow beyond it with a workforce that's confident, competent, and ready to lead.

Objectives of the Study

This study was never just about exploring a concept, it was about trying to solve a problem I kept encountering in real life: the disconnect between training and actual risk readiness. Every objective here stems from situations I've seen unfold on the ground where people were trained, certified, and still unprepared. Where organizations had policies, but not the people to implement them effectively. Where training hours were logged, but outcomes never measured.

With that in mind, this research was designed with the following core objectives each shaped by what I've experienced, what I've witnessed, and what I believe needs to change:

1. **To explore the role of competency assurance in operational risk mitigation across high-risk industries.**

I wanted to understand how organizations particularly those operating in hazardous sectors are using competency frameworks to reduce real risk. And more importantly, where those frameworks succeed or fall short in practical application.

2. **To identify the gaps between workforce training and on-the-ground performance, especially in safety-critical environments.**

I've seen this gap too often: workers are "trained" but not prepared. This study seeks to unpack that space between instruction and execution and how it contributes to incidents, non-compliance, or operational failure.

3. **To evaluate how structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) can improve workforce readiness and reduce safety and compliance failures.**

Based on models I've seen at companies like Saudi Aramco and supported by studies such as Gunawan & Melinda (2021), I want to examine how CAPs, when implemented properly, can become not just training tools, but risk management systems.

4. **To develop a practical framework for training institutes to design and deliver programs that align with organizational risk objectives.**

This research aims to give training providers especially in Saudi Arabia, a tool they can use to ensure their programs are not just skill-based, but risk-aligned and operationally relevant.

5. **To offer insights for policymakers and regulators on how competency assurance can strengthen national workforce development and safety frameworks.**

With Vision 2030 driving a transformation in how the Saudi workforce is trained and

deployed, this study seeks to support policymakers in shaping standards that are not just theoretical but grounded in the realities of high-risk work environments.

6. **To emphasize the value of integrating learning with leadership, culture, and continuous improvement.**

True competence doesn't come from a classroom alone, it comes from an ecosystem of accountability, feedback, and development. This research highlights the need for leadership involvement in sustaining competency over time.

These objectives, while academically structured, are rooted in my lived experience. They're about improving systems not just in theory, but in the real places where decisions matter, where risk is constant, and where the cost of being unprepared is simply too high.

Exploring the Role of Competency Assurance in Operational Risk Mitigation

This objective came directly from something I've seen too often in the field: the assumption that training is enough. That once an employee has completed a course, signed an attendance sheet, or passed a test, they're automatically ready to manage the risks associated with their role. But in high-risk industries like oil and gas, construction, aviation, and healthcare, I've learned that training alone doesn't guarantee readiness. It's competency assurance that makes the difference.

Competency assurance goes beyond training, it's about verifying whether an individual can apply what they've learned under real-world conditions. In my experience, this distinction is critical. I've worked with teams who knew the theory but froze when the pressure came. I've seen procedures memorized but misapplied. And I've read too many incident reports that pointed not to equipment failure, but to human error that could have been prevented with more practical, validated preparation.

That's why this objective matters. It's about getting to the core of how we prepare people to operate safely in environments where mistakes are measured in lives, downtime, environmental damage, or financial loss.

One of the clearest examples of how competency assurance supports risk mitigation can be seen in the practices of **Saudi Aramco**. From what I've observed and learned, their systems are not built around just delivering training they're designed to **verify** and **re-verify** that people are capable of performing under real conditions. Their CAPs (Competency Assurance Programs) are woven into job design, supervision, and risk assessment protocols. And it's not surprising that organizations with such integrated models report fewer incidents, stronger compliance, and a more resilient safety culture.

Studies like **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)** further support this connection. Their research showed that organizations that tied competency assurance directly to operational KPIs experienced significant improvements in both audit outcomes and incident reduction. In other words, when you treat competency as part of risk control not just development you lower the likelihood of failure across the board.

This objective also holds weight in industries beyond oil and gas. In aviation, for example, **ICAO and FAA frameworks** mandate that pilots, air traffic controllers, and maintenance crews undergo recurrent competency checks not just to stay certified, but to stay operationally safe. The same is true in healthcare, where patient safety depends heavily on the ability of professionals to make fast, informed, and coordinated decisions. Competency here is not abstract, it's the difference between harm and healing.

Despite this, I've found that many organizations, especially in emerging markets lack structured, measurable systems for competency assurance. Training is provided, yes. Policies exist. But competency is rarely **tracked, validated, or linked to operational risk** in a systematic way. And that's the gap this objective aims to address.

By exploring how competency assurance functions as a form of risk mitigation, this study helps shift the narrative. It pushes us to stop asking, "Did they attend the training?" and start asking, "Can they do the job safely, under pressure, today?" That's a much harder question. But it's the only one that really matters when risk is real.

So, this objective is not theoretical for me. It's personal. It comes from the frustration of seeing people fail not because they were careless, but because the system told them they were ready when they weren't. It comes from the belief that risk management must start with competence and that competence must be proven, not presumed.

In the end, exploring this link is about changing how we design training, how we evaluate readiness, and how we define safety. It's about putting people at the center of risk management and making sure they're not just present, but prepared.

[Identifying the Gaps Between Workforce Training and On-the-Ground Performance](#)

This objective didn't come from a textbook or a journal. It came from watching people struggle on the job, despite having gone through all the required training. It came from seeing how easily the illusion of preparedness can take root how a certificate on a wall, a completed LMS course, or a passing grade can convince us someone is ready when, in fact, they're not.

In safety-critical environments, that illusion is dangerous. Whether it's an oil rig, a refinery, a hospital, or a construction site, the gap between what someone has been trained to do and what they can actually do when it matters isn't just a performance issue, it's a risk.

I've personally witnessed this gap play out in subtle but telling ways. An operator hesitates during a routine equipment failure. A supervisor overlooks a small non-compliance because they've never been trained to question authority. A new technician doesn't report a near-miss because the training manual never said how. These aren't knowledge failures. They're **application failures** and they're everywhere.

This objective was driven by a need to understand that space more deeply: the **grey area between instruction and execution**. It's in that space where risks accumulate, where incidents happen, and where accountability often collapses.

Academic literature touches on this issue, but often in fragmented ways. **Boyatzis (2008)** talks about competency as something more than just skill, it includes emotional intelligence, behavioral traits, and decision-making under pressure. **Le Deist and Winterton (2005)** emphasize the importance of contextual competence. Both are correct, and both align with what I've seen in the field: workers are often taught what to do, but not *how* to do it under uncertainty, under fatigue, under stress, or in real-world complexity.

This disconnect is further reinforced by the way many organizations still design and evaluate training. Too often, success is measured by attendance, not by transformation. Learning outcomes are checked off, but behavior doesn't change. That's why I've emphasized in this study the importance of integrating **realistic assessment, scenario-based learning, and post-training observation** into any serious training or competency assurance framework.

I've also found that this gap isn't always the fault of the employee. It's often structural. The training content may be outdated. The context may have changed. The delivery might be disengaging or overly theoretical. I've seen this especially in technical fields, where training becomes a ritual a compliance checkbox rather than a space to build capability. And as a result, critical performance gaps are never identified until they become visible through failure.

What I hope to accomplish through this objective is to give organizations a clearer lens for identifying these hidden weaknesses. This includes understanding how knowledge, behavior, and confidence intersect on the job, and how training systems must evolve to capture not just what people know, but what they can *do*, consistently, in the conditions they actually work under.

I also believe this objective holds special relevance for industries here in Saudi Arabia and across the Gulf. As workforce nationalization continues and safety expectations rise, it will be critical to design training programs that do more than inform. They must **transform**. That means using **gap analysis tools, risk-based assessments, and feedback loops** that connect learning directly to the realities of frontline performance.

This part of the research is perhaps the most personal to me. Because I've seen the cost of assuming readiness. I've seen employees blamed for mistakes they were never equipped to avoid. I've seen safety teams left out of training design. And I've seen the emotional impact on workers who wanted to succeed, but didn't have the tools.

Identifying this gap isn't about pointing fingers. It's about building a system that sees people clearly, supports them fully, and prepares them realistically. It's about turning training into more than an event, it's about making it a bridge to actual competence. And in safety-critical environments, that bridge can't be optional. It has to be strong. It has to be tested. And it has to be real.

[Evaluating How Structured Competency Assurance Programs \(CAPs\) Can Improve Workforce Readiness and Reduce Safety and Compliance Failures](#)

This objective goes to the core of what I've come to believe after years of working alongside training teams, safety managers, and frontline employees: if competency assurance isn't structured, it doesn't last. It doesn't protect. It doesn't prepare. Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs), when done right, are not just frameworks for validation they are **systems of trust, tools for protection, and engines for consistency**. And in high-risk industries, consistency is everything.

I've worked in environments where competency assurance was treated as a checklist, and others where it was treated as a continuous process. The difference was striking. In the former, employees passed courses but still lacked readiness. In the latter, employees were challenged, assessed, coached, and gradually developed into professionals who could act with clarity in unpredictable conditions. The CAP was not a form they lived it.

This objective was about exploring what makes the difference. Not just whether CAPs exist—but whether they're structured, reinforced, and integrated with the organization's operational reality. In my view, structure is what separates a good idea from a sustainable system. CAPs that are vague, inconsistently applied, or only enforced during audits tend to collapse when real pressure arises. But when they're designed around clear risk profiles, linked to job roles, and continuously monitored, they elevate an organization's entire safety culture.

One of the best examples I've come across is **Saudi Aramco's competency assurance model**. What makes it so effective isn't just its scale, it's the structure. Every critical role is tied to a competency matrix, every training module is linked to a specific operational risk, and every employee is required to demonstrate not just declare proficiency. Their approach is embedded, not optional. And the results speak for themselves. Their incident rates, compliance records, and readiness for crisis scenarios set a benchmark not just for the region, but globally.

Research by **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)** supports this structure-over-form mindset. In their study of competency models in the energy sector, they found that organizations using structured, role-specific CAPs saw significant reductions in both safety violations and compliance issues. In other words, CAPs that are well-designed and enforced become part of the organization's risk infrastructure. Not paperwork. Not policy. Infrastructure.

In developing this objective, I also wanted to explore **how workforce readiness can be measured more meaningfully**. Readiness is often misunderstood as a binary state whether you're ready, or you're not. But in high-risk environments, readiness is situational, evolving, and role specific. A technician may be highly competent in regular operations, but completely unprepared for emergency shutdown procedures. A supervisor might manage teams well under normal workloads, but struggle during a major equipment failure. CAPs, if properly built, help identify and close those specific gaps before they become failures.

Another issue I've observed is that many organizations focus on initial training and then stop tracking progress. CAPs, when applied well, introduce **revalidation, refresher assessments, and in-field observation**, which ensure that skills don't degrade over time. I've seen CAPs in action that require employees to demonstrate critical procedures annually or after every equipment upgrade. These systems don't just maintain standards, they evolve with the environment.

This research also considers how structured CAPs influence **regulatory compliance**. In industries governed by bodies like **NEBOSH, OSHA, or ISO 45001**, having an auditable, structured CAP is often the difference between passing or failing a compliance inspection. More importantly, it's the difference between operating reactively or proactively. I've seen organizations face fines, shutdowns, or even public scrutiny not because they didn't train their people, but because they couldn't prove that training translated into verified competence.

And CAPs don't just affect safety, they impact efficiency, morale, and even retention. When employees know what's expected of them, when they're given the tools to meet those expectations,

and when their competence is acknowledged and supported, they perform better. They stay longer. They speak up more. They trust the system. And in return, the system protects them.

That's why this objective is so important. It's not about promoting another model. It's about advocating for structure in a space that still relies far too often on assumptions. It's about making the case that readiness is not a feeling or a guess, it's something we must build, measure, and maintain. And it's about showing that when CAPs are treated as essential not optional, they can transform how organizations manage risk, how employees experience training, and how safety is lived not just stated.

Developing a Practical Framework for Training Institutes to Align with Organizational Risk Objectives

This objective is personal to me not because I came across it in a journal article, but because I've stood inside training rooms and realized something wasn't connecting. I've watched instructors do their best with the resources they had. I've seen trainees nod along to content that had nothing to do with the actual challenges they were going to face on the job. And I've seen the growing frustration of training managers who deliver excellent programs, only to be told by industry partners that the "real work" still has to happen on site.

That's the disconnect this objective is trying to fix.

