Business Excellence Models Implementation in Saudi Nonprofit Organizations: Critical Success Factors and Key Barriers Hindering Adaptation

Osama Mohamed Salih, Sha'ri Mohd Yusof, and Rozzeta Dolah
Razak Faculty of Technology and Informatics
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
Kuala Lumper, Malaysia
Osama_salih@hotmail.com, shari@utm.my, rozzeta.kl@utm.my

Abstract

Business Excellence Models (BEMs) are widely recognized today as effective tools for improving organizational performance across different sectors. In Saudi Arabia, there has been a limited adaptation of BEMs among nonprofit organizations due to various barriers. This paper aims at developing an in-depth understanding of critical barriers hindering the adaptation of these models in Saudi nonprofit organizations. Also, it focused on identifying critical success factors for implementing BEMs in these organizations. The review of the literature has identified thirty-six (36) BEMs implementation critical success factors and fifteen (15) barriers that are typically preventing organizations from adapting BEMs. A survey was launched among nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia to assess the degree of criticality of identified factors among organizations within the sector. This study has found lack of: a culture of continuous improvement, organization strategy, qualified employees, customer orientation and, clear organizational roles and responsibilities as the top five (5) barriers for implementing BEMs in Saudi Nonprofit organizations. On the other hand, this study has also identified data analysis and reporting capabilities, effective organizational communication capabilities, the implementation strategy and approach, the use of benchmarking, and adapting a clear governance framework as the top five (5) success factors when implementing BEMs in Saudi nonprofit organizations.

Keywords
Business Excellence Models, Nonprofit Excellence, Excellence Implementation, and Saudi Arabia Nonprofit.

1.0 Introduction

In response to an increasingly competitive business environment, organizations are continuously searching for new practical tools and methods to improve their capabilities, performance, and results. In recent years Business Excellence Models (BEMs) have been adopted widely to improve performance. The application of Business Excellence (BE), through the understanding and use of BEMs criteria, concepts, and values, has broad appeal to many organizations. BEMs gained popularity in the late 1980s and the early 1990s with the launch of the Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award (MBNQA) in the USA and the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) Quality Award in Europe (Mann et al., 2011).

Successful implementation of BEMs involves many critical success factors (CSFs) that have been the subject of research for many scholars in recent years. On the other side, there are also barriers to the successful implementation of BEMs implementation initiatives. This paper aims at developing an in-depth understanding of the critical success factors for implementing BEMs as well as of the critical barriers hindering the adaptation of BEMs in the Saudi nonprofit sector.

2.0 Literature Review

Business Excellence (BE) is about strengthening and developing the management processes and systems of an organization to improve the performance and generate value for the stakeholders (Mann et al., 2011). SAI Global (2007) defines BEMs as integrated management and leadership system that explains the components necessary to sustainable business excellence. It is much above having a quality system in place and about attaining excellence in all aspects of an organization (incorporating strategy, leadership, customer focus, people, information management, techniques, and processes) and most significantly, attaining better business outcomes (Mann et al., 2011). Regardless of the different definitions used to define BEMs, the objectives and core values of most of these models are similar and focus on enhancing the competitiveness level of organizations in their respective countries (Talwar, 2009).
According to Talwar (2010), the evolution of BEMs was very much driven by the introduction of excellence awards in many countries around the world in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1984, Canada introduced the CAE Quality Award, followed by the MBNQA Award in 1987 in the United States. Subsequently, the European Quality Award was launched in 1991 based on the EFQM Excellence Model (Talwar, 2010). The wave of quality awards based on BEMs passed through most countries around the world in the period between 1994 till 2000 and onward. It is estimated that about 100 quality awards are running in 82 countries around the world, as reported by UNECE (2004).
Given the widespread of BEMs, many scholars have attempted to study them thoroughly to assess their benefits, limitations, and validity (Talwar, 2010). Regardless of the specific model used, BEMs are considered generally to be an efficient way of achieving better financial and non-financial results, as concluded by many researchers (Boulter et al., 2013; Escrig & Menezes, 2015). According to Bou-Llusar et al. (2009), organizations implementing BEMs can gain three major benefits:

- Having a holistic framework for systematically tackling many quality issues;
- Providing a tool for assessing the organization's current performance level and planning improvement initiatives; and
- Providing a mechanism for benchmarking the organization's performance with other similar organizations through structured and unified scoring references.

