

**A DIAGNOSIS FRAMEWORK FOR SELECTING OPERATIONAL
IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MALAYSIAN INDUSTRIES**

EDLY FERDIN BIN RAMLY

A thesis submitted in
fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

February 2019

DEDICATION

In the name of

ALLAH

Most Gracious,

Most Merciful

To my loving parents Ramly bin Bachik and Mariah binti Mohd. Dom

My precious wife Rosleena binti Hashim.

And my joyful children Iqmal, Aqmal, Eqma and Eqbal



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNJUKKAN AMINAH

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

"In The Name of Allah, The Most Beneficent, The Most Merciful". With all the praise to Allah swt, I managed to complete the data collection and progressing toward write up of thesis and journal publication.

So many people and organisations have contributed and supported in the completion of this project and I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest and sincere gratitude to all of them. First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Ts. Dr. Musli Mohammad, for his generous help, advise, guidance and support throughout the course of my Ph.D. study.

Thanks to Director General of Malaysia Productivity Corporation (MPC), Dato' Mohd Razali Hussain and his team, Tn Hj Zaki Ibrahim (Southern Region State Director), En Nik Mohd Faizal (State Director, Kelantan), En Megat Amirul, En Syed Hafiz, En Mujahid (MPC Consultants), Malacca SME Corp State Director, Tn Hj Ismail Hashim for providing the trust and continuous support to me on providing information and access to their clients.

Also sincere appreciation and gratitude to:

- All the experts interviewed for your kind knowledge and contribution, En Hood Atan from Exergy Management Training, En Khairun from Permintex Furukawa, En Zaki Tumijan from Flextronic Technology, and En Kamarulnizam from Siegwerk; En Razak from Sirim Training Services;
- Organizations and their team that were involved directly for this project;
- Dr. Azli Bin Nawawi, Dr. Mohd Nasrull Bin Abdol Rahman and Prof. Dr. Khalid Bin Hasnan for providing valuable feedback during colloquiums;
- Dr. Ahad Ali and Prof. Donald Reiner, Prof. Dr. Talib Bon from IEOM Society International for the access and sharing platform for my research;

- Dr. Jafri Rohani and Dr Wan Harun from Society for Cost and Quality Engineer;
- Mr. Maniam from Afnor Certification, France for access to their clients;
- EFR Certification Sdn Bhd staffs, En Ghazalee Hashim, Pn Harni Kasah and Pn Rokiah Abu Hassan for administration support of this research;
- My dear parents, families, beloved wife, in-laws for their support and caring during this course of research;
- Not to forget to all my clients and friend who shared their taught. Thank you very much.



ABSTRACT

Organizations need to diagnose their current operation performance and identify the opportunities for improvement in order to stay competitive. However, there seems to be lack of studies that focuses on operation diagnosis that align quality audit, business excellence (BE) assessment and project selection for lean six sigma. Hence, this study was undertaken with the objective to develop, evaluate and refine a diagnosis framework that selects operational improvement opportunities. The operational diagnosis framework which was aimed at identifying and selecting operational improvement opportunities was developed through multiphase mixed methods. Qualitative data was used more dominantly than quantitative data. The first phase of the research was to develop of the conceptual framework. The conceptual framework was formulated based on the literature review and semi-structured interviews. Then, it was included in the case study protocol to conduct the action-based case study. The second phase of the research was to evaluate and refine the diagnosis framework through action-based case study and evaluation survey. Four organizations were involved in the case studies and the results were analyzed. Evaluation survey was conducted to assess the proposed framework in term of design and contents. The final diagnosis framework consists of diagnosis steps and the diagnosis enablers. The diagnosis steps included; 1) evaluate the operational performance through BE categories; 2) determine the ISO9001 elements as the cause of operation performance; 3) determine the available operational improvement tools and techniques, and 4) select the improvement opportunities. The diagnosis enablers include; (1) diagnosis initiation, (2) leadership, (3) person who conducts the diagnosis, and (4) teamwork. Based on the final diagnosis framework, a diagnostic instrument was developed and tested. Hence, both the diagnosis framework and diagnostic instrument can be effectively employed in a wide range of Malaysian industries.

