



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**DEVELOPMENT OF AN ISO9001:2000 SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL
FOR USE IN ISO-CERTIFIED MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**

SEYED ALI ASGHAR TAYEFEH MORSAL

FK 2008 84

**DEVELOPMENT OF AN ISO9001:2000 SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR USE
IN ISO-CERTIFIED MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**

By

SEYED ALI ASGHAR TAYEFEH MORSAL

**Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in
Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science**

December 2008



DEDICATION

To my lovely wife and daughter



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science.

**DEVELOPMENT OF AN ISO9001:2000 SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR USE
IN ISO-CERTIFIED MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**

By

SEYED ALI ASGHAR TAYEFEH MORSAL

December 2008

Chairman: Associate Professor Ir. Md Yusof Ismail, PhD

Faculty: Engineering

Measuring and computing the maturity of the Quality Management System (QMS) is one of the most important requirements in ISO 9001:2000. Many organizations have not found any accurate and unique approach to QMS maturity assessment. Considering this fact, the ISO has never issued any self-assessment model. However, some ISO certified organizations have to apply the award models. Some of certified organizations have even become compelled to change one of the award models according to their needs. Nevertheless, in applying it, this approach has caused many difficulties for them. The main objective of this research was developing a proper self-assessment tool in accordance with the ISO9001:2000 requirements.

The process of developing a self-assessment tool was carried out in three stages. In the first stage, the framework of the tool was developed, while it was compiled according to the ISO requirements in the second stage. This tool was



formed by eight principles, 33 criteria and 300 indicators. Each principle was organized into many criteria and indicators, which provided necessary situation for judgment. Audit team investigated the effectiveness, efficiency and suitability of their QMS using the present tool. The third stage allocated tool verification and validation. Verification was performed by comparing the requirements of ISO and the content of the tool and expert's views.

Meanwhile the validation was carried out by pilot test and case study. A certification body and two consulting services companies studied the tool and offered their opinions; whereas, eight volunteered ISO certified manufacturing companies applied the tool to assess and test it in the real environment. The data obtained from the case studies and the investigations by the experts were analyzed. The results showed that, the developed self-assessment tool could be used to investigate the QMS maturity of the organizations.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**PEMBANGUNAN SUATU PERALATAN PENILAIAN SENDIRI ISO9001:2000
UNTUK DIGUNAKAN DALAM SYARIKAT PEMBUATAN YANG DISIJILKAN**

Oleh

SEYED ALI ASGHAR TAYEFEH MORSAL

December 2008

Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Ir. Md Yusof Ismail, PhD

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan

Banyak organisasi tidak dapat mencari pendekatan yang tepat dan unik kepada keberkesanan QMS. Oleh kerana, ISO tidak membuat model bantuan sendiri, sesetengah organisasi yang telah diktiraf ISO terpaksa memohon model penganugerahan tersebut. Malah, sesetengah organisasi yang diiktiraf telah mengubah salah satu daripada model tersebut untuk kepentingan organisasi sendiri dan menggunakannya namun pendekatan ini telah mendatangkan banyak masalah kepada mereka. Objektif utama kajian ini ialah untuk membentuk bantuan sendiri yang lebih berkesan bertepatan dengan keperluan ISO9001:2000.

Proses untuk pembentukan bantuan sendiri ini terdiri daripada 3 tahap. Dalam tahap pertama, rangka program ini telah dibentuk dan tahap kedua, program tersebut disusun mengikut keperluan ISO. Program ini telah dibentuk daripada

8 prinsip, 33 kriteria dan 300 indikator. Setiap prinsip dipengaruhi oleh banyak kriteria dan indikator, yang memberi gambaran diperlukan untuk sesuatu keputusan dibuat. Pasukan audit akan menyiasat keberkesanan, efisien dan kesinambungan QMS mereka berbanding program terkini. Tahap ketiga ialah membuat verifikasi dan pembetulan. Verifikasi dibuat dengan membandingkan asas keperluan ISO dengan kandungan program terkini dan diuji dalam syarikat yang bersaiz kecil. Pembetulan pula dilakukan dengan menggunakan pemerhatian tenaga pakar dan kajian kes. Sebuah badan pengiktirafan dan dua syarikat konsultan mengkaji program tersebut dan memberi pandangan mereka terhadapnya dan 8 syarikat pengeluaran yang diiktiraf ISO menggunakan program tersebut dalam persekitaran pekerjaan yang sebenar.