Training institutes play a vital role in preparing the workforce not just to pass tests, but to manage real-world risk. But too often, I've seen those institutes operate in a vacuum, designing programs around general competencies without fully understanding the operational risk environments of the industries they serve. This disconnect leads to technically sound courses that fail to prepare people for the unexpected. In critical sectors like oil and gas, construction, and healthcare, that failure has consequences far beyond training metrics it affects safety, performance, and even lives.

This is why the framework proposed in this study is grounded in **practical alignment**. It's not just about developing better lesson plans. It's about shifting how training providers think about their role from knowledge distributors to **risk reduction partners**.

In developing this objective, I drew not only from academic foundations but from models I've seen work in real environments. For example, organizations like **Saudi Aramco** don't just evaluate their internal employees, they work closely with third-party training providers to ensure that the content, delivery, and assessment methods are risk-aligned. Their training isn't abstract; it's tied to specific operational hazards, procedural expectations, and regulatory mandates. That level of collaboration is what I believe more training institutes should aim for.

To support that, this study offers a structured but adaptable framework that includes several key components:

First, a **risk-informed curriculum design** approach, where course content is developed with direct input from operational stakeholders, safety officers, line supervisors, and technical leads who understand the risks employees face day to day. Training shouldn't just teach "what" or "how," but "why," especially in the context of hazards, emergency protocols, and decision-making under stress.

Second, a **Training Needs and Gap Analysis (TNA)** methodology that goes beyond skill inventories. In my experience, many TNAs rely too heavily on generic job descriptions. But what really matters is understanding where current performance exposes the organization to risk. That's where true alignment begins. This framework helps institutes gather that data and tailor their programs accordingly.

Third, an emphasis on **scenario-based learning** and **simulation-driven assessments**. I've seen the impact when learners are exposed to real case studies, interactive scenarios, or VR-based environments. They retain more, reflect deeper, and make better decisions. This isn't just theory it's something I've tested in my own work, and the difference in engagement and retention is significant.

This framework also encourages institutes to take competency assurance seriously not just for their own instructors, but in how they assess trainees. Too often, evaluations focus on written tests or attendance. But what we need are assessments that test behavior, decision-making, and risk awareness in action. This study pushes for that shift from compliance-based evaluation to **capability-based validation**.

What I've also tried to do through this objective is make the framework practical. I know training institutes don't always have the luxury of massive budgets or deep access to client operations. That's why this model is designed to be **scalable**. Whether you're a large corporate academy or a smaller private training provider, these principles apply. They're about mindset, structure, and intention.

And this isn't just relevant to institutes in Saudi Arabia. As more countries pursue economic diversification and workforce localization like through **Vision 2030** the need for locally delivered, internationally aligned, risk-oriented training will only grow. This study supports that movement by equipping institutes with tools to move beyond content delivery and step into their true potential: shaping safer, smarter, and more resilient workforces.

This objective, in the end, is about giving training a new meaning. Not just teaching skills. Not just checking boxes. But becoming a **strategic partner in managing risk**. And for those of us who work in this space who stand in front of classrooms, design programs, and believe that what we teach

matters it's about making sure that what we offer doesn't just inform but protects us. That's what I want this framework to do. And that's why this objective means so much to me.

Offering Insights for Policymakers and Regulators on Strengthening Workforce Development and Safety Frameworks through Competency Assurance

This objective carries a different kind of weight for me. Not because it deals with policy on paper but because I've seen, time and again, how what happens at the policy level ripples all the way down to the classroom, the job site, and ultimately, the decisions people make in high-risk environments. When regulations are designed with real understanding of workforce realities, they don't just reduce risk they build trust, raise standards, and create long-term resilience.

But I've also seen what happens when that connection is missing.

I've worked with training providers who were eager to deliver meaningful content, but felt boxed in by vague standards or outdated regulatory requirements. I've spoken with safety officers who struggled to implement international best practices because local compliance frameworks didn't fully align. And I've seen policymakers draft well-intentioned regulations that didn't account for the gap between what's written and what's actually possible on the ground.

This objective is my attempt to close that gap by offering insights, grounded in field experience, that speak to the real challenges and opportunities faced by those shaping national workforce strategies and safety regulations.

One of the most relevant examples of this in action is **Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030**. The Kingdom's focus on workforce localization and industrial diversification has brought with it an urgent need for **competency-based systems** that go beyond basic training delivery. National frameworks like the **Saudi Classification of Occupations**, **TVTC initiatives**, and sectoral partnerships are already moving in this direction, but what's still needed is clarity on *how* to link workforce development to *risk outcomes*. That's where this research offers something useful.

Through this study, I aim to provide **a policy-aligned, risk-aware model** for competency assurance one that policymakers can adapt across different sectors. Whether it's oil and gas, healthcare, aviation, or construction, the principle remains the same: competency should not just be a requirement for hiring. It should be a system of continuous development, assessment, and accountability tied directly to national risk profiles and productivity goals.

Case studies from around the world reinforce this approach. In the oil and gas sector, for instance, the **OPITO standard** has become a globally recognized benchmark, precisely because it connects technical competence with offshore risk exposure. In aviation, regulatory frameworks from **ICAO**

and FAA require ongoing validation of competencies, not just one-time certifications because in safety-critical roles, currency matters just as much as initial training. These models show what happens when policy demands more than attendance it demands evidence of readiness.

But not all countries or regions have access to the same resources, platforms, or historical experience. That's why I believe that policymakers, especially in emerging economies, need practical tools that are scalable, culturally relevant, and economically viable. This study provides that through its adaptable framework one that considers local workforce dynamics, operational realities, and regulatory mandates. It's designed to help regulators shape standards that are **tough but achievable**, and that create a real difference in how competence is developed and verified.

From a corporate policy standpoint, this research also supports **HR and L&D leaders** tasked with aligning internal programs to external regulations. I've seen organizations struggle with succession planning, job role clarity, and professional development all because their competency models weren't linked to actual business or risk strategy. This objective addresses that too: offering a way to make competency assurance not just a regulatory requirement, but a **strategic advantage**.

I also see this objective as future-facing. As **digital transformation** continues to reshape industries, regulatory bodies will need to keep pace. Learning Management Systems (LMS), AI-powered training assessments, and real-time performance dashboards are already being used to track skill development in ways that were unthinkable a decade ago. Policymakers must consider how these technologies can be embedded into their frameworks not as gimmicks, but as tools for better decision-making and faster response to emerging risks. This study calls for that mindset shift.

Ultimately, this objective is about giving regulators and policymakers something grounded to work from. Something that reflects the messy, high-stakes environments workers operate in. Something that accounts for cultural context, industry variation, and the simple truth that competence must be proven not presumed.

And it's deeply personal to me. Because I've seen how the right policy can change the trajectory of a workplace and how the wrong one can leave good people vulnerable. I want to see national and corporate policies that truly protect the people they're meant to serve not just by enforcing minimums, but by raising expectations, supporting capability, and building systems that value competence as the first and most important form of risk control.

Emphasizing the Value of Integrating Learning with Leadership, Culture, and Continuous Improvement

Out of all the objectives in this study, this one feels the most human. Because at the heart of competency, training, and risk is something we don't always talk about in formal settings: **culture** and the leaders who shape it. I've come to learn that no matter how well-structured a competency program may be, no matter how aligned the training is with risk, and no matter how smart the policy is on paper, none of it will create lasting change unless the culture supports it. And culture, as I've seen, starts with leadership.

This objective was born from experience not from theory. I've sat in meetings where excellent training programs were shut down because a manager didn't see the value. I've watched frontline employees disengage from safety procedures because no one around them seemed to take it seriously. And I've seen teams thrive not because they had the best tools, but because they had leaders who believed in them, challenged them, and made learning a part of everyday life.

What I'm advocating for here is not just the delivery of training it's the integration of learning into the rhythm of how organizations operate. I've seen this done well. In some environments, leaders don't just "support" training, they model it. They take part in it. They ask questions during toolbox talks. They treat mistakes as learning opportunities rather than performance failures. And as a result, their teams trust the system. They invest in their own growth. They stay alert. And they perform.

Studies like **Spencer & Spencer (1993)** and **Boyatzis (2008)** have long emphasized that competence is not just a matter of knowledge or skill, it's shaped by values, motivation, and identity. In the same way, I believe an organization's **learning culture** isn't built through formal policies alone, it's built through **leadership behavior** and the daily reinforcement of what matters.

This objective is about recognizing that competency doesn't stop at the end of a course. It needs to be maintained, updated, and validated continually. In high-risk environments, where conditions evolve and stakes are high, what worked yesterday might not be enough tomorrow. That's why this study also highlights the importance of **continuous improvement loops** within training and competency systems. I've seen organizations fail not because they didn't train, but because they didn't adapt. They didn't listen to feedback. They didn't follow up. And slowly, the gap between expectation and execution widened until it became a risk.

Through this objective, I also wanted to highlight how **leadership at all levels** not just executives, but supervisors, coordinators, and even informal team leaders can serve as the bridge between competency and culture. When frontline leaders champion safety and growth, when they recognize competence and coach for it, that's when change becomes sustainable. I've seen organizations

where this shift didn't require more training hours it just required more presence, more conversation, and more follow-through.

Another important point here is that **learning and culture aren't static**. In today's workplace especially with younger, tech-savvy, and increasingly local workforces organizations need to reimagine how development is delivered and supported. Feedback must be faster. Recognition must be real. And learning must feel relevant, not just required. The competency systems I've seen succeed are the ones that embed this mindset not just at induction, but every day.

This research contributes to that conversation by emphasizing that **competency assurance must live within the culture** not outside of it. CAPs must be aligned not just with operations, but with leadership principles and values. Training institutes should collaborate with companies not just on content, but on behavior change strategies. And policymakers should frame regulations in ways that encourage them not to discourage ongoing dialogue between leadership and workforce development teams.

I believe this is especially critical now, as organizations across Saudi Arabia and the region embrace transformation under **Vision 2030**. It's not just about hiring more local talent, it's about developing leadership that nurtures competence, supports learning, and inspires a culture of responsibility and excellence.

This final objective is a reminder that while systems and policies matter, the real shift happens when people especially leaders believe in the purpose of what they're doing. When they see competency as more than compliance and learning as more than an event. That's when cultures change. That's when safety becomes second nature. And that's when risk is managed not just through controls, but through character.

This is the kind of change I've tried to capture in this study. And it's the kind of change I hope this research can help support, from training rooms to boardrooms, across industries, and across time.

Research Questions

This research emerged from a combination of field observations, organizational interactions, and a growing awareness of the inconsistencies between what training programs aim to achieve and what they actually deliver. Over the course of my work with training providers and operational teams particularly within high-risk industries, I have observed recurring issues that point to a misalignment between learning outcomes and risk-related performance on the ground.

These observations gave rise to the core questions guiding this study. Each question is shaped not only by academic inquiry, but by the realities I've encountered working with those who bear the responsibility of making high-stakes decisions in complex and high-pressure environments. My intention here is not just to explore gaps in the literature, but to offer a set of questions that resonate with the practical needs of industry, training institutions, and policymakers particularly in the context of Saudi Arabia's workforce development ambitions under **Vision 2030**.

The following research questions are structured to align directly with the six objectives of the study, providing a foundation for both theoretical insight and practical recommendations:

1. **What is the role of competency assurance in mitigating operational risk in high-risk industries such as oil and gas, construction, and healthcare?**

This question stems from firsthand observations of how organizations often prioritize technical systems over human readiness. It seeks to explore how competency frameworks when embedded as part of risk management strategy can reduce exposure to operational, safety, and compliance risks.

2. **What gaps exist between workforce training delivery and real-world performance, and how do these gaps affect safety, compliance, and decision-making under pressure?**

Having seen individuals complete training yet remain unprepared for critical tasks, this question aims to identify the disconnect between instructional content and the practical application of learned skills in dynamic, real-time work settings.

3. **How can structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) enhance workforce readiness and contribute to ongoing safety and compliance across job roles?**

This line of inquiry addresses the practical implementation of CAPs and their capacity to verify not just skill acquisition, but consistent, measurable performance. It also explores how CAPs can be adapted and sustained across various operational contexts.

4. **What framework can training institutes adopt to ensure their programs are directly aligned with the risk profiles and operational needs of the industries they serve?**

Training providers are often motivated to support industry needs, but lack a systematic model to translate operational risks into training design. This question explores the structure of a practical, adaptable framework for risk-aligned training development.