ABSTRAK

Organisasi perlu mendiagnosis prestasi operasi mereka dan mengenal pasti peluang penambahbaikan untuk kekal berdaya saing. Walau bagaimanapun, kajian sedia ada didapati terhad dan tidak menumpukan kepada diagnosis operasi yang sejajar dengan audit kualiti, penilaian kecemerlangan perniagaan dan pemilihan projek untuk *Lean Six Sigma*. Oleh itu, objektif penyelidikan ini adalah untuk membangunkan, menilai dan menambahbaik rangka-kerja diagnosis operasi untuk memilih peluang peningkatan operasi. Rangka-kerja diagnosis operasi untuk mengenalpasti dan memilih peluang penambahbaikan operasi telah dibangunkan melalui kaedah “*multiphase mixed methods*”. Data kualitatif digunakan dengan lebih dominan berbanding data kuantitatif. Fasa pertama penyelidikan adalah untuk membangunkan rangka-kerja konseptual. Rangka-kerja konseptual telah dibangunkan berdasarkan kajian ilmiah dan temubual. Rangka-kerja konseptual disertakan dalam protokol kajian kes untuk menjalankan kajian kes berdasarkan tindakan. Fasa kedua penyelidikan adalah untuk menilai dan menambahbaik rangka kerja diagnosis melalui kajian kes tindakan dan kaji selidik penilaian. Empat organisasi terlibat dalam kajian kes dan keputusan telah dianalisis. Kaji selidik penilaian telah dijalankan untuk menilai rangka- kerja yang dicadangkan dari segi reka bentuk dan kandungan. Rangka-kerja diagnosis yang dihasilkan merangkumi langkah-langkah diagnosis dan faktor pemboleh diagnosis. Langkah-langkah diagnosis merangkumi; 1) menilai prestasi operasi melalui kategori kecemerlangan perniagaan; 2) menentukan elemen ISO9001 sebagai punca prestasi operasi; 3) menentukan peralatan dan teknik penambahbaikan operasi yang ada; dan 4) memilih peluang penambahbaikan. Faktor pemboleh diagnosis melibatkan; (1) Permulaan diagnosis, (2) Kepimpinan, (3) Orang yang menjalankan diagnosis dan (4) Kerja berpasukan. Berdasarkan kerangka diagnosis akhir, alat bantuan diagnosis telah dibangunkan dan diuji untuk memilih peluang peningkatan operasi. Kerangka diagnosis dan alat bantuan diagnosis didapati bermanfaat dan boleh digunakan oleh industri di Malaysia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	i
DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
ABSTRAK	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xviii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction of the Chapter	1
1.2 Research Background	1
1.3 Problem Statement	3
1.4 Research Aim and Objectives	5
1.5 Research Scope and Limitation	5

1.6	Importance of Research	6
1.7	Thesis Outlines	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW		10
2.1	Introduction of the Chapter	10
2.2	Review on Operation Improvement	11
2.3	Review of Operation Diagnosis The Interview	17
2.4	Relevant Prior Frameworks in Context of Operation Operation Diagnosis	30
2.5	Research Opportunities and Gaps CAPDo Cycle	38
2.6	Conclusions of the Chapter “V” Cycle (Extracted	48
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY		49
3.1	Introduction of the Chapter Operation Process within	49
3.2	Selection of Research Design	49
3.3	Research Procedures	56
3.4	Data Collection and Analysis Procedure	58
3.5	Ensuring Quality of Research	63
3.6	Conclusion of the Chapter	66
CHAPTER 4 INTERVIEW– PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION AND FINDINGS		67
4.1	Introduction to the Chapter	67
4.2	Planning and Implementation of Semi-structured	67
4.3	Profile of Experts	69

4.4 Findings from interviews	73
4.5 Development of Conceptual Framework	84
4.6 Conceptual Diagnosis Framework	94
4.7 Conclusion of the Chapter	94

CHAPTER 5 ACTION-BASED CASE STUDY – PLANNING,

IMPLEMENTATION AND FINDINGS 98

5.1 Introduction to the Chapter	98
5.2 Planning for Action-based Case Study	98
5.3 Profile of Organizations	103
5.4 Result from Case Study	105
5.5 Cross Case Examination and Critical Analysis	139
5.6 Conclusion of the chapter	146

CHAPTER 6 EVALUATION SURVEY – PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION AND FINDINGS 147

6.1 Introduction to the Chapter	147
6.2 Planning and Implementation of Evaluation Survey	147
6.3 Profiles of Survey Respondents	149
6.4 Evaluation Survey Result and Analysis	151
6.5 Comment on Strengths, Weaknesses and Suggestions for Improvement	156
6.6 Conclusion of the Chapter	157