Data yang diperolehi daripada kajian kes dan penilaian pakar dianalisis dan keputusan untuk pembentukan program sendiri adalah perlu untuk menguji keberkesanan QMS dalam organisasi-organisasi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Md. Yusof Ismail, for his supervision and guidance throughout this study. He is rightfully top the list who has carried me through this study. Especially I thank him for the numerous times spent together discussing and providing encouragement on my research.

Special thanks must be dedicated to the committee member, Ir. Hj. Mohd Rasid Osman for his guidance, encouragement and unlimited help throughout this research.

My sincere gratitude and appreciation is given to my very good friend Mr. Abdulreza Nouzari for his multilateral and generously supporting and assistance throughout my study.

I dedicate this piece of my work to my family, my sister and Mr. Cyrus Hami a colleague and close friend of mine, whose love and accompaniment had inspired me to achieve the highest goals in my life.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 6th October 2008 to conduct the final examination of Seyed Ali Asghar Tayefeh Morsal on his Master of science thesis entitled “Development of a self-assessment tool for ISO9001:2000 in ISO certified manufacturing companies “ in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Rosnah Mohd. Yusuff, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chair person)

Tang Sai Hong, PhD

Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Norzima Zulkifli, PhD

Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Sha’ri Mohd. Yusof, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
(External Examiner)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The team members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Ir. Md YUSOF ISMAIL, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Ir. Hj. Mohd RASID OSMAN,

Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 9 April 2009



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

SEYED ALI ASGHAR TAYEFEH MORSAL

Date:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| DEDICATION | ii |
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ABSTRAK | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | vii |
| APPROVAL | viii |
| DECLARATION | xi |
| LIST OF TABLES | xiv |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xvi |
| ABBREVIATION | xvii |
| | |
| CHAPTER | |
| | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 General Review | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem Statement | 3 |
| 1.3 Objectives | 4 |
| 1.4 Benefits and Significant | 4 |
| 1.5 Scope of Study | 5 |
| 1.6 Layout of the Thesis | 6 |
| | |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 7 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 7 |
| 2.2 Quality Management System (QMS) | 8 |
| 2.3 Definition of Self-Assessment Model | 9 |
| 2.4 Concept of Maturity | 11 |
| 2.5 Types of Self-Assessment Models | 12 |
| 2.5.1 The Deming Prize (DP) | 13 |
| 2.5.2 The Malcolm Baldrige Nation Quality Award | 14 |
| 2.5.3 European Quality Award (EQA) | 14 |
| 2.5.4 Other Models | 15 |
| 2.6 Objectives and Benefits of Self-Assessment | 16 |
| 2.7 Application Problems of Award Models in Certified Organization | 19 |
| 2.7.1 Similarities and Differences in Principles | 21 |
| 2.7.2 Similarities and Differences in Structures | 22 |
| 2.7.3 Similarities and Differences in Requirements (Scope) | 24 |
| 2.7.4 Similarities and Differences in Expectations | 28 |
| 2.7.5 Similarities and Differences in Fundamental Concepts | 30 |
| 2.8 Differences in Development of self-assessment Model | 31 |



| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2.8.1 | Difference in Tactics to Assessment | 31 |
| 2.8.2 | Difference in Approach of Developing | 35 |
| 2.8.3 | Difference in Type of Indicators | 36 |
| 2.8.4 | Difference in Logic of Measurement | 36 |
| 2.9 | Specification of a Proper Self-Assessment Model | 42 |
| 2.10 | The Purpose of Each Concept | 45 |
| 2.11 | Previous Similar Studies | 48 |
| 2.12 | Radar Chart and Its Application in Judgment | 51 |
| 2.13 | The Validity of the Model | 52 |
| 2.13.1 | Construct Validity | 52 |
| 2.13.2 | Content Validity | 52 |
| 2.13.3 | Predictive Validity | 54 |
| 2.14 | The Importance Degree of Principle (IDP) | 54 |
| 3 | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 55 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 55 |
| 3.2 | Developing the Framework | 57 |
| 3.2.1 | Identifying and Selecting Tactics | 58 |
| 3.2.2 | Identifying and Determining the Criteria | 58 |
| 3.2.3. | Determining Indicators | 61 |
| 3.2.4. | Selecting Approach | 61 |
| 3.2.5 | Measurement System | 62 |
| 3.2.6 | Reporting System Adopting | 72 |
| 3.3 | Model Compiling | 73 |
| 3.4 | Model Verification and Validation | 73 |
| 3.5 | Identification of Population | 75 |
| 3.6 | The Sampling Method of the Study | 75 |
| 3.7 | The Strategy of Study | 76 |
| 3.8 | Justification of Company for Case Study | 77 |
| 3.9 | Analysis of Data | 78 |
| 4 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS | 80 |
| 4.1 | Prologue | 80 |
| 4.2 | The Framework Developing Results | 81 |
| 4.3 | Model Compiled Results | 84 |
| 4.4 | Verification of the Tool | 85 |
| 4.5 | The Analysis of Validity | 85 |
| 4.5.1 | Content Validity | 86 |
| 4.5.2 | Construct Validity | 87 |
| 4.5.3 | Predictive Validity | 89 |
| 4.6 | Selecting the Cases | 90 |
| 4.7 | Background of the Cases | 93 |
| 4.8 | The Result of the Pilot Test | 97 |
| 4.9 | The Results of the Case Studies | 98 |



| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 4.10 | Practicality of the Tool | 104 |
| 4.11 | Determination of Priorities for Improvement | 104 |
| 4.12 | The Significance of the Results | 110 |
| 5 | CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION | 111 |
| 5.1 | Conclusion | 111 |
| 5.2 | Recommendation | 113 |
| | REFERENCES | 114 |
| | APPENDICES | 119 |
| | BIODATA OF THE STUDENT | 222 |



LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 2.1 Some self-assessment topics, objectives, and representative models | 16 |
| 2.2 Benefits of the self-assessment process | 18 |
| 2.3 Comparison among the principles of Deming, ISO9001:2000 and King Abd. model | 22 |
| 2.4 The Differences between the structures of ISO and Baldrige | 23 |
| 2.5 The relationship between the Malcolm Baldrige and ISO 9001:2000 elements | 25 |
| 2.6 The relationship between the EFQM and ISO9000 | 26 |
| 2.7 The depth of requirements in a item of ISO9001:2000 | 29 |
| 2.8 The depth of requirements in the same item of the Baldrige | 29 |
| 2.9 The comparison among the concepts of Baldrige, ISO and EFQM | 30 |
| 2.10 Different tactics in self-assessment practice | 33 |
| 2.11 ISO maturity level matrix | 38 |
| 2.12 Matrix of scoring in the Baldrige Award Model | 39 |
| 2.13 The fundamental concepts of EFQM and their weight | 40 |
| 2.14 Matrixes of scoring in EFQM | 41 |
| 3.1 Matrix for judgment about stage of Approach | 64 |
| 3.2 Matrix for judgment about stage of Deployment | 65 |
| 3.3 Matrix for judgment about stage of control & improvement | 65 |
| 3.4 The equality of questionnaire range and Likert scale | 79 |



| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.1 | The number of key statement of each concept | 81 |
| 4.2 | The Key statements of each concept | 82 |
| 4.3 | The number of indicators of each one of concepts | 84 |
| 4.4 | The result of expert's views about content of the tool | 86 |
| 4.5 | Expert's views about content of the tool in Likert scale | 87 |
| 4.6 | Common specification of the firms and their QMS maturity | 99 |
| 4.7 | The fulfillment amount of each principle in the firms | 101 |
| 4.8 | The mean for the fulfillment of the requirement in eight firm | 102 |
| 4.9 | The IDPS (severity and grade of priority) of the eight firms | 104 |
| 4.10 | The improvement opportunities | 105 |
| 4.11 | The result of the self-assessment of the Firm 3 | 107 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 2.1 The ISO9000/EFQM connectivity | 27 |
| 2.2 Relationship of the ISO9000 and the Baldrige model | 28 |
| 2.3 The procedure of developing a self-assessment model | 34 |
| 2.4 Complexity of approaches used in the self-assessment process | 35 |
| 2.5 An example of range scale measuring tool | 56 |
| 3.1 The procedure of the research | 56 |
| 3.2 Balance of measurement and its domains | 65 |
| 3.3 The most value of the 3rd domain in prejudgment | 67 |
| 3.4 The maximum decrease, for first critical word (if it is not logic) | 67 |
| 3.5 The maximum decrease, for second critical word (if it is not compatible) | 67 |
| 3.6 The octagonal radar chart | 71 |
| 3.7 The verification and validation stages of the model | 74 |
| 3.8 The procedure of self-assessment | 78 |
| 4.1 The cluster of construct | 88 |
| 4.2 The QMS maturity situations in the applied firms | 103 |
| 4.3 The comparison between the principles maturity and the organization's maturity in the firms which focus on priorities | 106 |
| 4.4 The fourfold diagram of the Firm 3 | 108 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------|--|
| ISO | International organization for standardization |
| QMS | Quality management system |
| St. Dev. | Standard deviation |
| EFQM | European foundation for quality management |
| DP | Deming prize |
| UJSE | Union of Japanese scientists and engineers |
| MBNQA | Malcolm Baldrige nation quality award |
| MB | Malcolm Baldrige |
| NIST | National institute for standards and technology |
| EQA | European quality award |
| OMD | Organization's maturity degree in each key statement |
| IDP | Importance degree of principle |
| SWOT | Strength, weakness, opportunity and treatment |
| DNV | Det Norske Veritas (the Norwegian trust) |



CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 General Review

All quality management systems models in general, whether before or after than the ISO models have been used to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of organization. Increasing the effectiveness and efficiency will promote the competitive ability and survival of companies and lead to an improvement in product quality and a decrease in the price of products and delivery time for customers (Yang and Haik, 2003). Success can result from implementing and maintaining a management system that is designed to continually improve performance while addressing the needs of all interested parties (Oztas *et al.*, 2007).

If a company has an aim of passing through the ISO9001:2000 QMS standards, all the requirements and responsibilities of that system must be established in the company (Alp, 2002). ISO9001:2000 also outlines that every company which is interested to certify must satisfy all requirements that are available in its business. The subject of the QMS is not limited to ISO9000 standards and many of the greatest companies in Japan, USA, and Europe prior to ISO9001 have implemented their QMSs according to the TQM philosophy and recommendations. Therefore, every company which has implemented the QMS



in its organization is considered as an advanced organization, so all companies which desire to be advanced organizations, and to be certified is a value in the society, whereas, contrary to a popular belief to be effective is a value not to be certified. Cobb (2003) says the goal is effectiveness not just compliance.

Measuring and computing the maturity of the QMS is one of the most important requirements in ISO9001:2000. Top management shall review the organization's QMS, at planned intervals, to ensure its continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness. This review shall include assessing opportunities for improvement the need for changes to the QMS, including the quality policy and objectives.

Also, it has been emphasized on the improvement of effectiveness, efficiency, suitability and adequacy of the QMS through the other clauses such as quality policy, quality objective, audit results, analysis of data, corrective and preventive actions. The ISO9001:2000 has not directly recommended the assessment and evaluation as a tool for identification of the actual QMS situation, as well as right decision making and planning to improve. Therefore, many organizations are assuming that auditing the QMS is the surest and the only way for identifying the improvement opportunity, whereas, it leads into an error for the simple reason that, the ISO9001 has not clearly determined the manner of assessment of audit results. The descriptions of ISO9000 can remove this deficiency.