Studies conducted on winners of National Quality Awards developed based on BEMs showed that better market share, increased sales, and profit, enhanced employee satisfaction, and boost in overall competitiveness have been reported by these winner organizations (Lakhe and Mohanty, 1994; Hendricks and Singhal, 1997).
While many researchers have concluded that implementing BEMs brings about better financial and nonfinancial results, BEMs come with many limitations that indicate they are not the solutions for all problems. Although award-winning organizations have achieved better financial results, they have not made the top results in their industries (Talwar, 2010). In a study conducted by the National Institute of Standards (NIST), 17 publicly traded MBNQA's recipients underperformed the S&P 500 list of companies. They reported an 18.5% return as compared to a 33.58% return for S&P 500.
The divide identified through reviewing the literature related to BEMs implementation has led many researchers to question what makes BEMs implementation succeed in one organization while failing in another. Generally, researches around this particular area are complicated due to the involvement of many dimensions that could impact implementation such as leadership, organizational size, industry, people engagement, organizational structure and culture, and the availability of necessary resources and infrastructure (Dahlgaard et al., 2013). Assuming the BEMs are the natural continuation of TQM, Sila, and Ebrahimpour (2003) analyzed 76 different studies focused on TQM implementation success factors. They reported 18 various factors that are most commonly found in the literature; they are:

1. Leadership and commitment of top management;
2. The focus on the customer;
3. Analysis of information;
4. Providing necessary training;
5. Supplier partnership and management;
6. Strategic planning;
7. Employee Engagement;
8. People management;
9. Focus on process management;

10. Working in teams;
11. Efficient and effective design of product and service;
12. Controlling the process;
13. Performance benchmarking;
14. Focus on continuous improvement;
15. People empowerment;
16. quality assurance;
17. social responsibility; and
18. Satisfaction of employees.

In general, scholars tend to agree that the success in implementing improvement initiatives depends more on management practices rather than on tools and techniques (Corbett & Angell, 2011). These practices may include a continuous commitment of top management, communication, and trust, motivation of employees, investment in resources, management of change, performance management, structured approach to solving problems, and standardization of analysis.

A study carried out by Assarlind and Gremyr (2013) to identify the critical factors for Quality Management initiatives based on a review of the literature. From the 59 papers reviewed, the study came up with various critical factors grouped into six categories. The factors were not necessarily unique to small and medium enterprises, but collectively they were more focused on SMEs. They were; gradual implementation using realistic goals, contextualization, involvement, and training of employees, management involvement, involvement of external support, and fact-based follow-up.
Kharub and Sharma (2015) carried out a study to determine the important precursors of quality management and develop a research framework to help SMEs in the Indian manufacturing industry to successfully implement quality management practices in their businesses. The study came up with a model that categorized the critical success factors into four classifications namely; strategic factors, operational factors, tactical factors, and quality tools and techniques. The study identified 20 critical factors that influenced how firms implemented quality practices or management initiatives. They included: Top management commitment, Quality system, Quality culture, Supplier management, Quality awards, Benchmarking, Continuous improvement, Training and Education, Employee involvement, Rewards and incentives, Information and analysis, Communication system, Customer focus, Leadership quality, Process management, Product and service design, Human resource management, Tools for reviewing current condition, Long vision, and Tools for analysis current conditions.

The study by Black and Porter (2007) came up with ten critical factors of Total Quality management and compared them to other existing approaches like the Saraph's 8-factor model and the Baldrige approach. The ten factors were:

1. Corporate quality culture
2. Strategic quality management
3. Quality improvement measurement systems
4. People and customer management
5. External interface management
6. operational quality planning
7. Supplier partnerships
8. Teamwork structures
9. Customer satisfaction orientation
10. Communication of improvement information

Looking at the topic of BEMs implementation from the other side through studying failure cases has revealed almost the same conclusion, i.e., lack of success factors mentioned above led to the failure of BEMs implementation initiatives. Ahire et al., (1995) and Soltani et al., (2005) identified the followings as the main factors associated with BEMs implementation failure:

- Lack of commitment and engagement of top management;
- Lack of clarity in vision;
- Lack of planning;
- Limited availability of necessary resources;
- Inadequate change management;
- Overloading employee with work;

- lack of required training and education;
- lack of customer focus;
- lack systems for measuring performance; and
- lack of staff empowerment and engagement

2.1 Business Excellence in the Nonprofit Sector

There is an increased tendency from Nonprofit Organizations (NPOs) towards implementing BEMs as a direct result of governments, donors, and social pressure for improved performance and sustainability of these organizations (Claeye and Jackson, 2012). In search of improving their performance and for their sustainability, NPOs have turned to different tools and management practices (Chew and Osborne, 2009; Rojas, 2000). While some NPOs have concentrated their efforts on improving individual programs, some have taken a broader perspective on overall improvement initiatives utilizing overall capacity-building strategies (Boerner, 2004). As with other tools and practices, quality has gained wide-spread in NPOs and is perceived as an essential factor in performance improvement through both efficiency and effectiveness enhancement (Herman and Renz, 1999).

Al-Tabbaa et al. (2013) addressed the applicability of BEMs within the nonprofit context through exploring the extent to which quality models are appropriate for the use of NPOs as a strategy for improving performance with the focus on the EFQM model as the most commonly used BEM in the UK. The researchers found that the EFQM model, are relevant to NPOs and can be adopted both for self-assessment as well as a tool for planning improvements.

2.2 Business Excellence in Saudi Nonprofit Sector

NPOs in Saudi Arabia are facing many challenges and issues that limit their ability to meet their primary objectives (International Center for Nonprofit Research and Studies-Medad, 2014). These issues include the lack of specialized employees working in the sector in general, the limited amount of training programs provided to employees, the lack of financial resources and financial management capabilities in many organizations within the sector, the absence of governance structures and the lack of knowledge and implementation of necessary strategic planning in these organizations; and the lack of awareness or adaptation of proper strategic planning practices.

3.0 Proposed Research and Methodology

While there have been wide adaptation and implementation of BEMs in the private sector and the nonprofit sector globally, there has been limited implementation of BEMs among Saudi NPOs. Only 50 organizations out of 1600 registered NPOs have participated in the latest cycle of the Nonprofit Excellence Award (Nonprofit Excellence Award Annual Report, 2019). This research aims at investigating and defining key barriers preventing nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia from implementing BEMs. It also looks at critical factors that can help more organizations to adapt BEMs successfully. The key research questions the study investigate are the followings:
Question 1: What are the key critical success factors for implementing BEMs in nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia?
Question 2: What are the key barriers preventing nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia from adapting BEMs?

To answer these questions, the research adopted a quantitative approach using a questionnaire as the data collection method. The questionnaire was designed in five key sections, including:

- Section 1: General information about the organization, including key demographic questions.
- Section 2: General information about the respondent.
- Section 3: Exploring the organization experience in implementing BEMs in the last twelve months.
- Section 4: Measuring the level of criticality of implementation barriers (for organizations that have not experienced any BEMs implementation initiatives).
- Section 5: Measuring the level of criticality of BEMs implementation success factors (for organizations that have experienced BEMs implementation initiative in the last twelve months).

Through the review of the literature, 15 critical implementation barriers have been identified and included in Section 4 of the questionnaire; these are (not according to sequence):

1. Lack of top management commitment
2. Limited availability of financial resources

3. The fear of change
4. High work overload
5. Lack of customer orientation
6. Lack of clear measurement system
7. Lack of qualified employees
8. Long implementation time needed
9. Lack of perceived benefits stemming from the BEMs
10. Lack of a culture of continuous improvement
11. Too prescriptive nature of BEMs
12. Lack of organization strategy
13. Lack of adequate support from BE awards custodians
14. Not having a steering group and improvement teams to drive the BE effort
15. Lack of clear organizational roles and responsibilities

Similarly, 36 different critical success factors have been identified and listed in Section 5 of the questionnaire; these are (not according to sequence):