CHAPTER 7 DISCUSSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND REFINEMENT OF A DIAGNOSIS FRAMEWORK	158
7.1 Introduction to the Chapter	158
7.2 Steps in diagnosis process	159
7.3 Expected Result and Benefit from the Diagnosis	170
7.4 Diagnosis Framework Enabler	171
7.5 Refinement of the Diagnosis Framework	173
7.6 Conclusion of the Chapter	174
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSION	175
8.1 Introduction to the Chapter	175
8.2 Summary of Main Research Findings	175
8.3 Strengths of the Diagnosis Framework	181
8.4 Contribution of the Research	182
8.5 Limitations and Suggestion for Future Research	186
8.6 Conclusion of the chapter	186
References	187
Appendix	197
Vita	

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Example of Approaches, Techniques and Tools in Six Sigma and Lean	16
2.2	Example of Techniques and Tools relevant to operation improvement process and their application (Slack et al., 2013; Imai, 1986 and Kaplan, 2009).	17
2.3	Common Diagnosis Techniques	20
2.4	Summary of comparison between quality audit, BE Assessment and Lean Six Sigma project selection	24
2.5	Summary of the prior study on "Operation diagnosis and selection of improvement initiatives	26
2.6	Prior Framework on operational improvement diagnosis	31
2.7	Prior Frameworks Strength and Limitation	38
2.8	Summary of current diagnosis approaches enablers	42
3.1	Research "world view" adopted from Creswell (2009)	51
3.2	Summary of Operation diagnosis and improvement research aim and research design	52
3.3	Summary of research objectives, research questions and research method	55
3.4	Data Collection Plan	61
4.1	Experts position and area of expertise	70
4.2	Breakdown of experts background	70
4.3	Common Diagnosis Techniques	75
4.4	Summary of output to determine and select the operational improvement opportunities	80
4.5	Feedback summary on the importance of this research	83

4.6	Summary of phases and steps in diagnosis conceptual framework	95
4.7	Summary of finding and analysis from interview	96
5.1	Summary of phases and steps in diagnosis conceptual framework	100
5.2	List of case organization	101
5.3	Case A: Visit plan and actual visit date	106
5.4	Category 6 Operation Assessment Result	108
5.5	Category 7.1 Result Assessment Result	109
5.6	Summary of operational audit	110
5.7	Self-Assessment Analysis Worksheet	112
5.8	Operation improvement opportunities derived from audit “genba” and assessment	113
5.9	Case B – Research Activity and visit	114
5.10	Case B: Product Process Matrix	115
5.11	Product flow and support process	116
5.12	List of operational issues/ improvement opportunities	118
5.13	List of improvement opportunities with cause type and category	120
5.14	Case B – Weighing factor	121
5.15	Selection through simple average weight (SAW)	121
5.16	Summary of the result and impact of the improvement project	122
5.17	Case C – Research Activity and visit	123
5.18	Case B: Product Process Matrix	124
5.19	Case C - List of improvement opportunities with cause type and category	126
5.20	Case C - Weight factors	128
5.21	Case C – part of selection through simple average weight (SAW)	129
5.22	Summary of the result and impact of the improvement project	130
5.23	Case D – Research Activity and visit	131
5.24	Case B: Product Process Matrix	132
5.25	Case D - List of improvement opportunities with cause type and category	135

5.26	Case D – Part of improvement opportunities with tools and techniques	136
5.27	Case C – part of selection through simple average weight (SAW)	137
5.28	Case D - Summary of the result and impact of the improvement project	138
5.29	Initiation of operational diagnosis	139
5.30	Performance criteria for operational processes	141
5.31	Common issue and improvement opportunities in operational process	142
5.32	Summary of achievement from implementation of selected improvement opportunities	145
6.1	Summary of evaluation survey workshop	149
6.2	Summary of Degree of agreement of each phase and step in diagnosis process	153
6.3	Summary of Degree of agreement of each enabler in diagnosis framework	154
6.4	Summary of Mean and Standard on overall framework evaluation	155
6.5	Summary of P-Value on overall framework evaluation	156
7.1	List of Common Issues	163
7.2	Recommended Problem Solving Techniques	167
7.3	Initial list of Improvement Tools and Techniques by Case-category	168
7.4	Summary of Tangible Benefits from the Project	171
7.5	The Summary of Main Differences Between the Quality Audit, BE Assessment and Lean Six Sigma Project Selection	174
8.1	Linkage between Main Findings Presented in the Thesis	176
8.2	Summary of Diagnosis Phases and Steps in Conceptual Framework	179