5. **How can the insights gained from structured competency systems be used to inform national workforce development policies and sector-specific regulatory frameworks?**

As Saudi Arabia advances toward economic and industrial diversification, there is a clear need for competency-based regulation and policy. This question investigates how research findings can contribute to developing standards that support national risk mitigation, economic stability, and workforce performance.

6. **What is the role of leadership and organizational culture in sustaining competency assurance, and how can continuous learning be embedded into the operational fabric of high-risk organizations?**

Competency systems do not operate in isolation; their success often depends on cultural reinforcement and leadership commitment. This question focuses on the human side of implementation how values, attitudes, and leadership behavior influence whether competency becomes part of daily operations or remains a one-time initiative.

Taken together, these research questions reflect both the academic scope and the lived relevance of this study. They seek to illuminate not only where gaps exist, but how training institutes, organizations, and policymakers can close them by aligning competency assurance with risk, embedding learning within culture, and reinforcing readiness as a continuous process rather than a final outcome.

[Exploring the Role of Competency Assurance in Mitigating Operational Risk in High-Risk Industries](#)

The relationship between competency and risk management is something I came to understand not through theory alone, but through lived encounters with workers, supervisors, and safety professionals in industries where the stakes are visibly high. In oil and gas facilities, at large-scale construction sites, and within hospital corridors places where a single misjudgment can result in injury, loss of life, or critical system failure, I witnessed a recurring pattern: operational risk increases when competency is assumed rather than assured.

This research question is rooted in those observations. It asks not only whether competency assurance is relevant to risk, but how it functions as a **strategic risk control** a frontline barrier between predictable operations and preventable incidents.

In high-risk sectors, risk is inherent and cannot be fully eliminated. However, as **ISO 31000** outlines, risk can be minimized and controlled through structured, proactive measures. Competency assurance, in this context, becomes more than a training goal, it becomes a **risk treatment strategy**. A system that ensures individuals have the knowledge, skills, and behaviors required to perform safely and effectively is, in itself, a safeguard.

The importance of this link is well-documented in academic literature. **Spencer and Spencer (1993)** and **Boyatzis (2008)** emphasize that competency is not a fixed point, but a dynamic, contextual capability one that must be continuously validated, particularly when decisions carry operational consequences. In high-risk environments, technical knowledge alone is not enough; situational awareness, judgment under stress, and behavioral discipline become equally critical. These are not qualities that emerge from traditional training, they are developed through sustained, structured competency systems.

In practice, organizations that take this seriously demonstrate markedly different results. **Saudi Aramco**, for example, has built one of the region's most advanced competency assurance ecosystems. Each role whether technical, operational, or supervisory is linked to a competency profile that directly reflects risk exposure. Personnel are assessed not only at onboarding, but periodically, with revalidation protocols built into the operational lifecycle. Through these systems, Aramco manages to keep its safety performance within globally recognized benchmarks, despite the complexity and danger of its environments.

Internationally, the **aviation industry** offers another robust model. Regulatory bodies like the **Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)** and **ICAO** require aviation professionals to undergo recurrent competency checks, scenario-based simulations, and performance assessments under real-time constraints. These are not arbitrary requirements; they are based on decades of evidence showing that **operational incidents decline when competency is maintained as an ongoing process**.

The **healthcare sector** has also begun to follow suit, particularly in the wake of safety failures attributed to human error rather than clinical knowledge. For instance, the UK's **National Health Service (NHS)** developed the **Core Skills Training Framework**, which ties clinical training to competency standards for safe patient care. This was in response to a growing awareness that even highly qualified practitioners were susceptible to risk if their real-time readiness wasn't assured.

Further evidence is found in the case study conducted by **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)**, which examined the implementation of structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) in Indonesia's petrochemical industry. Their findings showed a **notable reduction in safety incidents and regulatory violations** once CAPs were aligned with operational KPIs and enforced through field-based assessments. Their study supports what I've long suspected and seen in my own work: competency assurance is not simply an HR process, it is a control mechanism woven into the organization's overall risk framework.

However, despite these successful models, the reality is that many organizations especially in developing markets still approach competency as a **compliance task**, rather than a **risk-oriented process**. Training is often reactive, based on regulatory deadlines or internal checklists, with little connection to the specific operational risks employees face. This disconnect not only diminishes the value of training but increases exposure to risk, as workers may be certified without being fully capable.

Through this question, I seek to investigate and reframe the **role of competency assurance as a core function of risk mitigation**. Not parallel to it. Not supplementary. But central. Competency, when truly assured, becomes a shield. It ensures that frontline decisions are made with confidence. That emergencies are met with practiced calm. That operations are sustained not just by procedures, but by people who are fully prepared to execute them.

In conclusion, the role of competency assurance in high-risk industries cannot be overstated. It must be elevated from a checkbox to a core pillar of safety and performance. And it is my hope that through this research, more organizations and more regulators will begin to treat it as such.

[Investigating the Gaps Between Workforce Training and Real-World Performance](#)

This question touches the very core of why I pursued this research in the first place. In nearly every organization I've worked with regardless of industry, size, or location, I've encountered some form of disconnect between what people were trained to do and what they actually did on the job. At first glance, these gaps often seem minor. But in high-risk environments, even small disconnects can have serious consequences.

The assumption that a trained employee is a competent one is widespread and dangerously misleading. In theory, successful training delivery is seen as the end of the learning process. In practice, however, it is often just the beginning. This research question seeks to explore **what is missing between instruction and execution**, and how those missing pieces manifest as risk in the form of human error, compliance failures, or breakdowns in judgment during high-pressure scenarios.

Through my own work, I've come to realize that many training programs despite being well-designed and well-intentioned fail to translate into confident, capable, risk-aware behavior in real operational settings. Employees often complete modules, pass assessments, and receive certifications, yet remain underprepared when faced with the demands of live decision-making or emergency response. This is not a failure of effort; it is a failure of **alignment**.

Several academic and industry studies support this observation. **Boyatzis (2008)** argues that real competency is not just about acquiring knowledge it's about applying it with emotional awareness, judgment, and adaptability. Similarly, **Le Deist and Winterton (2005)** note that competence is deeply contextual, requiring more than theoretical understanding; it requires experience-based problem-solving in environments marked by uncertainty and dynamic risk.

These gaps become most visible during moments of stress during unexpected failures, emergencies, or near misses. In such instances, people fall back not on what they were told in a classroom, but on what they've practiced and internalized. If that practice hasn't occurred in realistic, risk-reflective environments, then training is unlikely to hold up under pressure.

One example that continues to influence my thinking comes from the aviation industry. Despite having some of the most rigorous training systems in the world, the **2013 Asiana Airlines crash** at San Francisco International Airport revealed that even highly qualified pilots could misinterpret instrumentation or delay critical decision-making under unusual conditions. Investigations pointed to training gaps particularly in scenario-based simulation and cross-crew communication despite compliance with all regulatory requirements. It served as a stark reminder: compliance is not competence.

Similarly, in the **healthcare sector**, the tragic case of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Trust in the UK highlighted how staff, though technically trained, lacked the situational awareness and support structures to respond adequately to patient needs leading to a major crisis in care quality. Post-event reports identified a lack of ongoing performance feedback and behavioral reinforcement as critical training gaps, despite the presence of routine upskilling.

Even in Saudi Arabia, I have personally observed training delivery that was compliant but disconnected. Courses were conducted, participants were assessed, certificates were issued, but no clear mechanism existed to evaluate how that learning influenced actual behavior on site. There was little feedback from supervisors. No in-field coaching. No cross-functional debriefing to assess how well training outcomes aligned with daily operational realities.

This is where the value of **Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** becomes even more apparent. CAPs are designed to bridge the space between learning and doing. They bring structure to performance evaluation, aligning skill development with role-specific risk and job-critical behavior. More importantly, CAPs encourage **continuous verification**, not just one-time testing. This ongoing validation helps identify where learning has fallen short and provides an opportunity to course-correct before failure occurs.

The gaps we're exploring here are not simply about poor training. Often, the content is strong, and the instructors are experienced. The issue is that many programs stop at the point of delivery, with little or no integration into ongoing operations. Without reinforcement, without post-training observation, without real accountability, even excellent instruction can fade into memory detached from practical behavior.

This research question, then, is about understanding how to **close those gaps**, not just through better content, but through better systems, the systems that align training with real work, ensure behavior is reinforced, and evaluate readiness as an evolving state, not a checkbox.

Ultimately, what's at stake here is trust. Organizations must be able to trust that their people can perform not just when conditions are ideal, but when they're not. And that trust is only earned when training outcomes are tested, validated, and improved in light of real-world performance.

In high-risk industries, there is no room for assumptions. This question is about replacing those assumptions with evidence, and about challenging systems that measure "completion" instead of capability.

Examining the Role of Structured Competency Assurance Programs in Enhancing Workforce Readiness and Ensuring Safety and Compliance

Through my own work in high-risk industries, I've seen the difference between training that aims to meet compliance requirements and systems that genuinely prepare individuals for their roles. The turning point, almost always, is structure. Training without a system of assurance is like a checklist without follow-up it satisfies the minimum requirement, but it rarely changes outcomes. That's what led me to this question: what role do **structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** play in creating a workforce that is not only qualified but truly **ready** and how does that readiness translate into safer operations and stronger regulatory compliance?

The first thing I observed in the field is that **readiness is not automatic**, and it doesn't end with training. Just because someone completes a course or passes a test does not mean they are fully

capable of executing tasks in high-pressure, high-risk scenarios. That assumption, if left unchallenged, can lead to dangerous complacency. A structured CAP introduces a critical layer of **validation** a system that tests whether someone can perform safely and consistently, **not just in theory, but in practice**.

In highly regulated sectors like oil and gas, aviation, and petrochemicals, the CAP becomes not just a workforce development tool, but a **core part of the organization's safety infrastructure**. At **Saudi Aramco**, for instance, competency assurance is tightly integrated with risk assessments, performance audits, and job-specific performance criteria. Each employee's readiness is evaluated not only through technical checks but through behaviorally anchored assessments and role-specific simulations. This ensures that personnel aren't just certified they're capable. Aramco's CAP model serves as one of the strongest examples of how structured assurance leads to measurable safety outcomes and operational continuity.

The study by **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)** reinforces this. In their case analysis of CAP implementation within the petrochemical industry, they reported that organizations using structured CAPs experienced significant improvements in audit compliance and a noticeable drop in incident frequency. Their findings confirmed what I have long observed in practice that **competency is not an outcome of training alone, but of structured, ongoing validation**.

This approach is mirrored in aviation as well. The **FAA** mandates regular re-certification and skills validation through structured assessments, including in-flight simulations and real-time decision-making drills. The intent is clear: in safety-critical industries, **competency must be maintained not assumed**. And that maintenance requires a system that is as robust as it is repeatable.

But the question of structure goes beyond procedure. What makes a CAP "structured" is not just the presence of forms or schedules, it's the **consistency, transparency, and alignment** of the program with operational risk. In some environments, I've seen CAPs implemented on paper but neglected in practice checklists filled out with little observation, assessments conducted without field data, feedback delivered without consequence. In those cases, the program exists—but the **assurance** does not.

This research question aims to distinguish those superficial implementations from the structured models that actually contribute to organizational resilience. Structured CAPs typically include several critical elements: role-based competency profiles, validated assessment tools, trainer and assessor qualification requirements, and ongoing cycle reviews. They also require **leadership support, data**

tracking, and most importantly, **a culture of accountability** that values competence over mere compliance.

Another factor I've learned to appreciate is that **structured CAPs also help close the gap between departments**. Training is no longer an isolated HR function, it becomes a collaborative system, shared between safety teams, supervisors, assessors, and leadership. This cross-functional involvement increases visibility and reinforces the idea that competency is everyone's responsibility. I've seen how this shift fosters stronger ownership, better feedback, and more meaningful performance development across entire organizations.

In terms of **regulatory compliance**, structured CAPs provide a traceable, defensible system that satisfies auditors and aligns with international standards such as **ISO 45001**, **NEBOSH guidelines**, and industry-specific frameworks like **OPITO**. For organizations under increasing scrutiny especially in emerging markets CAPs offer both **protection and clarity**. They demonstrate due diligence, reduce legal exposure, and ultimately foster a safer, more consistent working environment.

In conclusion, this research question seeks to explore CAPs not just as educational frameworks, but as **operational safeguards**. When properly structured and embedded, they support workforce readiness at every level—from technical workers to supervisors while directly contributing to reduced incidents, improved compliance, and a workforce that is confident, capable, and equipped to perform under pressure.

Structured CAPs, in my view, are not just beneficial, they are essential. And it is this structure that transforms competency from a concept into a measurable, sustained, and risk-aligned reality.

