



AENSI Journals

Advances in Environmental Biology

Journal home page: <http://www.aensiweb.com/aeb.html>

Comparative Study on Quality Awards

¹Fazlollah Agamohamadi Basmenj, ²Shahryar Sorooshian, ³Yusof Ismaiel

¹Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University Putra Malaysia, 43300, Malaysia

²Department of Technology Management, University Malaysia Pahang, 26300, Malaysia

³Department of Manufacturing Engineering, International Islamic University Malaysia, 50728, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 10 September 2013

Received in revised form 13 November 2013

Accepted 23 November 2013

Available online 6 January 2014

Key words:

Quality award, Malaysia, Comparative study, quality management

ABSTRACT

Background: quality awards are known as one of the research interests in quality management sector. **Objective:** This study tries to compare quality awards. **Results:** In the first part we focused on Malaysian quality award, aim to introduce it as one of the successful quality awards systems. Then in the next phase of the paper we try to review the joint points and differences of the quality awards. **Conclusion:** Last section of this paper concludes the comparative study to improve quality awareness in the present increasing competitive world..

© 2013 AENSI Publisher All rights reserved.

To Cite This Article: Fazlollah Agamohamadi Basmenj, Shahryar Sorooshian, Yusof Ismaiel., Comparative Study on Quality Awards. *Adv. Environ. Biol.*, 7(13), 4032-4034, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Six quality awards have been introduced in the Malaysian public sector, which include the quality management circles quality award 1984; Native authority quality award 1993; Prime Minister's quality award 1990; finance ministry's secretary general quality award 2001; public service quality award 1992; and district workplace quality award 1992. Of all the awards the Prime Ministers' quality award is seen as the best and most recognized amongst them [1].

Seven criteria have been used as the basis for the Prime Ministers' award, these include (a) the use of information and information in management quality as a reference to the use of data quality and data for achieving quality improvement. (b) The use of human resources in reference to corporations effectiveness in their human resources management, in areas such as workers involvement, workers management, workers recognition, workers development and surrounding dealings. (c) Leadership in quality management in reference to management team roles in the initiative standard management mobilization and different connected programs. (d) Upcoming strategic method in reference to the intelligent method for the upcoming standard for organizational upcoming strategy. (e) Innovation quality improvement project in reference to the achievement of quality programs within the current year compared to years in the past, which were mostly based on the output quality innovation and client recognition. (f) Satisfaction of client in reference to the functions carried out to promote customers satisfaction. (g) Output of quality assurance in reference to the measures undertaken by a corporation to assume output standard in terms of quality procedures, documentation and quality audit [1].

Comparative Study:

Every award has its famous classes and stress which are common areas [2] (a) every model award is comprised of 2 parts: implementation of total quality management i.e. the enablers; the reverse may be that the total results of business occur

(b) Leadership importance were the main emphasis of all the three award models; employee education and coaching, information policy and strategy management method, client focus and quality management provider [3].

According to analysis of comparative regional and natural quality awards, Vokurka et al., [4], found important similarities within the criteria used for candidate award access. One reason was that countries that seek to prove national quality awards look towards the established awards as model for the management of total quality [5]. Different awards are different in structure and content however, there are certain value sets and principles that they share in common. According to Chuan and Shortly [5] criteria for analyzing major seven; out of the seventeen quality national awards (NQAs) around the world include strategic and planning;

Corresponding Author: Fazlollah Agamohamadi Basmenj, Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, University Putra Malaysia, 43300, Malaysia.
E-mail: f_agamohamadi@yahoo.com