LIST OF FIGURE

2.1	Literature Review flows	10
2.2	Overall interaction of operation process (Figure adopted from Slack et al., 2013, p.1)	12
2.3	ISO 9001:2015 Interaction of Operation clause 8 and Improvement clause 10 (Figure adopted from (ISO, 2015, p. viii)	13
2.4	Framework for selecting quality management and improvement initiatives (Thawesaengskulthai, 2010)	32
2.5	Guidance framework for selecting organizational improvement initiative (Mohammad, 2012)	33
2.6	ISO standard framework extracted from ISO19011 (2011, p.6)	36
2.7	Audit and self-assessment framework (Karapetrovic & Willborn, 2001a)	37
2.8	Common steps for operation diagnosis and improvement	40
2.9	Initial Conceptual Framework	43
3.1	Research Purpose - Research Design – Data Collection Strategy	51
3.2	Research method process flow	57
3.3	Common qualitative data source (Patton, 2005)	58
3.4	Example of Number of sample(s) until information saturation based on Yin (2011)	60
4.1	The Interview Process Flow and Description	69
4.2	Thematic Analyses Derived from ‘Atlas TI’ To Determine the Common Procedure of Operational Diagnosis	76
4.3	CAPDo Cycle (Extracted from SAE presentation, 2011)	78
4.4	“V” Cycle (Extracted from SAE presentation 2011)	79
4.5	Common Steps for Operational Diagnosis	80

4.6	Operation Process within Value Stream Mapping (Excerpt From Rother And Shook (1999))	86
4.7	Value Stream Mapping Process zZone	87
4.8	Example of Direct Performance Criteria from Value Stream Mapping (Excerpt from Rother and Shook (1999))	88
4.9	Conceptual Framework	94
5.1	Process flow for the action-based case study	99
5.2	Current state VSM of TI product family	117
5.3	Kaizen burst symbol	118
5.4	Painting at the yard for oil and gas platform structure	124
5.5	Current state VSM for pipe product type	125
5.6	Current state pre-operation and operation processes	126
5.7	Case D - Current state VSM for generic product type	133
5.8	Case D - Current state VSM with “Kaizen Burst”	134
5.9	Five type	134
6.1	Process flow for evaluation survey	148
6.2	Number of respondents for each workshop	150
6.3	Respondent years of experiences in quality, productivity and/ or BE	150
6.4	Respondent roles in organization	151
7.1	Performance criteria tool box	160
7.2	Value Stream Mapping process zone performance criteria tools box	161
7.3	Step 1 of diagnosis framework	162
7.4	Ishikawa diagram	164
7.5	Step 2 of diagnosis framework	166
7.6	Recommended Cause Category from Why 1 to 5	167
7.7	Step 3 and 4 of diagnosis framework	170
8.1	A diagnosis framework for selecting operational improvement opportunities	177
8.2	Process to develop conceptual diagnosis framework	178

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BE</i>	-	Business Excellence
<i>BEF</i>	-	Business Excellence Framework
<i>CI</i>	-	Continual Improvement
<i>IE</i>	-	Industrial Engineering
<i>MPC</i>	-	Malaysia Productivity Corporation
<i>OE</i>	-	Operational Excellence
<i>OM</i>	-	Operation Management
<i>PDCA</i>	-	Plan – Do – Check – Action
<i>QM</i>	-	Quality Management
<i>QMS</i>	-	Quality Management System
<i>QoS</i>	-	Quality of Service
<i>SAW</i>	-	Simple average weighing
<i>TQM</i>	-	Total Quality Management
<i>UTHM</i>	-	Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia



PTT
PERPUSTAKAAN TUN AMINAH
UTHM

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A2.1	Case study protocol	197
A3.1	Survey Instrument	206
A3.2	Data analysis sheets	223
A4.1	Guideline: Diagnosis Instrument	230
A4.2	Diagnosis-Instrument Templates	244



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction of the Chapter

This chapter describe the research background, problem statements, research aim and objectives, research scope, importance of the research and outline of the thesis.