Defining a Framework for Training Institutes to Align with Industry Risk and Operational Realities

This question emerged from a growing awareness that many training institutes despite their best intentions, often design programs in isolation from the very environments they're meant to serve. I've seen this disconnect up close: training sessions that are rich in theory but poor in contextual relevance, or curricula that cover broad skills without addressing the specific operational risks workers will face once they step onto the job site.

The issue isn't a lack of commitment. In my experience, most training providers genuinely want to prepare people well. The problem lies in the **absence of a structured framework** that links training content to **real-world risk scenarios, industry-specific regulations, and job-critical behaviors**. That's

what this research question seeks to explore how training institutes can systematically design and deliver programs that are not only educational but operationally meaningful.

A central component of this alignment is **understanding the operational risk profile of the industry** in question. Whether the training is for oil and gas, construction, healthcare, or aviation, the competencies being developed must correspond to the pressures and safety demands of that sector. In sectors like oil and gas, for example, where incidents can escalate rapidly, training must go beyond theoretical knowledge. It must simulate decision-making under uncertainty, stress, and physical risk.

A strong case study can be drawn from the **OPITO standards** used globally in the offshore energy industry. OPITO-certified training institutes must adhere to strict frameworks that mirror offshore safety risks from fire prevention to helicopter escape. The strength of these programs lies not in content alone, but in **how tightly that content is linked to the specific risks of the job**. This level of detail, structure, and context-specific design is what I believe more training institutes especially in emerging economies need to adopt.

In Saudi Arabia, particularly under the momentum of **Vision 2030**, there's a clear demand for local training providers to meet international standards while supporting national workforce development. But for many institutes, the challenge is knowing **how** to design such programs. This is where a practical, adaptable framework becomes essential one that begins with industry consultation, includes role-based risk mapping, and integrates continuous validation throughout the training lifecycle.

My observations have shown that institutes which succeed in aligning training with risk tend to follow a few shared principles:

1. **They involve operational leaders early** in the curriculum design process ensuring that real-world challenges inform the training content.
2. **They conduct in-depth Training Needs and Gap Analyses (TNA)** based not on general skills but on observed performance gaps tied to safety and compliance issues.
3. **They use scenario-based methods**, simulations, and real-world case studies not just to improve engagement, but to develop behavioral response and critical thinking.
4. **They treat assessments as validations**, not formality using competency-based rubrics that go beyond technical knowledge and into performance in realistic conditions.

In terms of academic support, **Draganidis and Mentzas (2006)** advocate for dynamic, competency-based learning frameworks that are continuously aligned with evolving business needs. Their approach emphasizes modularity, adaptability, and integration with strategic objectives all of which are echoed in this study's proposed framework. Additionally, **Gunawan and Melinda (2021)** emphasize how training programs designed with clear operational indicators improve compliance and reduce preventable safety incidents.

Another important part of this framework is **feedback integration**. Too often, training is designed once and then left unchanged. But operational environments change. Risks shift. Equipment gets updated. Regulations evolve. A sustainable framework must include **feedback from supervisors, assessors, and trainees**, along with regular reviews informed by incident reports and performance data. This transforms the training program into a **living system** responsive, relevant, and aligned with risk.

This research question is about giving training providers a clear path toward that kind of system. A path that helps them **move from generic skill-building to targeted risk mitigation**, from theoretical instruction to **applied competence**, and from isolated delivery to full **operational integration**.

Ultimately, training institutes have the potential to be not just educators but **risk partners**. And with the right framework, they can contribute directly to the safety, resilience, and performance of the sectors they support. That's the kind of alignment this research hopes to promote because in high-risk industries, every hour spent in training should reduce risk, not just meet requirements.

Translating Competency System Insights into Policy and Regulatory Frameworks

In my experience working across training environments and industry operations, I've often found that the most critical disconnects don't occur within systems, but between them. A training provider might deliver content effectively. A company might have internal CAPs in place. But without national policy frameworks that promote cohesion, alignment, and accountability, these systems often remain fragmented, overlapping, or inefficient. This question emerged from my personal observations of that fragmentation and from the conviction that competency assurance, when systematized, has much more to offer than operational performance alone. It can shape national workforce resilience.

Competency systems, especially when structured and continuously validated, provide data, patterns, and lessons that are invaluable to policymakers. They reveal where workforce capability is strongest and where it's vulnerable. They highlight which competencies correlate with reduced incidents or improved compliance. They expose trends across industries and job functions. Yet, in

many regions, this knowledge remains trapped within organizational silos. It is rarely shared across sectors, and even more rarely leveraged at the policy level.

This question seeks to explore **how those insights can be elevated and translated into policies**, policies that shape not just compliance requirements, but education standards, labor strategies, and national occupational frameworks.

A strong point of reference here is **Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030**, which places workforce localization and upskilling at the heart of national transformation. The push to diversify the economy, localize key industries, and raise productivity will only succeed if national policies align with what high-risk industries actually demand from their people. Structured competency assurance systems offer a pathway to make that alignment tangible. By gathering performance data across sectors, linking it to training outcomes, and embedding it into national standards, policymakers can shape more targeted, evidence-based development strategies.

Case studies such as the **United Kingdom's National Occupational Standards (NOS)** and the **Competency-Based Qualifications (CBQ)** framework offer useful examples. These systems, built on structured competency insights, are used not only to define professional pathways but also to set national training benchmarks across multiple sectors. Similarly, the **OPITO framework** in the oil and gas sector, recognized in over 50 countries, is directly integrated into both corporate and national policies, ensuring workforce development and safety standards are consistent at every level from offshore platforms to government regulation.

What these examples show is that **structured CAPs don't just improve performance, they generate insight**. They allow regulators to understand not just what's being taught, but how it's being applied, where gaps remain, and how interventions can be designed with precision. In my own work, I've seen how workforce development strategies benefit when policymakers engage with training feedback loops when they move beyond abstract targets and start asking: *"What is the actual readiness level of the people in this industry?"*

This question also speaks to the potential for **standardization and harmonization** across sectors. I've encountered industries that operate side-by-side but under entirely different competency standards even though they share similar risk profiles. This inconsistency creates not only inefficiencies but also regulatory vulnerabilities. Insights from structured CAPs can help bridge these differences, establishing shared frameworks that are flexible enough to respect industry specificity but coherent enough to serve as national benchmarks.

Equally important is the **digital transformation of policy frameworks**. With the rise of LMS platforms, real-time assessment tools, and AI-driven performance analytics, regulators now have the opportunity to shift from reactive to proactive oversight. Instead of relying on post-incident reports or audit findings, national bodies could monitor workforce readiness trends in near real-time if systems were integrated and data was shared responsibly. CAPs, with their structured and traceable design, are the backbone of such a future.

Finally, this research question touches on something deeper: the role of policy in shaping **culture**. When national frameworks prioritize competency not just credentials, they send a message about what matters. They shape how organizations invest in training, how employees view their own development, and how safety and professionalism are measured across the board. Structured CAPs can play a role in embedding that message not just operationally, but nationally.

In conclusion, this question invites us to look beyond individual programs or companies and ask: *How can what we learn on the ground help shape what we do at the highest level?* Because if the lessons of competency assurance stay confined to the organizations that run them, then we miss an opportunity, a chance to build national systems that are smarter, safer, and more aligned with the realities of the work they're meant to support.

Understanding the Role of Leadership and Culture in Sustaining Competency and Embedding Continuous Learning

Over time, I've come to believe that even the most well-structured competency systems cannot survive without the right leadership and an enabling culture. I've seen technically sound training programs lose momentum because no one in management reinforced them. I've seen excellent CAP frameworks implemented with enthusiasm only to be quietly set aside six months later when priorities shifted. That's what led me to this question: what is the actual role of leadership and culture in sustaining competency assurance? And what does it take to make learning not just an event, but a way of working?

This research question reflects the final, essential layer of the competency conversation—one that doesn't always appear in formal policies or curricula but is almost always the deciding factor in whether competency systems work or quietly fail over time.

In high-risk industries, consistency is critical. And consistency is rarely achieved through systems alone. It is cultivated intentionally and repeatedly, by leaders who treat competency as a **shared value**, not just a checklist. Leaders set the tone for whether learning is seen as part of the job or as a distraction from it. In my own work, I've noticed that the most effective organizations aren't

necessarily the ones with the most advanced tools, they are the ones where **leaders model learning**, ask questions, and coach performance.

This aligns with literature that emphasizes the behavioral and cultural dimensions of competence. **Spencer and Spencer (1993)** and **Boyatzis (2008)** both argue that competence is influenced by internal driver's motives, values, identity not just external instruction. These drivers are shaped in large part by **organizational culture**, which in turn is shaped by leadership behavior. In other words, leaders don't just manage competence, they set the conditions for it to grow or fade.

The healthcare sector offers a telling example. In many hospitals, especially those operating under high pressure and staff shortages, training is deprioritized. Yet in institutions where leadership consistently champions continuous professional development, such as **Johns Hopkins Medicine** or the **Mayo Clinic**, ongoing learning is not only embedded, it's expected. The result is measurable improvements in patient safety, procedural adherence, and even job satisfaction.

In the industrial sector, **Shell's General Competence Assurance System (GCAS)** is often cited for its successful integration of competency assurance and culture. What makes it sustainable isn't just its structure, it's the fact that performance reviews, promotions, and daily supervision are tied to behavior-based competencies. It is the **alignment of culture, leadership, and process** that keeps the system alive.

In my experience, organizations that treat competency assurance as an HR or compliance responsibility tend to see short-term success, followed by long-term decline. Those that embed it into their **leadership model**, their **language**, and their **daily routines**, those are the organizations where competency becomes a cultural norm.

This research question also addresses a deeper concern: **how do we sustain learning beyond training events?** The answer lies in moving toward a **continuous learning culture**. This means creating systems where feedback is normalized, where mistakes become learning opportunities, and where professional growth is tied to actual job performance. I've seen this done through regular debriefs, peer evaluations, mentorship programs, and digital tools that track and reinforce competencies in real time.

One of the most promising developments in this space is the integration of **learning analytics and AI-driven development platforms**. These tools, when aligned with CAPs, can provide real-time data on skill acquisition, usage, and decay. But they only work when leadership chooses to use them not just as tracking tools, but as coaching platforms.

Ultimately, this question brings us back to the **human element** of all training and competency efforts. Systems, frameworks, and standards are necessary, but not sufficient. It is people, especially those in leadership who determine whether competency becomes embedded or remains performative.

This study argues that for CAPs to be sustained, leadership must be accountable not just for operational results, but for **learning behavior**. And culture must evolve to support **ongoing validation, feedback, and growth** not just in response to incidents, but as part of daily operations.

In high-risk environments, that kind of culture isn't a luxury. It's a necessity. Because competence, when left untended, erodes. But when nurtured through leadership, accountability, and embedded learning, it becomes the foundation not just for safety, but for organizational excellence.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses presented in this study are not purely theoretical. They are drawn from lived experience rooted in patterns I've observed across high-risk industries and supported by existing literature on training, workforce development, and risk management. While the research itself adopts a primarily exploratory and qualitative design, these hypotheses serve as **structured assumptions** that frame the analysis and offer direction for future empirical validation.

Each hypothesis is a reflection of what I've seen in the field: the limitations of training when divorced from operational reality, the transformative effect of leadership on learning culture, and the difference that structured systems make not only in safety outcomes, but in confidence, accountability, and resilience across the workforce.

H1: Structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) are positively associated with higher levels of workforce readiness in high-risk industries.

In high-risk sectors like oil and gas or aviation, readiness cannot be taken at face value. Organizations that assume training completion equals job readiness are often caught off guard when incidents occur. What I've seen in more mature operational settings is that **CAPs provide the necessary infrastructure to move from education to readiness.**

These systems allow for ongoing assessment, job-specific competency validation, and clear metrics tied to both individual and operational outcomes. In contrast, organizations without structured CAPs rely heavily on static certification or generic safety courses, which fail to reflect actual field performance or adaptability in high-pressure situations.