leadership; data analysis; individual management; quality system and practices; resources; client or market focus; individual satisfaction; provider partner relationship; impact on society and results. Majority of these national quality awards as their association suggests showed were modeled in line with the most notable three powerful quality awards: Deming price MBNQA and EQA. Although differences exist among these national quality awards models, normally the representative standard for each national award is comparable [6]. The three quality award models provide the organization with a procedure to live their position against collective general criteria, as well as identify their weaknesses and strength within the quality practice areas and business results [7]. Accessibility to management excellence was not the issue that are requested by the award models, instead they are concerned with the factors that impact on the total quality management that they provide “what to do” and do not provide “how to do” in order to achieve the target; they do not resolve a selected characteristics of the organization, which may impact on the total quality management implementation. They do not provide detailed organizational pointers for use in quality management practice improvement. All the quality management procedures are not provided for use to prevail over the organizations weaknesses. Thus some difficulties have been encountered by the organization why adopting the standard award models effectively, and enhance their management quality practices. Moreover, it is not clear the differences in quality management procedures that are regularly used to enhance the performance of organizations quality [3]. The criteria for quality award difficulty are that they only provide broad pointers and its distress to recognize that organizational results and practices are obtained from the utilization of total quality management programs. The criteria of quality award sometimes promote practices that do not seem to supply any business worth for a corporation. The existing idea was that the corporation receives profit from approaches due to total quality management; however, this conception was mainly based on believe, instead of analysis based on facts. Detailed data failed to prevail in areas that are more helpful as well as the means by which resources are brought to such areas. The data was unable to be supplied by the total quality management, even if one amongst the major practices within the discipline is that the measurement of organizational performance. Of all the areas of central management one was within the criteria award; data analysis obviously fails to supply the proof and direction for improvement for longer term of the discipline [8-11].

Conclusion:

As suggested by Thiagarajan and Zairi [12], the model for national quality award was observed as the most effective means of assessing competence and organizational capability. A country's efforts are conjointly represented to strengthen quality awareness in the present increasing competitive world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Effort and responsibility of presented information is with the first author. Research consultation and method teaching was with the second and third author based on their research area.

REFERENCES

- [1] The Malaysia Government's Official Portal., 2012. Quality Awards. Retrieved 15/6/2012, 2012, from <http://www.malaysia.gov.my/EN/Relevant%20Topics/Employment%20and%20Training/GovernmentEmployees/AwardsPromotion/QualityAwards/Pages/QualityAwards.aspx>
- [2] Sorooshian, S., 2013. Basic Developments of Quality Characteristics Monitoring, Journal of Applied Mathematics, Article ID 974340.
- [3] Zhang, Z., 2001. Implementation of Total Quality Management: An Empirical Study of Chinese Manufacturing Firms. PhD Thesis, University of Groningen, Netherlands.
- [4] Vokurka, R.J., G.L. Stading, & J. Brazeal, 2000. A comparative Analysis of National And Regional Quality Awards. Quality Progress, August, pp: 41-49.
- [5] Chuan, T.K., & L.C. Soon, 2000. A detailed trend analysis of national quality awards worldwide. Total Quality Management, 11(8): 1065-1080.
- [6] Sila, I., & M. Ebrahimpour, 2002. An investigation of the total quality management survey based research published between 1989 and 2000. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 19(7): 902-970.
- [7] Agamohamadi, F.B., M.Y. Rosnah, Z. Norzima, I. Yusof, S. Sorooshian, 2013. Modeling Approach to the Elements of TQM Practice, Advanced Material Research, 711: 719-727.
- [8] Kujala, J., 2002. Total Quality Management as Cultural Phenomena- A Conceptual Model and Empirical Illustration. doctoral dissertation, Helsinki University of Technology, Finland.
- [9] Sorooshian, S., M. Salimi, M. Salehi, N. Bekheir, S.A. Yasha, 2013. Customer Experience about Service Quality in Online Environment: A Case of Iran, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93: 1681-1695.

- [10] Salimi, M., H.R. Hadjali, S. Sorooshian, 2012. A Moderator's Perspective From Service Quality and Purchase Intentions Relationship: A Case Study of AirAsia Airlines, *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 4(23): 5074-5078.
- [11] Wong, E.H., S. Sorooshian, 2013. Service Quality and its Relationship with Customer Satisfaction, *Journal of Management and Science*, 3(4): 40-49.
- [12] Thiagarajan, T., & M. Zairi, 1997. A review of total quality management in practice: Understanding the fundamentals through examples of best practice application- Part I. *The TQM Magazine*, 9(4): 270-286.