1.2 Research Background

The need to diagnose and improve operation performance has been a major discussion due to the competitive pressure in all industries (Russell, 2004). In order to achieve higher competitiveness level, organizations must be able to identify the current operation performance and realign their strategies in operations and process. This would allow them to improve the quality performance (Mohammad *et al.*, 2011; Foley & Guillemette, 2010). In particular, the “Eleventh Malaysia Plan 2016-2020” outlined that the productivity driven economy growth as one of the main elements of the plan (EPU, 2015). According to the plan, higher productivity growth can be achieved through comprehensive operations improvement initiatives at all levels and championed by industry players. At the same time, Industry 4.0 is the current trend of automation and data exchange in manufacturing technologies to improve the organization velocity, flexibility and adaptability. Since lean manufacturing system

enables the organization to increase the velocity and flexibility, Industry 4.0 should be developed from the basis of lean principles before a "smart factory/ organization" can be created (Kolberg & Zühlke, 2015; Lee *et al.*, 2015).

In pursuance towards operation improvement, the organization must be able to identify "Weakness" and "Opportunities". Similarly, the term diagnosis is defined as the process of identifying something, especially on illness (Hornby, 2005). Even though, the definition is more inclined towards medical terms, however it can be accepted that the term illness brings the meaning of weaknesses. Hence, the process of identification opportunities of improvement from the operation weaknesses can be considered as "Diagnosis" process. Once the improvement opportunities are identified, the organization should select the relevant improvement initiatives, approaches, techniques and tools in order to improve and sustain their organization performance.

Based on the extensive literature review, it is evident that approaches such as quality audit for ISO9001 certification, assessment for Business Excellence award and improvement project selection for lean and Six Sigma are common approaches in operational improvement (Manders *et al.*, 2012; Dahlgard *et al.*, 2013; Slack *et al.*, 2013). Hence the most common and popular operation diagnosis approaches are: 1) ISO9001 Quality Audit; 2) Business Excellence Assessment according to Business Excellence Framework (BEF); and 3) Project Selection for Six Sigma and Lean project. This is due to the trend of industries adopting the TQM by using Quality Management System standard which are on the rise, with more than 1 million organization certified with ISO9001 (Manders *et al.*, 2012). At the same time, Business excellence framework (BEF) have received more attention for past two decades for the organization to pursue for continual improvement (Dahlgard *et al.*, 2013). BEF utilised the self-assessment to identify the improvement opportunities. In addition, there are also increasing trends on Six Sigma and Lean improvement approaches (Thawesaengskulthai, 2007). In improving operations, Lean and Six Sigma improvement initiatives utilised Project Selection to identify improvement opportunities.

However, issues have been raised in specific diagnosis approaches such as minimum evidence of linking performance improvement and quality audit (Rajendran & Devadasan, 2005), no standardized criteria to identify the project for lean and six sigma (Pakdil & Leonard, 2014), and standard weighing score with less

attention on organization type and level in Business Excellence assessment (Williams *et al.*, 2006). To address this issues, improvement have been made on the new revision of ISO9001 version 2015 (ISO, 2015) and Baldrige Business Excellence Framework (BEF) 2017-2018 (Baldrige, 2017) that link context of organization, organization profile and performance evaluation and results.

Nevertheless, there is no detailed framework in the operational diagnosis that are utilised in all the current best practice in operation improvement approaches such as BEF, ISO9001, Lean, Six Sigma and at the same time provide the guideline on selection of appropriate improvement opportunities and with relevant improvement techniques and tools.

1.3 Problem Statement

Based on the comprehensive literature review, it is evident that all the available diagnosis approaches have their own strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, organization will be able to grasp potential benefit if they are able to align these three diagnosis approaches. And, it is also likely that each of the diagnosis approach will be able to complement to each other. For instance, according to Karapetrovic & Willborn (2001a) quality audit and BE Assessment have clear diagnosis standard requirements and criteria, while six sigma and/ or lean improvement initiative may not have standard criteria. Despite of the weaknesses of lean and/or six sigma, the approaches are excellent waste and variation reduction performance based improvement (Andersson *et al.*, 2006; Singh, *et al.*, 2010), while quality audit has been criticized for less contribution toward performance improvements (Beckmerhagen *et al.*, 2004; Dahlgard *et al.*, 2013; Rajendran & Devadasan, 2005; Williams *et al.*, 2006). Hence, by aligning the three approaches organization can benefit through valuable operations improvement.