1. High leadership capabilities of top management
2. Commitment of top management toward BE
3. Effective strategic planning capabilities
4. Employee satisfaction and engagement
5. Focus on process management
6. Focus on financial resources management
7. Change management
8. Defining and tracking key performance indicators
9. Focus on customer satisfaction
10. Focus on partners and suppliers management
11. Providing necessary financial resources for implementing BE
12. Providing necessary training
13. Efficient and effective design of product and service
14. Use of consultants
15. Right level of workload
16. Having a short implementation time
17. Setting up a steering group and improvement teams
18. Access to external resources and knowledge
19. Having a culture of continuous improvement
20. Participation in BE awards
21. Providing necessary human resources for implementation
22. Implementation strategy and approach
23. Adapting quality management systems such as IS9000
24. Data analysis and reporting capabilities
25. Effective organizational communication capabilities
26. Availability of clear vision in the organization
27. Adapting an effective and flexible organization structure
28. Clarity of roles and responsibilities in the organization
29. Having the right level of authorities
30. The use of benchmarking
31. Employee motivational and reward programs
32. Management support and encouragement to innovation culture in the organization
33. Investment and use of information technology and systems in the organization
34. Focus on customer complaints management and opinion
35. Employee opinion management and engagement in decision making
36. Adapting a clear governance framework

A draft version of the questionnaire was shared with five members of the Nonprofit Sector Committee within the Saudi Quality Council, who represent experts in both BE practices as well as the nonprofit sector. Two of the five members responded with their feedback, and the questionnaire was updated accordingly.

A five-point Likert scale was used to gauge respondents' answers to each statement under sections 4 for assessing barriers was designed as follows:
1 = Strongly not a barrier
2 = Not a barrier
3 = Somewhat a barrier
4 = a barrier
5 = Strong Barrier

On the other side, the side, a similar scale was designed and used in Section 5 as follows:
1: Strongly not Critical
2: Not Critical
3: Somewhat Critical
4: Critical
5: Strongly Critical

The questionnaire was communicated to 696 nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia initially through direct phone calls aimed at explaining the objectives of the questionnaire followed by a link to an online questionnaire delivered using popular online messaging application WhatsApp. Out of these organizations, 138 organizations responded and completed the online questionnaire with a response rate of 19.8%.

4.0 Data Validity and Reliability

Collected data were tested for validity using Pearson Product Moment Correlation utilizing SPSS statistical analysis package, as illustrated in Appendix 1 for critical success factors and Appendix 2 for barriers. Since all p-values are less than the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the questionnaire is found to be valid for both critical barriers as well as critical success factors. The data was also tested for reliability using Cronbach's Alpha, which concluded the reliability of both data groups, as illustrated in table 1.

Table 1: Reliability Test Results Using Cronbach's Alpha (Success Factors)

Critical Success Factors Reliability		**Critical Barriers Reliability**	
Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
0.971	36	0.895	15

5.0 Data Analysis and Findings

The criticality level of each factor was determined based on the results of factor analysis. The following algorithm was used:
1. The first factor was selected as the carrier of the largest percentage of variance.
2. The importance and criticality of each predictor factor was determined by the value of its coefficient in a linear combination to represent 1 of the first factor. The full results of factor analysis for the barriers and success factors are provided in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively, below.

Table 2: Criticality of barriers based on the factor analysis results

Rank	**Item**	**Weight of the item**
1	Lack of a culture of continuous improvement	0.798

2	Lack of organization strategy	0.762
3	Lack of qualified employees	0.757
4	Lack of customer orientation	0.736
5	Lack of clear organizational roles and responsibilities	0.735
6	lack of perceived benefits stemming from the BEMs	0.690
7	Lack of top management commitment	0.672
8	Lack of clear measurement system	0.657
9	The fear of change	0.605
10	Not having a steering group and improvement teams to drive the BE effort	0.594
11	Long implementation time needed	0.550
12	High work overload	0.504
13	Too prescriptive nature of BEMs	0.463
14	Lack of adequate support from BE awards custodians	0.331
15	Limited availability of financial resources	0.268