To illustrate the tangible difference, consider the following comparison:

Table 1: Comparison of Organizations With vs. Without Structured CAPs

Feature/Outcome	Organizations with CAPs (e.g., Saudi Aramco, Shell)	Organizations without CAPs
Competency Validation	Role-specific, ongoing, risk-aligned	One-time, generic, often disconnected from role
Workforce Readiness	Measured, tracked, adjusted continuously	Assumed post-training
Safety Incident Frequency	Lower due to performance-based validation	Higher due to unverified readiness
Training ROI	Tracked via audit data and operational KPIs	Difficult to quantify beyond attendance
Learning Culture	Embedded in operations	Seen as HR-driven or compliance-focused
Feedback Loops	Built into assessments and supervision	Siloed or non-existent

This hypothesis reflects what both industry and research are now confirming: **structured CAPs convert training into readiness** not just through more content, but through accountability, repetition, and alignment with risk.

H2: The gap between training delivery and real-world performance contributes to increased operational risk and compliance failures.

This hypothesis stems from a recurring theme I’ve encountered in both incident reviews and operational feedback: training often fails not because of what it covers, but because of what it doesn’t translate into. When learners complete training without reinforcement, without practical simulation, and without follow-up in the field, they may be aware of the correct response in theory, but unable to apply it under stress.

For example, in construction or manufacturing settings, procedural training may be provided during onboarding, but rarely is performance re-evaluated during actual task execution. This often leads to **latent performance gaps**, which only surface when something goes wrong. Literature by **Boyatzis (2008)** and **Le Deist and Winterton (2005)** reinforces the idea that competence must be **contextual and behavioral**, not just technical.

The more that organizations assume training equals competence, the more exposed they are to preventable incidents, and this is especially dangerous in high-risk environments where “moment-of-truth” decisions matter.

H3: Training programs designed around operational risk profiles result in improved alignment between learning outcomes and job performance.

I've come to understand that **content is only as effective as its relevance**. Training programs developed without engagement from safety teams, operations managers, or compliance leads tend to drift into generalization. They might still be well-received, but they don't reduce risk because they don't reflect the actual situations employees are likely to face.

Organizations that begin their training design with **risk identification** mapping content directly to hazards, job-specific failure modes, and past incident reports see a measurable improvement in how learning translates to behavior.

In particular, case studies from the **aviation and offshore energy sectors** (e.g., OPITO-compliant safety training) demonstrate how high-fidelity simulation and scenario-based learning dramatically improve emergency response outcomes. Learners not only retain the content longer but demonstrate better decision-making in high-pressure environments.

This hypothesis suggests that training should no longer be treated as a standard product, it should be a **risk-specific intervention**, custom-designed to protect people and prevent failure.

H4: Competency assurance systems that are reinforced by leadership and integrated into organizational culture are more likely to be sustained over time.

This is a point I've observed time and again: the **longevity of competency systems is directly tied to leadership support**. Where leaders model the expected behavior, engage in learning, and hold others accountable, the system takes root. Where they do not, even the best-designed CAPs become dormant over time.

Research from **Spencer & Spencer (1993)** and **Kotter (1996)** confirms that culture is the true container for sustainable change. If competency is seen as "an HR thing," it is rarely embraced across departments. But when it is built into team briefings, supervision, performance reviews, and leadership evaluations, it becomes **how the organization works**, not just a policy.

This hypothesis reflects a foundational belief in this study: **structure initiates competency but leadership sustains it**.

H5: Insights from structured competency systems can support the development of national policies and regulatory frameworks aimed at workforce safety and operational resilience.

Many countries, especially those in industrial transition struggle to align workforce development goals with actual risk conditions in the field. Structured CAPs can provide the missing data: clear evidence of where skills are strong, where gaps persist, and how readiness evolves over time.

The **UK's NOS and CBQ frameworks**, and global systems like **OPITO**, offer proof of how competency assurance insights can inform national standards. This hypothesis argues that Saudi Arabia and other Vision 2030-aligned economies could benefit from structured CAP adoption not only at the company level but as part of national workforce regulation.

Insights gathered through CAPs can inform policy development, educational reform, and regulatory oversight ensuring that labor markets produce not just workers, but **risk-ready professionals**.

H6: Continuous feedback, post-training validation, and scenario-based assessments significantly enhance the effectiveness of CAPs in high-risk environments.

In my experience, CAPs are most effective when they remain active not static. The moment competency is treated as a one-time achievement, risk begins to grow again.

Organizations that introduce **refresher validations**, **360° feedback**, and **realistic simulations** as part of their CAP cycles show improved incident prevention, stronger audit outcomes, and higher levels of workforce confidence. This approach also supports a **learning culture**, where feedback isn't seen as punitive, but as a normal and valued part of performance development.

This hypothesis emphasizes the **evolutionary nature of competence** and argues that CAPs must include mechanisms that allow for reflection, challenge, and renewal.

Methodology Section

Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to comprehensively assess the relationship between competency assurance and risk mitigation in high-risk industries such as oil and gas, construction, and healthcare, with a particular focus on Saudi Aramco. A mixed-methods approach enables both breadth and depth of analysis, facilitating the triangulation of data to enhance the validity and reliability of research findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

- **Quantitative Approach:** Utilized to measure the impact of competency assurance on risk reduction through statistical analysis of survey data.
- **Qualitative Approach:** Provides contextual insights through semi-structured interviews, exploring stakeholder perspectives on the effectiveness of competency frameworks in risk management strategies.

- **Research Paradigm:** The study follows a pragmatic paradigm, focusing on practical outcomes and applying both objective data and subjective insights to formulate a holistic understanding of the research problem.

Research Variables

In this study, the relationship between Competency Assurance (IV) and Risk Reduction (DV) is explored through a structured analysis of key metrics and performance indicators. By defining these variables precisely and linking them to established models and frameworks, the research aims to provide a robust empirical foundation for understanding how competency-based training influences operational safety and compliance outcomes.

1. Independent Variable (IV): Competency Assurance

Introduction:

Competency Assurance (CA) involves implementing a systematic process to ensure employees possess the necessary skills, knowledge, and behaviors to perform their roles effectively and safely (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). The effectiveness of CA programs is often measured through structured frameworks, including Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs), training evaluation models, and competency assessments. These metrics serve as critical indicators of how well an organization's workforce is prepared to meet operational demands and manage risks.

1.1 Existence of Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)

Definition:

Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) are structured systems that validate the competencies of employees through a continuous cycle of assessment, development, and evaluation (Boyatzis, 2008). CAPs ensure that personnel meet defined competency standards before performing critical tasks, particularly in high-risk industries such as oil and gas, construction, and healthcare.

Research Insight:

Studies by Draganidis and Mentzas (2006) demonstrate that organizations with robust CAPs report higher safety compliance and lower operational risks. For example, in the oil and gas sector, CAPs aligned with OPITO standards have contributed to significant reductions in safety incidents and improved compliance with ISO 45001 safety management standards.

1.2 Training Effectiveness Scores Based on Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model

Introduction:

The Kirkpatrick Evaluation Model provides a four-level framework for assessing training effectiveness, which includes:

- Level 1: Reaction: Participants' satisfaction with the training.
- Level 2: Learning: The degree of skill and knowledge acquisition.
- Level 3: Behavior: Application of new skills in the workplace.
- Level 4: Results: Impact on organizational goals, including risk reduction (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Application in Competency Assurance:

Utilizing this model in Competency Assurance ensures that training programs not only deliver content effectively but also translate into measurable performance improvements. Research by Gunawan and Melinda (2021) found that organizations applying the Kirkpatrick model observed a 30% reduction in safety incidents, demonstrating a clear link between training effectiveness and risk mitigation.

1.3 Competency Assessment Results

Introduction:

Competency assessments are critical in determining whether employees possess the required competencies to perform their roles safely and effectively. These assessments typically include:

- Knowledge Tests: Evaluate theoretical understanding.
- Skill Demonstrations: Assess practical capabilities through simulations or real-world scenarios.
- Behavioral Assessments: Measure attitudes and behaviors that influence job performance.

Evidence from Research:

According to Le Deist and Winterton (2005), regular competency assessments contribute to continuous workforce improvement. Organizations implementing structured assessment frameworks reported enhanced compliance with ISO 31000 risk management guidelines, leading to fewer operational disruptions.

2. Dependent Variable (DV): Risk Reduction

Introduction:

Risk Reduction refers to the measurable decrease in operational risks, compliance failures, and safety incidents as a result of effective competency assurance practices. This variable is crucial for assessing the impact of workforce development initiatives on an organization's overall risk profile.

2.1 Operational Risk Incidents

Definition:

Operational risk incidents include safety violations, equipment failures, and near-miss events that can disrupt organizational processes. Reducing these incidents is a primary goal of risk management frameworks such as ISO 31000 (ISO, 2018).

Link to Competency Assurance:

Research by Hubbard (2020) indicates that organizations with high competency standards experience up to 40% fewer operational risks. For example, Saudi Aramco's competency-based training programs have led to significant declines in equipment-related incidents, showcasing the direct impact of competency assurance on risk reduction.

2.2 Compliance Performance

Introduction:

Compliance performance measures how well an organization adheres to regulatory standards and industry guidelines. Effective competency assurance ensures that employees understand and follow compliance requirements, reducing the risk of penalties and operational disruptions.

Research Findings:

A study by Kaplan and Mikes (2012) found that companies with structured competency frameworks had higher compliance rates with OSHA and ISO 45001 standards. These organizations utilized competency assessments as part of their compliance strategy, linking competency management directly to regulatory performance.

2.3 Safety Performance Indicators

Introduction:

Safety performance indicators include metrics such as:

- Incident Rates: Frequency of workplace accidents.
- Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate (LTIFR): The number of injuries resulting in lost work time per million hours worked.
- Regulatory Compliance Scores: Evaluations based on safety audits and inspections.

Impact of Competency Assurance:

According to Spencer and Spencer (1993), organizations with effective competency management systems report improved safety metrics. A case study in the construction industry showed that integrated competency assurance programs led to a 25% reduction in LTIFR, demonstrating the effectiveness of competency-based training in enhancing safety outcomes.

Data Collection Methods

In this study, a mixed-methods approach is utilized to collect both quantitative and qualitative data, enabling a comprehensive analysis of how Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) impact risk management outcomes within Saudi Aramco. The quantitative method involves structured surveys to gather measurable data, while the qualitative method uses interviews to explore in-depth insights into competency assurance practices and risk management strategies. Combining these methods enhances the validity and reliability of the study by capturing both numerical data and contextual understanding.

Quantitative Data Collection

Introduction:

The quantitative component of this study aims to measure the impact of competency assurance on risk reduction using a structured survey methodology. The survey is designed to generate numerical data that can be statistically analyzed to identify patterns and correlations between the presence of CAPs and risk management performance.

Survey Design

- **Format:** A structured questionnaire featuring closed-ended questions to maintain consistency and ease of analysis.
- **Response Scale:** Utilizes a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). This scale allows for a granular analysis of respondents' attitudes towards competency assurance and risk management practices.
- **Rationale:** The Likert scale is effective in capturing perceptions and attitudes in a quantifiable manner, facilitating the application of descriptive and inferential statistical methods (Boone & Boone, 2012).

Questionnaire Content

- **Competency Assurance Measures:** Questions focus on:
 - The existence of CAPs within Saudi Aramco.
 - Frequency of training programs and the types of assessment methods used.
 - The effectiveness of competency assessments in enhancing safety performance.
- **Risk Management Outcomes:** Measures include:
 - **Safety Performance:** Frequency of safety incidents and compliance with safety protocols.
 - **Operational Efficiency:** Impact of competency assurance on workflow optimization and risk reduction.
 - **Compliance Levels:** Adherence to industry standards such as ISO 31000 and OSHA regulations.
- **Demographic Data:** Collects relevant participant information, including:

- Job Role: To assess how competency assurance impacts different functions within the organization.
- Experience Level: Evaluates whether longer tenure correlates with better risk management practices.
- Department Affiliation: Ensures diverse representation from safety, operations, training, and HR departments.

Sample Size Determination

- Methodology: The sample size is calculated using Cochran's formula for large populations, targeting 250-300 participants.
- Confidence Level: 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error, ensuring the statistical robustness of the findings.
- Supporting Research: According to Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001), a well-calculated sample size improves the generalizability of quantitative studies.

Sampling Technique

- Approach: The study employs stratified random sampling, which involves dividing the population into sub-groups (strata) based on departmental affiliation and randomly selecting participants from each stratum.
- Purpose: This method ensures that all key departments (safety, operations, training, HR) are adequately represented, enhancing the validity of the research by reflecting the diverse perspectives within Saudi Aramco.
- Benefit: Stratification helps in reducing sampling bias, allowing for a balanced representation of different job roles and experience levels (Fowler, 2014).