However, there is a notable paucity of studies which investigates these three diagnosis approaches. Unfortunately, previous studies only attempted to study on one or two operation diagnosis approaches. There were attempts to align two of the diagnosis tools i.e. quality audit and self-assessment (Karapetrovic & Willborn, 2001a), BE Assessment and Lean or Six Sigma (Yang, 2004; Yang & Hsieh, 2009) and Quality audit and Lean Sigma (Simons & Taylor, 2007). However, as to date

there yet to be any attempt made to align the three diagnosis approaches. To support this statement, existing related studies were critically discussed and presented in chapter 2.

In order to align the diagnosis approaches, the main outcome of the diagnosis was to list out operations improvement opportunities. In quality audit, the term non-conformance is commonly used as operations improvement opportunities, while in six sigma and lean, the terms issues or problems is used. Each improvement opportunities may require specific initiatives, techniques and tools to solve the problems effectively (Adebanjo *et al.*, 2015; Tickle *et al.*, 2014). According to Mohammad *et al.* (2010), there are hundreds of improvement initiatives available. It is crucial that relevant improvement initiatives, techniques and/ or tools are selected based on the operation improvement opportunities. Mohammad (2012) has extensively investigated and developed the guidance model to select improvement initiatives. The guidance model is useful for overall organization based on Business Excellence Framework and not specific to operational contexts and issues.

Up to now, most of previous studies focused on selection of business improvement tools and techniques on specific industries, sector and services (Dahlgard *et al.*, 2013; Radnor *et al.*, 2015; Spasojevic-Brkic *et al.*, 2012; Tickle *et al.*, 2014) and far too little attention was given to link the improvement tools and techniques into operational diagnosis such as tools and techniques for diagnosis and tools and techniques on the operations improvement opportunities. At the same time, there are very little efforts taken to conduct action-based case studies in context of operation diagnosis. Hence, an aligned operation diagnosis and improvement framework is recommended for development due to current trend of organizations adopting multiple management systems and improvement initiatives. The industries need useful and performance based aligned operation improvement diagnosis framework.

1.4 Research Aim and Objectives

The aim of this research is to develop a diagnosis framework to select operational improvement opportunities. The framework assists the organizations to determine improvement opportunities through aligning Quality Audit, BE Assessment and Lean Sigma project selection. Hence, the research objectives are as follows:

- (1) To investigate the main steps in diagnosis process;
- (2) To determine the enablers for effective diagnosis to select operational improvement opportunities;
- (3) To develop, evaluate and refine a diagnosis framework for selecting operational improvement opportunities.

1.5 Research Scope and Limitation

The scope of this research is focused on framework development processes. This research emphasizes in diagnosis process, listing of improvement opportunities and selecting the improvement opportunities as depicted in Figure 1.1. The scope of this research and the limitations are stated below:

- (1) To ensure the research is effective and manageable, this research is based on cross sectional research. Actual implementation and implication is applied for the research validation purpose based on time frame provided. The long term adoptions and maintenance of the operations improvement are beyond the scope of this research as depicted in Figure 1.1.
- (2) This research is intended for BE assessors, quality auditors, consultants, six sigma and lean practitioners;
- (3) The data collections were collected from experts and four organisations in Malaysia;
- (4) The BE framework was based on Balridge 2015-2016 framework and ISO9001 framework was based on ISO9001 version 2015 which are the current edition as and when the case study was conducted.

- (5) This research only covers operation function since the operations function is central to the organization because it produces the goods and services. Operation function is one of the three core functions of any organization apart from marketing (including sales) function and product/service development function (Slack *et al.*, 2013) which are exclude in this research.



Figure 1.1 : Research scope involving diagnosis and selection of improvement opportunities

1.6 Importance of Research

The operational diagnosis for selecting the operational improvement opportunities is an important area of research due to following reasons:

- (1) The diagnosis framework contributes to “Eleventh Malaysia Plan –RMK11” (EPU, 2015) through diagnosis of organisation operations function and selecting productivity related improvement opportunities. The resulting outcomes from the research can be capitalized as guideline to any type and size of organization in productivity improvement;
- (2) Implementation of quality audit, BE assessment, lean and six sigma required cost, time, resources and knowledge (Daniels, 2000; Hepner *et al.*, 2004; Williams *et al.*, 2006). Aligning of these approaches may save organization time, cost and resources and concurrently improve organization performance, maintain the certification and recognitions;
- (3) With more than million organizations certified with ISO9001 (Psomas & Fotopoulos, 2009), and an increasing number of organizations embarking on BE award, Lean and sigma (Behrouzi & Wong, 2011; Pakdil & Leonard, 2014), the

diagnosis framework is expected to provide valuable techniques and guides to quality auditors (internal and external), BE assessor (Self and external examiner), lean and six sigma practitioner, consultants, management and Top Management of organization.