Table 3: Criticality of success factors based on the factor analysis results

Rank	**Item**	**Weight of the item**
1	Data analysis and reporting capabilities	0.858
2	Effective organizational communication capabilities	0.842
3	Implementation strategy and approach	0.839
4	Use of benchmarking	0.830
5	Adapting a clear governance framework	0.830
6	Change management	0.813
7	Focus on process management	0.807
8	Efficient and effective design of product and service	0.798
9	Providing necessary financial resources for implementing BE	0.797
10	Defining and tracking key performance indicators	0.795
11	Investment and use of information technology and systems in the organization	0.770
12	Providing necessary human resources for implementation	0.766
13	Focus on partners and suppliers management	0.760
14	Providing necessary training	0.755
15	Focus on financial resources management	0.744
16	Having a culture of continuous improvement	0.735
17	Employee motivational and reward programs	0.733
18	Focus on customer satisfaction	0.729
19	Setting up a steering group and improvement teams	0.726

20	Effective strategic planning capabilities	0.721
21	Availability of clear vision in the organization	0.721
22	Use of consultants	0.715
23	Commitment of top management toward BE	0.712
24	Management support and encouragement to innovation culture in the organization	0.673
25	High leadership capabilities of top management	0.663
26	Focus on customer complaints management and opinion	0.660
27	Employee satisfaction and engagement	0.656
28	Clarity of roles and responsibilities in the organization	0.654
29	Adapting an effective and flexible organization structure	0.636
30	Access to external resources and knowledge	0.633
31	Employee opinion management and engagement in decision making	0.622
32	Participation in BE awards	0.621
33	Adapting quality management systems such as IS9000	0.613
34	Having the right level of authorities	0.576
35	Right level of workload	0.566
36	Having a short implementation time	0.419

6.0 Discussion

The results of this research identified the top 5 barriers hindering nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia from adapting BEMs are the followings:

1. The lack of a culture of continuous improvement
2. The lack of organization strategy
3. Lack of qualified employees
4. Lack of customer orientation
5. The lack of clear organizational roles and responsibilities

On the other side, the research results concluded that the top 5 success factors for implementing BEMs in nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia are:

1. Data analysis and reporting capabilities
2. Effective organizational communication capabilities
3. The implementation strategy and approach
4. The use of benchmarking
5. Adapting a clear governance framework

References

Ahire, S. L., Landeros, R. and Golhar, D. Y., Total Quality Management: A literature review and an agenda for future research", *Production and Operations Management*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 277–306, 1995.

Al-Tabbaa, O., Gadd, K. and Ankrah, S., Excellence models in the non-profit context: strategies for continuous improvement, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 590-6, 2013.

Assarlind, M. and Gremyr, I., Critical Factors for Quality Management Initiatives in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 397-411, 2015.

Black, Simon & Porter, Leslie, Identification of the Critical Factors of TQM, *Decision Sciences*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2007.

Boerner, S., Artistic quality in an opera company: toward the development of a concept, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, vol. 14, pp. 425-436, 2004.

Boulter, L., Bendell, T., and Dahlgaard, J.J., Total quality beyond North America: A Comparative Analysis of the Performance of European Excellence Award Winners, *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 197 –215, 2013.

Bou-Llusar, J.C., Escrig-Tena, A.B., Roca-Puig, V. and Beltra´n-Martı´n, I., An empirical assessment of the EFQM excellence model: evaluation as a TQM framework relative to the MBNQA model, *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 27, pp. 1-22, 2009.

Claeye´, F. and Jackson, T., The iron cage re-revisited: institutional isomorphism in non-profit organizations in South Africa, *Journal of International Development*, vol. 24, pp. 602-622, 2012.

Chew, C. and Osborne, S.P., Exploring strategic positioning in the UK charitable sector: emerging evidence from charitable organizations that provide public services, *British Journal of Management*, vol. 20, pp. 90-105, 2009.

Corbett, L. M., and Angell, L. C., Business excellence in New Zealand: Continuous improvement, learning, and change, *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 755–772, 2011.

Dahlgaard, J. J., Chen C. K., Jang J. Y., Banegas L.A., and Dahlgaard-Park S. M., Business excellence models: limitations, reflections and further development, *Total Quality Management*, 2013 vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 519 –538, 2013.

Escrig, A.B. and de Menezes, L.M., What characterizes leading companies within business excellence models? An analysis of "EFQM Recognized for Excellence" recipients in Spain, *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 169, pp. 362-375, 2015.

Kharub, M. and Sharma, R.K., Investigating the role of CSF's for successful implementation of quality management practices in MSMEs, *International Journal of Systems Assurance and Engineering Management*, 2015.