Qualitative Data Collection

Introduction:

The qualitative aspect of the study involves semi-structured interviews to gain deep insights into competency assurance practices and their influence on risk management strategies. This method captures contextual and experiential data, which complements the quantitative findings and provides a richer understanding of the research problem.

interview Methodology

- Type of Interview: Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions allow for flexibility while maintaining focus on key research themes.
- Advantages: This method enables the interviewer to probe deeper into responses, uncovering nuanced insights into how competency frameworks are applied within Saudi Aramco.
- Supporting Theory: Patton (2002) emphasizes that semi-structured interviews are particularly effective in case studies and organizational research where complex processes are examined.

Interview Guide

- Core Themes Explored:
 - Leadership in Risk Management: How leaders support the implementation of CAPs.
 - Training Program Effectiveness: The impact of training on employee performance and risk awareness.
 - Challenges in Implementing Competency Frameworks: Barriers to successful adoption, such as resistance to change and resource constraints.
- Question Examples:
 - "Can you describe a situation where a Competency Assurance Program led to a measurable improvement in safety performance?"
 - "What are the main challenges in aligning competency training with risk management objectives?"

Participant Selection

- Sampling Method: Purposive sampling is used to select 15-20 key informants who have direct experience with competency assurance and risk management.
- Target Participants: Include safety managers, training coordinators, HR professionals, and risk management experts.

- Justification: These participants are expected to provide expert insights into how CAPs influence safety and compliance outcomes, which is critical for validating the study's theoretical framework.

Data Collection Tools

- Audio Recordings: Interviews are recorded to ensure accuracy and completeness of the data.
- Transcription and Analysis: NVivo software is used to transcribe interviews and perform thematic analysis, helping identify key patterns and themes in the qualitative data.
- Thematic Analysis: The data will be coded into categories such as competency development, leadership support, training challenges, and risk management strategies (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Data Analysis Methods

The data analysis phase of this study involves applying both quantitative and qualitative methods to gain a comprehensive understanding of how Competency Assurance (IV) influences Risk Reduction (DV) within Saudi Aramco. By utilizing advanced statistical tools and thematic analysis techniques, the research aims to provide empirical evidence supporting the proposed theoretical model. The combination of descriptive, inferential, and qualitative analyses ensures a robust approach to validating the research hypotheses.

1. Quantitative Data Analysis

Introduction:

The quantitative analysis focuses on identifying statistical relationships between competency assurance practices and risk management outcomes. By employing advanced statistical techniques, this study aims to quantify the impact of CAPs on safety performance, operational efficiency, and compliance with regulatory standards.

1.1 Statistical Tools

- SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences):
 - Usage: SPSS will be utilized for both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses.

- Functions: The software supports data cleaning, frequency analysis, correlation analysis, and advanced statistical testing, providing a comprehensive toolkit for hypothesis testing (Pallant, 2020).
- AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structures):
 - Purpose: AMOS is particularly useful for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), enabling the study to assess the causal relationships between competency assurance, training effectiveness, and risk reduction.
 - Application: The SEM approach allows for testing both direct and indirect effects, contributing to a more detailed understanding of the proposed theoretical model (Byrne, 2016).

1.2 Descriptive Analysis

- Objective: To summarize the dataset and establish a baseline understanding of competency levels and risk profiles within the organization.
- Statistical Measures:
 - Frequency Distributions: To visualize the distribution of responses regarding competency assurance practices.
 - Mean and Standard Deviation: Provide insights into the central tendency and variability of data, particularly in training effectiveness scores.
 - Variance Analysis: Helps identify differences in competency assurance impacts across various departments (Fowler, 2014).

1.3 Inferential Analysis

- Multiple Regression Analysis:
 - Purpose: To test the primary hypothesis that Competency Assurance (IV) significantly influences Risk Reduction (DV).
 - Application: By using multiple regression, the study can determine the strength and nature of this relationship, considering control variables such as job role, experience level, and department affiliation (Hair et al., 2019).
- ANOVA (Analysis of Variance):

- Use Case: ANOVA will be applied to compare risk outcomes between different competency assurance frameworks.
- Benefit: This method is particularly effective in assessing whether varied training models lead to significantly different safety and compliance results.
- Chi-Square Test for Independence:
 - Objective: To examine the association between structured competency frameworks and compliance with safety standards.
 - Expected Outcome: A significant chi-square statistic would indicate a strong link between competency assessments and regulatory compliance performance (Field, 2018).
- Structural Equation Modeling (SEM):
 - Application: SEM will be used to validate the theoretical model, demonstrating the causal relationship between competency assurance, training effectiveness, and risk reduction.
 - Model Fit Indicators: The study will report Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) to ensure the model's validity (Byrne, 2016).

2. Qualitative Data Analysis

Introduction:

The qualitative data analysis involves a thematic analysis of interview transcripts, aimed at identifying recurring themes related to competency development, training impacts on risk management, and the role of leadership in fostering a risk-aware culture. This approach enables the study to capture contextual insights that complement the quantitative findings, offering a holistic view of the research problem.

2.1 Thematic Analysis

- Software Tool: NVivo will be used for data management, coding, and theme development. This software facilitates the systematic analysis of qualitative data, enhancing the reliability of thematic interpretation (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013).

- Key Themes Explored:
 - Competency Development Practices: How CAPs influence employee performance and risk management behaviors.
 - Impact of Training on Risk Management: Specific examples of risk mitigation achieved through competency-based training.
 - Role of Leadership: How leaders promote a risk-aware culture by supporting competency initiatives.

2.2 Coding Process

- Open Coding:
 - Objective: To identify broad themes by examining raw data without preconceived categories.
 - Example: Statements like *"Our training programs significantly reduce safety incidents"* would be coded under training effectiveness.
- Axial Coding:
 - Purpose: To establish connections between themes, such as linking competency assurance with organizational safety culture.
 - Method: Analyzing how frequent training assessments correlate with reduced compliance failures.
- Selective Coding:
 - Focus: On core themes that directly align with the research objectives, such as the impact of CAPs on safety performance.
 - Outcome: Development of a theoretical narrative demonstrating how competency frameworks contribute to risk management effectiveness (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Validity and Reliability Measures

Ensuring validity and reliability is crucial in enhancing the credibility and generalizability of research findings. This study employs rigorous methods to validate the quantitative data collection instruments and maintain the reliability of qualitative data. By integrating content and construct validity, internal consistency tests, and member checking, the research aims to produce robust and trustworthy results.

1. Quantitative Data Validity

Introduction:

Validity in quantitative research refers to the degree to which a tool measures what it is intended to measure. In this study, validity measures focus on ensuring that the survey instrument effectively captures competency assurance practices and risk reduction outcomes.

1.1 Content Validity

- Definition: Content validity involves evaluating whether the survey items comprehensively cover the constructs of competency assurance and risk reduction.
- Methodology:
 - The questionnaire design will undergo an expert review process, involving subject matter experts (SMEs) in competency management and risk assessment.
 - The experts will assess whether the survey questions align with the research objectives and theoretical constructs.
 - A content validity index (CVI) will be calculated to quantify expert agreement, targeting a CVI score above 0.8, which indicates high content validity (Lynn, 1986).
- Application Example:
 - Questions related to Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs) will be reviewed to ensure they reflect real-world practices in high-risk industries such as Saudi Aramco.
 - Items measuring risk reduction will be evaluated against standardized safety metrics, including incident rates and compliance performance.

1.2 Construct Validity

- Definition: Construct validity assesses whether the survey accurately measures the theoretical constructs it intends to measure, such as competency assurance and risk management effectiveness.
- Method:
 - Factor Analysis: Conducted using SPSS, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) will identify whether survey items group into expected factors, such as competency development and risk reduction practices.
 - Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA): Implemented through AMOS software, CFA will validate the factor structure and assess the model fit using indices like CFI, GFI, and RMSEA (Byrne, 2016).
- Expected Outcome:
 - A strong model fit would confirm that survey questions are effectively capturing key constructs, supporting the validity of the quantitative measures.

2. Quantitative Reliability

Introduction:

Reliability refers to the consistency of measurement, indicating whether the survey instrument produces stable results over time. This study employs internal consistency measures to ensure that quantitative data is reliable and repeatable.

Cronbach's Alpha Test

- Definition: Cronbach's alpha evaluates the internal consistency of survey items, ensuring that they measure the same construct cohesively.
- Target Score: The study aims for a Cronbach's alpha coefficient above 0.7, indicating acceptable reliability (Field, 2018).
- Implementation:
 - SPSS software will calculate the alpha score for each survey section, including competency assurance measures, risk management outcomes, and training effectiveness.
 - If any survey items significantly reduce the alpha score, they will be revised or removed to improve reliability.

- Significance:
 - An alpha score between 0.7 and 0.9 is considered good, while above 0.9 indicates excellent internal consistency, enhancing the credibility of the findings (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

3. Qualitative Data Reliability

Introduction:

In qualitative research, reliability focuses on the accuracy and consistency of the data interpretation process. This study employs member checking and triangulation methods to validate interview findings and support thematic analysis.

3.1 Member Checking

- Definition: Member checking involves asking interview participants to review transcripts of their responses to ensure accuracy and authenticity.
- Process:
 - Participants will be provided with written transcripts of their interviews and invited to confirm or clarify statements.
 - Any discrepancies identified by participants will be corrected before data analysis.
- Objective:
 - This method ensures that the qualitative data truly reflects participants' perspectives, enhancing the trustworthiness of the findings (Birt et al., 2016).

3.2 Triangulation

- Definition: Triangulation involves comparing qualitative data with quantitative survey results and organizational records to validate the research findings.
- Types of Triangulation Used:
 - Data Triangulation: Cross-referencing interview insights with survey data to verify that qualitative themes align with quantitative trends.
 - Methodological Triangulation: Combining interview data, survey results, and document analysis (e.g., safety incident reports) to ensure comprehensive analysis.

- Expected Benefit:
 - Triangulation enhances the credibility of qualitative data by providing multiple perspectives on competency assurance impacts on risk management.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations are critical in ensuring that research is conducted with **integrity, respect, and accountability**. This study adheres to established **ethical guidelines** to protect **participants' rights**, maintain **data confidentiality**, and comply with **institutional and national standards**. By incorporating **informed consent, confidentiality protocols, and compliance with ethical standards**, the research upholds the **highest ethical standards** throughout the **data collection and analysis process**.

1. Informed Consent

Definition:

Informed consent involves providing participants with **comprehensive information** about the study, enabling them to make a **voluntary and informed decision** about their participation (Resnik, 2020). This process ensures that participants understand the **purpose of the research, how their data will be used**, and their **rights** within the study.

Implementation:

- **Information Provided:**
 - **Research Purpose:** Participants will receive a **clear explanation** of the study's objectives, specifically its focus on evaluating the impact of **Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** on **risk management outcomes** within **Saudi Aramco**.
 - **Data Usage:** Information on how **survey responses** and **interview data** will contribute to the **study findings**, including **statistical analysis** and **thematic interpretation**.
 - **Rights of Participants:**
 - **Right to Withdraw:** Participants will be informed that they can **withdraw at any time** without **penalty** or **negative consequences**.
 - **Voluntary Participation:** Participation is **not mandatory**, and participants can choose to **skip questions** they are **uncomfortable answering**.

- **Consent Process:**

- Participants will sign a **written consent form**, which will outline their **rights** and the **study's procedures**.
- The consent form will include **contact information** for the **research team** and the **Institutional Review Board (IRB)** for any **questions or concerns**.
- The study will ensure that **consent forms** are available in **both English and Arabic**, accommodating the **diverse linguistic background** of participants.

2. Confidentiality Protocols

Definition:

Confidentiality involves protecting **participants' identities** and ensuring that **personal data** is not **disclosed without permission**. This study adopts **strict confidentiality measures** to maintain **data security** and **participant anonymity** (Sieber, 2013).

Data Anonymization:

- **Anonymization Techniques:**

- Assigning **unique identification codes** to participants instead of using **names** or **personal identifiers**.
- Redacting any **identifiable information** from **interview transcripts** and **survey responses** before **analysis**.

- **Storage and Access:**

- **Audio recordings** and **transcripts** will be stored in **encrypted digital formats** on **password-protected devices**.
- **Access to raw data** will be **restricted to authorized research personnel only**, ensuring **controlled data handling**.
- Physical documents, such as **signed consent forms**, will be stored in a **locked cabinet** within a **secure facility**.

- **Data Reporting:**

- When reporting **qualitative data**, the study will use **generic descriptors** (e.g., *Safety Manager A* or *HR Professional B*) to maintain **anonymity**.