1.2 Problem Statement

Audits are used to determine the extent to which the quality management system requirements are fulfilled (ISO9001:2000). This standard also indicates that audit findings are used to assess the effectiveness of the quality management system and to identify opportunities for improvement. At the same time, self-assessment can provide an overall view of the performance of the organization and the degree of maturity of the quality management system. In addition, it can help to identify areas requiring improvement in the organization and to determine priorities (ISO9000:2000). The lack of unique approach to assessment has caused many QMS's problems in organizations, and those who have acknowledged its necessity activity, do not know how they should do it (Oztas *et al.*, 2007). Unfortunately, the lack of developed practice in measuring the quality of services often becomes an impediment for successful quality improvement.

It is for sure that a few interested organizations may apply the award model (EFQM, Malcolm Baldrige, Deming model, and so forth) for self-assessment, but they are not comfortable, because there are many differences between the scope and the depth of the ISO requirements and the award models (Achilleos and Ioannou, 2000). Companies will have to choose the right approach based on their business need. Many of companies always face two difficult questions: which model to choose to best fit the company's need and in which direction to move (Keleman *et al.*, 2007).

Quality liaison group's research reveals that the defects arising today are virtually unchanged from those identified 20 years ago while some organizations (construction industry) have invested a great deal in improving quality. Despite of all discussions on the uncertainty surrounding the effectiveness of QMS (Oztas *et al.*, 2007), some researches, for example Al-Nakeeb *et al.* (1998) have stated the need for measuring the effectiveness of QMS. They also have stated that researches have been performed on seeking a way to measure the effectiveness of the system. With regards to the problems and deficiencies stated above, the existence of an easy and reliable self-assessment model can help to solve these problems.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of this study are:

- A. To develop a self-assessment tool to determine the maturity of the ISO9001:2000 certified organizations.
- B. To test and validate the self-assessment tool in ISO certified organizations.

1.4 Benefits and Significant

Generally, the assessment tool of the Quality Management Systems have brought about many benefits and significant which can be divided into two

main groups, internal organizational benefits and the external organizational benefits. The internal organizational benefits include:

- A. To help organization meet the requirements of the standard.
- B. To judge any factors concerning the organizations' performances or criteria (Brown, 2000).
- C. To provide feasibilities that organizations can compare their situations in every term with later
- D. To prepare a necessary and an appropriate infrastructure for the plan, do, check, and act (PDCA) cycle.

And in contrast, the external organizational benefits include:

- A. To form an appropriate basis for benchmarking.
- B. To lead to the existence of a unique approach to current affairs in organization.
- C. To improve the organization's motivations for competition.

The model which will be proposed in the current study is expected to meet all the internal organizational benefits.

1.5 Scope of Study

This study will be focused on the development and validation of a self-assessment tool. Although, a self-assessment is a measurement instrument which is required to measure the extent of QMS maturity (effectiveness,



efficiency, suitability and adequacy of organization's QMS), it should be applied only in ISO certified manufacturing companies which have meet the requirements of the ISO9001:2000. Regarding to this requirement, the sample of companies were chosen from only ISO9001:2000 certified companies. The selected companies should also have at least five years passed QMS implementation in their organizations and involved in manufacturing industries.

1.6 Layout of the Thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters as listed below:

The first chapter introduces the background, objectives, benefits and scope of the research.

Chapter two elaborates the critical review of literature related to the overview of the self-assessment tools and principles of developing them.

Chapter three describes the methodology of developing and testing the tool in this research.

Chapter four explains the result analysis and discussion. It consists of case studies in eighty ISO certified manufacturing companies.

Chapter five concludes the new self-assessment tool for measuring the maturity of QMS in ISO certified manufacturing companies.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) was established after the end of the World War II to bring commonality and uniformity to products and some critical quality areas. ISO is based in Geneva, Switzerland. It is a nongovernmental voluntary standards organization with a worldwide membership. Its charter is the development of voluntary international standards. Its activities include many topics and fields. In fact, ISO is an organization of organizations; meaning no individuals, companies, or countries are typically direct members (Sanders and Scott, 1997). Each national membership is usually held by the recognized standard body or agency from the member's country. The national standards body holding ISO membership is a recognized function or quasi function of the government in some countries (Wilson, 1996).

The development of the ISO9000 series was a natural step for the international organization upon standardization. This series was designed to bring uniformity to the area of quality systems. The ISO9000 series standards were developed by the committees of quality experts selected from member bodies