Mann, R., Adebanjo, D., Laosirihongthong T. and Punnakitikashem P., Awareness and impact of business excellence in Asia. *Total Quality Management,* vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1237–1258, 2011.

Mann, R., Adebanjo, D., and Tickle, M., Deployment of business excellence in Asia: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 604–627, 2011.

Medad Center, "Strategic Plan for Saudi Nonprofit Sector, Available: http://www.medadcenter.com/books/, 2014.

Nonprofit Excellence Award, *Nonprofit Excellence Award Annual Report*, 2019, Available: http://sea.sa/wp/ , 2019.

Hendricks, K. B., and Singhal, V. R., Does implementing an effective TQM program actually improve operating performance? Empirical evidence from firms that have won quality awards, *Management Science*, vo. 43, no. 9, pp. 1258– 1274, 1997.

Herman, R. D., and Renz, D. O., Theses on Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp.107–126, 1999.

Lakhe, R. and Mohanty, R., Total quality management: concepts, evolution, and acceptability in developing economies", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. 9-33, 1994.

Rojas, R., A review of models for measuring organizational effectiveness among for-profit and nonprofit organizations, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, vol. 11, pp. 97-104, 2000.

SAI Global, *2007 Australian Business Excellence Award*, Available: http://www.sai-global.com/, 2007.

Sila, I., and Ebrahimpour, M., Examination and comparison of the critical factors of total quality management across countries, *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 235–268, 2003.

Soltani, E., Van der Meer, R. and Williams, T.M., A contrast of HRM and TQM approaches to performance management: some evidence", *British Journal of Management*, vol. 16, pp. 211-230, 2005.

Talwar, B., Comparative study of core values of excellence models vis-a`-vis human values, *Measuring Business Excellence*, vol. 13 no. 4, pp. 34-46, 2009.

Talwar, B., Business excellence models, and the path ahead, *The Total Quality Management Journal*, vol. 23 No.1, pp. 21-35, 2010.

UNECE, *National Quality Award Schemes*, Available: http://www.unece.org/, 2004.

Biographies

Osama Salih is a Ph.D. candidate at Razak Faculty of Technology and Informatics, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. He obtained his B.S. in Industrial Engineering from Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, and M.S in Engineering Management from Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. He has been working in the management consulting industry in Saudi Arabia for the past 20 years providing strategic, operational, and organizational excellence consulting to private, public, and nonprofit organizations in Saudi Arabia.

Prof Sha'ri Mohd Yusof has a degree in Industrial Engineering from the University of Miami and a Master of Science in Integrated Quality Systems from the University of Birmingham and Doctor of Philosophy with a focus on TQM for small manufacturing business from the University of Birmingham. He is a Registered Professional Engineer with the Board of Engineers Malaysia (BEM) and a Senior Member of the American Society for Quality (ASQ).
He is now a Professor of Quality Engineering and Management in UTM. Having graduated from the USA, he spent one-year training in Body Assembling in Mitsubishi Motors Corporation, Japan. Upon completion of the training, he was involved in the beginning years in Proton (Malaysian National Car) in the Body Assembling Section, and later in the Quality Control Department. He joined UTM in 1990 and currently supervising many research projects both at PhD and master level in topics relating to Quality Management, Robust Quality Engineering, Sustainability, Lean Manufacturing, and Industrial Engineering.
Prof Sha'ri has published over 100 papers in national and international journals and conferences. Besides writing, he has been involved in training several organizations, including Proton, IWK, Hitachi Chemical, Mitsubishi in various topics of Quality Engineering, ISO 9001, Industrial Engineering, and Project Management. He is currently heading a research project on developing a theoretical framework for lean adoption in Malaysian companies.