- **Quantitative results** will be presented in **aggregate form**, avoiding any **data segmentation** that could lead to the **identification of individual participants**.

3. Compliance with Ethical Standards

Introduction:

The study will adhere to **ethical guidelines** established by the **Institutional Review Board (IRB)** and **Saudi research ethics standards**, ensuring compliance with **local and international ethical principles** such as **beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice** (Belmont Report, 1979).

Key Ethical Guidelines Followed:

- **IRB Approval:**
 - The research proposal, including **study design, methodology, and ethical considerations**, will be **reviewed and approved** by the **IRB** to ensure it meets **ethical standards**.
 - The IRB will assess **potential risks to participants** and validate that the **informed consent process** is **comprehensive and transparent**.
- **Adherence to Saudi Ethical Standards:**
 - The study will align with the **Saudi National Committee of Bioethics (NCBE)** guidelines, which emphasize **participant welfare, confidentiality, and ethical data management practices**.
 - The research will also follow **institution-specific policies** related to **participant engagement, data storage, and research integrity**.
- **Ethical Research Practices:**
 - **Avoiding Coercion:** Ensuring that **participants are not pressured** into participating, particularly when recruitment involves **organizational channels** within **Saudi Aramco**.
 - **Minimizing Harm:** The study design incorporates strategies to **mitigate risks**, including offering **support resources** if **participants experience discomfort** during **interviews or surveys**.

4. Monitoring and Mitigation of Ethical Risks

- **Regular Ethical Reviews:**

- Throughout the study, the research team will conduct **periodic ethical assessments** to ensure continued **adherence to ethical protocols**.
- **Amendments to procedures** (e.g., in response to participant feedback) will be reviewed by the **IRB** to maintain **ethical compliance**.
- **Handling Ethical Dilemmas:**
 - The study will establish **guidelines** for managing **unanticipated ethical issues**, such as how to respond if a **participant discloses sensitive information** related to **workplace safety violations**.
 - In such cases, the **research team** will follow a **pre-defined protocol** that respects **confidentiality** while addressing **mandatory reporting requirements**.

Anticipated Limitations

Every research study has inherent **limitations** that may impact the **validity, reliability, and generalizability** of its findings. Identifying these **anticipated limitations** and implementing **mitigation strategies** enhances the **credibility** of the research. This study on **Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** and **Risk Reduction** within **Saudi Aramco** acknowledges potential **sampling bias, data interpretation challenges, and limitations in generalizability**. By proactively addressing these limitations, the study aims to provide **robust and applicable insights** for **high-risk industries**.

1. Sampling Bias

Definition:

Sampling bias occurs when certain **groups of participants** are **overrepresented** or **underrepresented** in the study sample, potentially leading to **skewed results** that do not accurately reflect the **target population** (Fowler, 2014).

Potential Causes of Sampling Bias:

- **Non-Response Bias:**
 - **Risk:** If certain participants choose **not to respond**, their perspectives might not be captured, impacting the **representativeness of the data**.
 - **Example:** Employees with **negative experiences** regarding **CAPs** may avoid participation, resulting in **positive bias** in the findings.

- **Selection Bias:**

- **Risk:** When the **selection process** favors certain participants, leading to **unintended biases**.
- **Example:** If only **managers and supervisors** participate, insights from **frontline employees** who directly experience **training programs** might be **missed**.

Mitigation Strategies:

- **Follow-Up Communications:**

- **Approach:** Send **reminder emails** and **follow-up calls** to encourage **non-responders** to participate.
- **Benefit:** Helps achieve a **balanced response rate**, reducing **non-response bias**.

- **Randomization Techniques:**

- **Method:** Implement **stratified random sampling** to ensure **proportionate representation** from **different departments** within **Saudi Aramco** (**safety, operations, training, and HR**).
- **Expected Outcome:** **Random sampling** minimizes **selection bias** by giving all eligible participants an **equal chance** of selection (**Pallant, 2020**).

2. Data Interpretation Challenges

Definition:

Qualitative research often involves **subjective interpretation**, where **researcher bias** or **misinterpretation of responses** could influence the **findings**. Such challenges are common when analyzing **semi-structured interviews** to explore **competency assurance practices** and **risk management strategies**.

Risks Associated with Qualitative Data:

- **Subjectivity in Analysis:**

- **Challenge:** Interview responses can be **interpreted differently**, leading to **inconsistent coding** or **biased thematic analysis**.
- **Example:** When participants discuss **leadership's role in promoting a risk-aware culture**, subjective interpretations could affect **data categorization**.

- **Inconsistent Coding:**
 - **Issue:** Without a **structured approach**, coding could result in **overlapping or unclear themes**, affecting the **clarity of the results**.

Mitigation Strategies:

- **Systematic Coding Using NVivo:**
 - **Software Tool:** NVivo provides **structured methods** for coding and analyzing **qualitative data**, supporting **thematic analysis** through:
 - **Open Coding:** Initial identification of **broad themes**.
 - **Axial Coding:** Establishing **relationships between themes**, such as **competency development** and **safety culture**.
 - **Selective Coding:** Focusing on **core themes** that align with the **research objectives** (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013).
- **Peer Review of Analysis:**
 - **Approach:** Engage **multiple researchers** in the **coding process** to reduce **individual bias**.
 - **Benefit:** Achieves a **consensus approach**, enhancing the **objectivity of qualitative findings**.
- **Member Checking:**
 - **Method:** Share **interview transcripts** with participants to **validate the accuracy** of interpretations.
 - **Outcome:** Ensures that the **findings accurately reflect participants' perspectives**, contributing to **data credibility** (Birt et al., 2016).

3. Generalizability of Findings

Definition:

Generalizability refers to the extent to which the **study findings** can be **applied to broader contexts** beyond the **specific research setting**. Since this study is focused on **Saudi Aramco**, there are limitations in **applying the findings to other industries** or **geographical regions** without **contextual adaptation**.

Challenges in Generalizability:

- **Industry-Specific Context:**
 - **Issue:** Competency assurance practices in **Saudi Aramco** are tailored to the **oil and gas sector**, which might differ from practices in **construction, healthcare, or manufacturing**.
- **Cultural and Organizational Differences:**
 - **Risk:** Strategies that work within **Saudi Arabia's corporate environment** may not directly translate to **international settings** or **different organizational cultures**.

Mitigation Strategies:

- **Contextual Analysis:**
 - **Approach:** Provide a **detailed contextual background** in the study, highlighting **specific organizational factors** that influence the **effectiveness of CAPs**.
 - **Benefit:** Helps other researchers and practitioners **adapt the findings** to **similar environments** with **appropriate modifications**.
- **Comparative Studies:**
 - **Future Research Recommendation:** Conduct **comparative studies** in **other high-risk industries** to assess the **transferability of competency assurance models** and identify **best practices** applicable across **different contexts**.
- **Transparent Reporting:**
 - **Method:** Clearly **acknowledge the study's scope** and **limitations** in the **discussion section**, guiding readers on how to **interpret and apply the findings** appropriately (Yin, 2018).

Expected Outcomes

The **expected outcomes** of this study are focused on demonstrating the **impact of structured Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** on **risk management outcomes** within **Saudi Aramco**. By integrating **quantitative statistical analysis** with **qualitative insights**, the research aims to provide **evidence-based findings** that support the **theoretical model** linking **competency assurance** to **improved safety, compliance, and organizational resilience**.

1. Quantitative Analysis: Anticipated Results

Introduction:

The **quantitative analysis** will assess the **relationship between competency assurance (IV) and risk management outcomes (DV)** using **advanced statistical methods**. The study hypothesizes a **statistically significant positive correlation**, indicating that **structured competency frameworks** lead to **measurable improvements** in **safety performance, operational efficiency, and compliance levels**.

1.1 Expected Statistical Significance

- **Hypothesis Testing:**
 - The study will test the hypothesis that **competency assurance significantly influences risk reduction**, with an expected **p-value of <0.05**.
 - This threshold is widely accepted in **behavioral and social sciences**, indicating that the **results are statistically significant** and not due to **random chance** (Field, 2018).
- **Multiple Regression Analysis:**
 - The **regression model** is expected to show a **strong positive correlation** between **competency assurance metrics** (e.g., **existence of CAPs, training effectiveness scores**) and **risk reduction indicators** (e.g., **incident rates, compliance scores**).
 - **Regression coefficients** (β values) are anticipated to demonstrate that **increases in competency assurance practices** lead to **proportional improvements** in **risk management outcomes**.

1.2 Anticipated Results in Descriptive and Inferential Statistics

- **Descriptive Statistics:**
 - The study expects to find **high mean scores** on **competency assurance practices** among **Saudi Aramco employees**, suggesting **strong adoption of CAPs**.
 - **Standard deviation and variance analysis** will likely indicate **consistent competency levels** across **departments**, supporting the **effectiveness of structured training programs**.
- **ANOVA (Analysis of Variance):**

- The **ANOVA test** is expected to reveal **significant differences** in **risk management outcomes** between **departments** with **varied competency assurance models**.
- For instance, **safety departments** with **advanced CAPs** might report **lower incident rates** compared to **departments** with **less structured competency programs**.
- **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM):**
 - **SEM analysis** is anticipated to validate the **theoretical model**, showing a **direct causal link** between **competency assurance**, **training effectiveness**, and **risk reduction**.
 - The study aims for **model fit indices** such as **CFI** and **GFI** above **0.9**, and an **RMSEA** value **below 0.05**, indicating a **well-fitted model** (Byrne, 2016).

2. Qualitative Insights: Expected Findings

Introduction:

The **qualitative data analysis** will explore **in-depth perspectives** on how **competency assurance programs** influence **organizational safety culture** and **support risk mitigation strategies**. By analyzing **interview transcripts**, the study expects to uncover **rich, contextual data** that complements the **quantitative findings**.

2.1 Thematic Analysis: Anticipated Themes

- **Competency Development Practices:**
 - Participants are expected to highlight how **regular training assessments** and **CAPs** contribute to **improved job performance** and **risk awareness**.
 - The study anticipates finding that **structured competency frameworks** enhance **employee confidence** in **handling safety protocols** and **compliance procedures**.
- **Impact of Training on Risk Management:**
 - **Interviewees** are likely to share **specific examples** where **competency-based training** led to **measurable risk reductions**, such as **fewer safety incidents** and **enhanced compliance with ISO standards**.
 - Thematic analysis may reveal that **practical training methods**, such as **simulations** and **scenario-based learning**, are **particularly effective** in **risk mitigation**.
- **Role of Leadership in Promoting a Risk-Aware Culture:**

- The study expects to identify that **leaders who actively support CAPs** foster a **proactive safety culture**.
- **Qualitative data** may indicate that **leadership engagement** in **competency assurance initiatives** is a **key factor** in **successful risk management**.

2.2 Expected Coding Results

- **Open Coding:**
 - Preliminary coding might categorize responses into **broad themes** such as **training effectiveness, safety management, and compliance practices**.
- **Axial Coding:**
 - The analysis is expected to show **strong links** between **competency assurance** and **organizational safety culture**, indicating that **competent employees** are more likely to **adhere to safety standards**.
- **Selective Coding:**
 - Core themes are anticipated to align with the **research objectives**, particularly focusing on how **competency assurance programs** contribute to **systematic risk reduction**.

3. Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

Mixed-Methods Interpretation:

- **Convergence of Results:**
 - **Quantitative data** showing a **positive correlation** between **competency assurance** and **risk management** is expected to align with **qualitative insights** that emphasize the **practical benefits of CAPs**.
 - The study aims to **triangulate data** by comparing **survey results** with **interview findings**, strengthening the **overall validity** of the research.
- **Practical Implications:**
 - The combined findings will support the **implementation of structured CAPs** in **high-risk industries**, demonstrating how **competency-based approaches** contribute to **safety enhancement** and **regulatory compliance**.

- These insights will provide **actionable recommendations** for **Saudi Aramco's management** and **policymakers** looking to **optimize workforce development strategies**.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this study defines its geographical, industry, and conceptual boundaries, ensuring a focused and comprehensive analysis of competency assurance and risk mitigation in workforce development. By concentrating on Saudi Arabian training institutes, high-risk industries, and competency-based workforce development models, this research aims to provide actionable insights for enhancing workforce competency, reducing operational risks, and improving regulatory compliance.

Geographical Scope: Training Institutes in Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia has emerged as a **global industrial hub**, particularly in **oil and gas, construction, and healthcare**. With an increasing emphasis on **workforce nationalization (Saudization)**, **safety regulations, and quality assurance**, competency assurance has become a **key priority** for training institutes.