- (4) This research also contributes to body of knowledge, since this is the first study and first attempt to align the most popular improvement approaches and diagnosis. Since, little attention is given by academic journal publications on effectiveness of operation diagnosis. Therefore, this research is deemed important so as to enrich the reference materials, case study in operation diagnosis and results.

1.7 Thesis Outlines

In order to achieve the set of objectives, this research employs sequential mixed methods. As such, the whole study is presented in 8 chapters (as depicted in Figure 1.2). The first chapter introduces the research background, problem statements, research aim and objectives, research scope and importance of the research. Chapter 2, critically reviews the relevant literatures related to operations improvement and operations diagnosis. Firstly, the literature review focuses on the concept and theoretical evolution of operation improvement from the system theory toward rational decision making. Secondly, literature review identifies the strength, limitations and gaps of each approach, prior framework and identifies gap and opportunities in current knowledge. Chapter 3, describes the research design and methodology. This chapter elaborates and explains the selection of research designs, research procedure data collection methods and ensuring quality of research.

Chapter 4, 5 and 6 consist of data collections and findings of this research. Chapter 4 describes the semi-structured interviews process. It comprises of the planning and implementation of the interviews, profiles of experts, and findings from the interviews. Chapter 5 presents the planning for the action-based case study, the implementation of the diagnosis activities, and implementation of operational activities and reports the findings from the activities. Chapter 6 explains the planning and implementation of the evaluation survey

REFERENCES

- Abdulmalek, F. A., & Rajgopal, J. (2007). Analyzing the benefits of lean manufacturing and value stream mapping via simulation: A process sector case study. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 107(1), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2006.09.009>
- Adebanjo, D., Tickle, M., Laosirihongthong, T., & Mann, R. (2015). A study of the use of business improvement initiatives: the association with company size and level of national development. *Production Planning & Control*, 26(7), 507–524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2014.927931>
- Albliwi, S. A., Antony, J., & Lim, S. A. H. (2015). A systematic review of Lean Six Sigma for the manufacturing industry. *Business Process Management Journal*, 21(3), 665–691.
- Andersson, R., Eriksson, H., & Torstensson, H. (2006). Similarities and differences between TQM, six sigma and lean. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(3), 282–296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09544780610660004>
- Arter, D. (2003). *Quality Audits for Improved Performance* (3rd ed.), ASQ Quality Press.
- Asbury, S. (2013). *Health and Safety, Environment and Quality Audits: A Risk-based Approach*. Routledge.
- Atweh, B., Kemmis, S., & Weeks, P. (2002). *Action research in practice: Partnership for social justice in education*. Routledge.
- Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2017). 2017–2018 Baldrige Excellence Framework: A Systems Approach to Improving Your Organization's Performance. Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology. <http://www.nist.gov/baldrige>.
- Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2015). 2015–2016 Baldrige Excellence Framework: A Systems Approach to Improving Your Organization's Performance. Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology. <http://www.nist.gov/baldrige>.
- Banuelas, R., Tennant, C., Tuersley, I., & Tang, S. (2006). Selection of Six Sigma projects in the UK. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(5), 514–527.
- Barratt, M., Choi, T. Y., & Li, M. (2011). Qualitative case studies in operations management: Trends, research outcomes, and future research implications. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29(4), 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2010.06.002>
- Barthelemy, J. L., & Zairi, M. (1994). Making ISO 9000 Work The Role of Auditing. *The TQM Magazine*, 6(3), 44–47.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/09544789410057908>