Ts. Dr. Rozzeta Dolah CEng MIET, trained in Japan and is a Chartered Engineer registered in UK, is currently a senior lecturer at Razak Faculty of Technology and Informatics, University Teknologi Malaysia. She just completed her postdoctoral fellow at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, USA, with expertise in robust quality engineering for renewable energy. Her area of interest is in renewable energy for biomass conversion into transportation fuel and optimization method using the Taguchi Method and Design of Experiment (DOE). As postdoctoral fellow at Prof. Rohit Karnik's Lab of Microfluidics and Nanofluidics Research Laboratory, at MIT Department of Mechanical Engineering, and having the experience in robust measurement and metrology during her Ph.D at Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan; the research has enabled her to develop a pyrolysis oil upgrading method as the alternative fuel for jet fuel. She is a MINITAB consultant, statistical software for quality improvement. As a member of Japan's Quality Engineering Society and American Institute of Chemical Engineers, she led many quality improvement projects through the implementation of Taguchi Method (Robust Quality Engineering), Design of Experiments (DOE), and Lean/Black Belt Six Sigma for many applications in renewable energy.

Appendix 1: Validity Testing Using Pearson Correlation for Critical Success Factors

Statement	Test	Score
High leadership capabilities of top management	Pearson Correlation	0.674
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Commitment of top management toward BE	Pearson Correlation	0.721
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Effective strategic planning capabilities	Pearson Correlation	0.722
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Employee satisfaction and engagement	Pearson Correlation	0.667
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Focus on process management	Pearson Correlation	0.800
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Focus on financial resources management	Pearson Correlation	0.749
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Change management	Pearson Correlation	0.805
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Defining and tracking key performance indicators	Pearson Correlation	0.783
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
The focus on customer satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	0.732
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Focus on partners and suppliers management	Pearson Correlation	0.759
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Providing necessary financial resources for implementing BE	Pearson Correlation	0.796
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Providing necessary training	Pearson Correlation	0.769
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42

Efficient and effective design of product and service	Pearson Correlation	0.794
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Use of consultants	Pearson Correlation	0.729
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
The right level of workload	Pearson Correlation	0.584
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Having a short implementation time	Pearson Correlation	0.440
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.004
	N	42
Setting up a steering group and improvement teams	Pearson Correlation	0.728
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Access to external resources and knowledge	Pearson Correlation	0.644
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Having a culture of continuous improvement	Pearson Correlation	0.735
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Participation in BE awards	Pearson Correlation	0.619
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Providing necessary human resources for implementation	Pearson Correlation	0.772
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
The implementation strategy and approach	Pearson Correlation	0.844
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Adapting quality management systems such as IS9000	Pearson Correlation	0.610
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Data analysis and reporting capabilities	Pearson Correlation	0.846
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Effective organizational communication capabilities	Pearson Correlation	0.847
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42

Availability of clear vision in the organization	Pearson Correlation	0.725
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Adapting an effective and flexible organization structure	Pearson Correlation	0.640
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Clarity of roles and responsibilities in the organization	Pearson Correlation	0.674
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Having the right level of authorities	Pearson Correlation	0.600
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
The use of benchmarking	Pearson Correlation	0.832
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Employee motivational and reward programs	Pearson Correlation	0.742
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Management support and encouragement to innovation culture in the organization	Pearson Correlation	0.680
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
The investment and use of information technology and systems in the organization	Pearson Correlation	0.771
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
The focus on customer complaints management and opinion	Pearson Correlation	0.659
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Employee opinion management and engagement in decision making	Pearson Correlation	0.630
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42
Adapting a clear governance framework	Pearson Correlation	0.834
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	42

Appendix 2: Validity Testing Using Pearson Correlation for Critical Barriers

Statement	Test	Score
Lack of top management commitment	Pearson Correlation	0.682
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Limited availability of financial resources	Pearson Correlation	0.350
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001
	N	90
The fear of change	Pearson Correlation	0.610
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
The high work overload	Pearson Correlation	0.527
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of customer orientation	Pearson Correlation	0.749
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of clear measurement system	Pearson Correlation	0.697
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of qualified employees	Pearson Correlation	0.757
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
The long implementation time needed	Pearson Correlation	0.595
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of perceived benefits stemming from the BEMs	Pearson Correlation	0.708
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of a culture of continuous improvement	Pearson Correlation	0.801
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Too prescriptive nature of BEMs	Pearson Correlation	0.505
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of organization strategy	Pearson Correlation	0.770
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90

Lack of adequate support from BE awards custodians	Pearson Correlation	0.391
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Not having a steering group and improvement teams to drive the BE effort	Pearson Correlation	0.0630
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90
Lack of clear organizational roles and responsibilities	Pearson Correlation	0.733
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	90