Why Focus on Saudi Arabia?

- **Saudi Vision 2030:** The country is actively transforming its economy through workforce development initiatives. The National Industrial Development and Logistics Program (NIDLP) and the Human Capability Development Program (HCDP) highlight the need for **competency-based training**.
- **Regulatory Requirements:** Saudi labor laws and sector-specific regulations (e.g., **Saudi Aramco Safety Standards, HCIS Regulations, Saudi Commission for Health Specialties [SCFHS] certification**) mandate strict **competency assurance frameworks**.
- **Growing Training Industry:** The demand for **certified training institutes** that align with international competency standards is increasing, particularly in **safety-critical industries**.

Research Target within Saudi Arabia

- **Training Institutes:** Accredited training centers that develop workforce competencies in **oil and gas, construction, and healthcare sectors**.

- **Regulatory Bodies:** Organizations such as **Saudi Aramco, SCFHS, and the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development (HRSD)**, which enforce competency regulations.
- **Corporate Training Programs:** Companies investing in **in-house competency training** to improve employee safety and compliance.

By focusing on Saudi Arabia, this study will provide **context-specific insights**, helping local training institutes and industries adopt **competency-based risk management strategies** tailored to national needs.

Industry Scope: High-Risk Industries (Oil & Gas, Construction, Healthcare)

This study focuses on industries where **workforce competency gaps pose significant operational, safety, and financial risks**. High-risk industries require **stringent competency assurance programs** to prevent catastrophic failures, reduce liability, and ensure regulatory compliance.

1. Oil & Gas Industry

- **Risk Exposure:**
 - High potential for **industrial accidents (explosions, equipment failures, environmental hazards)**.
 - Stringent safety regulations enforced by **Saudi Aramco, OPITO, and HCIS**.
- **Competency Assurance Needs:**
 - Workers must undergo **certification programs** (e.g., OPITO for offshore safety).
 - **Technical training on hazardous material handling, emergency response, and risk assessment**.
 - Leadership training for risk-aware decision-making.

2. Construction Industry

- **Risk Exposure:**
 - High accident rates due to **falls, equipment failures, and structural collapses**.
 - Legal liability due to **non-compliance with safety codes (Saudi Building Code, OSHA)**.
- **Competency Assurance Needs:**

- **Safety training (CITB, NEBOSH) to prevent workplace injuries.**
- **Site supervisor competency programs** to ensure project risk mitigation.
- Training in **hazard identification, risk assessment, and crisis response.**

3. Healthcare Industry

- **Risk Exposure:**
 - **Medical errors, patient safety risks, and regulatory non-compliance.**
 - Impact of **workforce competency** on mortality rates, patient care, and ethical compliance.
- **Competency Assurance Needs:**
 - **Medical licensing and competency certification (SCFHS).**
 - Simulation-based training for **emergency medical procedures.**
 - **Leadership training for hospital risk management.**

By analyzing these industries, this study will highlight how **competency-based workforce training contributes to risk reduction**, ensuring that training institutes **align their programs with industry-specific risk management needs.**

Conceptual Scope: Competency Assurance, Risk Management, Training Effectiveness

This study is conceptually framed around **three core areas:**

1. Competency Assurance

- Defined as the process of **certifying that employees possess the skills, knowledge, and behavior required to perform job roles effectively.**
- Focuses on structured **Competency Assurance Programs (CAPs)** used in high-risk industries.
- Examines best practices in **competency frameworks, skills assessments, and certification models** (e.g., OPITO, NEBOSH, ICAO).

2. Risk Management in Workforce Development

- Evaluates how **workforce competency gaps** contribute to **operational, financial, and compliance risks.**

- Identifies risk reduction strategies through **competency-based learning, training audits, and industry benchmarking.**
- Explores the **integration of competency assurance with risk assessment models (ISO 31000, FMEA, ALARP).**

3. Training Effectiveness

- Measures how **training institutes structure competency-based learning to enhance workforce preparedness.**
- Analyzes the effectiveness of **traditional training vs. competency-based training models.**
- Explores innovations in **learning technologies (e-learning, VR simulations, AI-based training analytics).**

By focusing on **these conceptual areas**, this study aims to provide a **comprehensive framework** that guides **training institutes, corporate HR, and industry regulators in implementing competency-based risk management strategies.**

References

Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVivo*. SAGE Publications.

- Provides insights into **thematic analysis techniques** using **NVivo software**.

Belmont Report. (1979). *Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research.

- Establishes **ethical guidelines** for **informed consent** and **participant rights**.

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). *Member Checking: A Tool to Enhance Trustworthiness or Merely a Nod to Validation? Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1802–1811.

- Discusses the use of **member checking** to enhance the **credibility of qualitative research**.

Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. Routledge.

- Provides a comprehensive guide to using **AMOS** for **SEM analysis**.

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. SAGE Publications.

- Covers **statistical methods** including **regression analysis**, **ANOVA**, and **reliability testing**.

Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.

- Offers strategies for **avoiding sampling bias** and **improving response rates** in **quantitative research**.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. SAGE Publications.

- Discusses advanced **SEM techniques** used to analyze **competency assurance impact** on **risk management**.

ISO (2018). *ISO 31000: Risk Management – Guidelines*. International Organization for Standardization.

- Details the **risk management framework** used as a **benchmark** for evaluating **compliance performance**.

Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

- Introduces the **Kirkpatrick Model** for **evaluating training effectiveness**, applied in measuring **CAP impact**.

Lynn, M. R. (1986). *Determination and Quantification of Content Validity*. *Nursing Research*, 35(6), 382-385.

- Explains **content validity techniques** including the **Content Validity Index (CVI)**.

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step-by-Step Guide to Data Analysis Using IBM SPSS*. McGraw-Hill Education.

- A practical guide to **statistical analysis** using **SPSS**, focusing on **data interpretation** and **hypothesis testing**.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. SAGE Publications.

- Describes methods for **semi-structured interviews** and **qualitative data analysis**, including **triangulation**.

Resnik, D. B. (2020). *Research Ethics: A Philosophical Guide to the Responsible Conduct of Research*. Cambridge University Press.

- Outlines the **ethical principles** applied in the **informed consent process** and **confidentiality protocols**.

Sieber, J. E. (2013). *The Ethics of Social Research: Surveys and Experiments*. Springer.

- Discusses **confidentiality practices** and **ethical considerations** in **social science research**.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). *Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha*. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55.

- Explores **Cronbach's alpha** as a measure of **internal consistency** in **survey instruments**.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. SAGE Publications.

- Provides guidelines for **case study research**, including **methods to enhance generalizability**.

API List

AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structures)

- **Purpose:** Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) for assessing causal relationships between variables.
- **Application:** Used to validate the theoretical model linking **Competency Assurance** and **Risk Reduction**.

ISO (International Organization for Standardization)

- **Standard Referenced:** ISO 31000 (Risk Management)
- **Application:** Provides guidelines for integrating **competency assurance** into **risk management frameworks**.

NVivo

- **Purpose:** Qualitative data analysis software for **thematic analysis**.
- **Application:** Utilized for coding **interview transcripts** and identifying **recurring themes** related to **competency development** and **organizational safety culture**.

OPITO (Offshore Petroleum Industry Training Organization)

- **Role:** Sets industry standards for **competency assurance** in the **oil and gas sector**.
- **Application:** Benchmarked in the study as an example of **effective CAP implementation**.

SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences)

- **Purpose:** Tool for **descriptive and inferential statistical analysis**.
- **Application:** Used for **frequency analysis, regression analysis, ANOVA, and Chi-square tests**.

Appendix

Appendix A: Research Instruments

1. Survey Questionnaire

- A structured survey instrument with closed-ended questions.
- Sections included:
 - Competency Assurance Measures: Questions about the presence of CAPs, frequency of training, and assessment methods.
 - Risk Management Outcomes: Items measuring safety performance, operational efficiency, and compliance levels.
 - Demographic Data: Capturing job role, experience level, and department affiliation.
- Survey Design: Used a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)).
- Distribution Method: Administered digitally through email invitations and online survey platforms.

Appendix B: Interview Materials

1. Interview Guide

- Semi-structured interview format with open-ended questions.
- Focused on themes such as:
 - Leadership in Risk Management.
 - Training Program Effectiveness.
 - Challenges in Implementing Competency Frameworks.
- Sample interview questions included:
 - *"Can you describe how competency assurance programs impact safety culture in your department?"*
 - *"What are the main challenges in maintaining compliance with safety standards?"*

2. Consent Form for Interviews

- Included information on research objectives, confidentiality measures, and voluntary participation.
- Participants signed the consent form before interviews began, in line with ethical standards.

Appendix C: Data Collection Tools

1. Quantitative Data Tools

- SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences): Used for descriptive and inferential statistics.

- AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structures): Employed for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to assess the causal relationship between competency assurance and risk reduction.

2. Qualitative Data Tools

- NVivo Software: Utilized for thematic analysis of interview transcripts.
- Thematic analysis involved:
 - Open Coding: Generating initial codes from raw data.
 - Axial Coding: Identifying relationships between themes.
 - Selective Coding: Focusing on core themes that align with research objectives.

Appendix D: Ethical Documentation

1. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval

- Approval documentation confirming the study's compliance with ethical guidelines and research standards.

2. Confidentiality Agreement

- Detailed procedures for maintaining participant anonymity and data security.
- Included steps for data anonymization, secure storage, and controlled access.

3. Informed Consent Forms

- Copies of the informed consent forms provided to participants.
- Outlined the study purpose, voluntary nature of participation, and right to withdraw at any time.

Appendix E: Data Analysis Outputs

1. SPSS and AMOS Output

- Includes statistical outputs such as:
 - Descriptive statistics: Mean, standard deviation, frequency distributions.
 - Inferential tests: Results from regression analysis, ANOVA, Chi-square tests, and SEM.

2. NVivo Analysis Reports

- Thematic analysis outputs, showing coded data and emerging themes.
- Examples of coded themes:
 - Competency Development Practices.
 - Impact of Training on Risk Management.
 - Role of Leadership in Safety Culture.

3. Visual Data Representations

- Graphs and charts illustrating:
 - Competency assurance levels across departments.
 - Correlation between training programs and risk reduction metrics.
 - Thematic maps showing qualitative analysis results.

Appendix F: Supplementary Information

1. Company Policies and Guidelines

- Overview of Saudi Aramco's competency assurance policies, including training requirements and compliance standards.

2. Case Studies and Benchmarking Reports

- Examples of successful competency assurance programs in similar industries, highlighting best practices.

3. Supporting Literature

- A summary of key studies referenced in the literature review, including methodologies, findings, and implications for competency assurance and risk management.

Appendix G: Additional Figures and Tables

1. Statistical Tables

- Detailed tables showing:
 - Factor analysis results for survey validity.
 - Regression coefficients demonstrating the impact of CAPs on safety outcomes.

2. Thematic Analysis Charts

- Visual charts generated from NVivo software, displaying theme frequency and connections between competency assurance and organizational safety culture.

3. Model Fit Indices

- SEM model fit statistics, including:
 - Goodness of Fit Index (GFI).
 - Comparative Fit Index (CFI).
 - Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA).

List of Abbreviations

Research and Statistical Methods

- AMOS: Analysis of Moment Structures
- ANOVA: Analysis of Variance
- CFI: Comparative Fit Index
- GFI: Goodness of Fit Index
- IRB: Institutional Review Board
- RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
- SEM: Structural Equation Modeling
- SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

2. Competency and Training Programs

- CAP: Competency Assurance Program
- CITB: Construction Industry Training Board
- CPD: Continuous Professional Development
- FMEA: Failure Modes and Effects Analysis
- OPITO: Offshore Petroleum Industry Training Organization
- SCFHS: Saudi Commission for Health Specialties
- TNA: Training Needs Analysis

3. Risk Management and Safety Standards

- ALARP: As Low As Reasonably Practicable
- BCP: Business Continuity Planning
- HCIS: High Commission for Industrial Security
- ISO: International Organization for Standardization
- LTIFR: Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate
- NEBOSH: National Examination Board in Occupational Safety and Health
- NIDLP: National Industrial Development and Logistics Program
- OSHA: Occupational Safety and Health Administration

4. Technology and Innovation

- AI: Artificial Intelligence
- AR: Augmented Reality
- LMS: Learning Management System
- VR: Virtual Reality

5. Governmental and Institutional Programs

- HCDP: Human Capability Development Program
- HRSD: Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development
- ICAO: International Civil Aviation Organization