- Bazrkar, A., & Iranzadeh, S. (2017). Prioritization of Lean Six Sigma Improvement Projects using Data Envelopment Analysis Cross Efficiency Model. *Calitatea*, 18(157), 72.
- Beckmerhagen, I. a., Berg, H. P., Karapetrovic, S. V., & Willborn, W. O. (2004). On the effectiveness of quality management system audits. *The TQM Magazine*, 16(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09544780410511443>
- Behrouzi, F., & Wong, K. Y. (2011). Lean performance evaluation of manufacturing systems: A dynamic and innovative approach. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 388–395. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.065>
- Bendell, T. (2005). Structuring business process improvement methodologies. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 16(8–9), 969–978. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360500163110>
- Bolboli, S. A., & Reiche, M. (2013). A model for sustainable business excellence: implementation and the roadmap. *The TQM Journal*, 25(4), 331–346. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17542731311314845>
- Bowen, G. A. (2008). Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: a research note. *Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 137–152.
- Bozdogan, K. (2010). Towards An Integration Of The Lean Enterprise System , Total Quality Management , Six Sigma And Related Enterprise ESD-WP-2010-05 ESD Working Paper Series Towards An Integration Of The Lean Enterprise System , ESD-WP-2010-05. *ESD Working Paper Series*, 5(August), 1–23. Retrieved from <http://esd.mit.edu/WPS/2010/esd-wp-2010-05.pdf>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D., & Maguire, P. (2003). Why action research? *Action Research*, 1(1), 9–28.
- Büyüközkan, G., & Öztürkcan, D. (2010). An integrated analytic approach for Six Sigma project selection. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(8), 5835–5847.
- Casadesús, M., & Karapetrovic, S. (2005). Has ISO 9000 lost some of its lustre? A longitudinal impact study. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 25(6), 580–596.
- Chakravorty, S. S. (2009). Six Sigma programs: An implementation model. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 119(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.01.003>
- Chiarini, A., & Vagnoni, E. (2014). A proposed audit pattern for the shop-floor processes in TQM, Lean Six Sigma and ISO 9001 environments. *International Journal of Services and Operations Management*, 18(2), 159–178.
- Choi, T. Y., & Hong, Y. (2002). Unveiling the structure of supply networks: case studies in Honda, Acura, and DaimlerChrysler. *Journal of Operations Management*, 20(5), 469–493.
- Clegg, B., Pepper, M. P. J., & Spedding, T. A. (2010). The evolution of lean Six Sigma. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 27(2), 138–155.

- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rd Ed.). Sage publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Ed.). Sage publications.
- Dahlgaard, J. J., Chen, C.-K., Jang, J.-Y., Banegas, L. a, & Dahlgaard-Park, S. M. (2013). Business excellence models: limitations, reflections and further development. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 24(August), 519–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2012.756745>
- Dane, F. C. (1990). *Research methods* (Vol. 120). Brooks/Cole Publishing Company Pacific Grove, CA.
- Daniels, S. E. (2000). Tire failures, SUV rollovers put quality on trial quality experts offer perspectives on the causes and effects. *Quality Progress*, 33(12), 30–33. Retrieved from <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-0034511505&partnerID=40&md5=1ce005e203b5fbb28ba08c3cc2eec397>
- Deros, B., Mohd Yusof, S., & Azhari. (2006). A benchmarking implementation framework for automotive manufacturing SMEs. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 13(4), 396–430. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14635770610676272>
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1989.4308385>
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25–32.
- Economic Planning Unit. (2015). *Eleventh Malaysia Plan 2016-2020: Anchoring Growth on People*. Malaysia: Prime Minister's Department.
- Flynn, B. B., Sakakibara, S., & Schroeder, R. G. (1995). Relationship between JIT and TQM: practices and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1325–1360.
- Foley, É., & Guillemette, M. G. (2010). What is Business Intelligence? *International Journal of Business Intelligence Research*, 1(4), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.4018/jbir.2010100101>
- Fujii, S., & Lee, G. (2016). Integration-oriented product development management in Japan - an application of product-customer matrix to KAO -. *Journal of Asia Pacific Studies Volume*, 34(Nobeoka), 154–169.
- Gardner, E. R. (1997). Applying ISO 9000 principles when auditing. *Logistics Information Management*, 10(5), 208–213. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09576059710174423>
- Garza-Reyes, J. A., Visnevskis, F., Kumar, V., & Antony, J. (2015). A review and comparative analysis of the Russian Federation Government Quality Award. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 19(4), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-08-2014-0028>
- Gebauer, H., Kickuth, M., & Friedli, T. (2009). Lean management practices in the pharmaceutical industry. *International Journal of Services and Operations Management*, 5(4), 463–481.
- Hepner, I., Wilcock, A., & Aung, M. (2004). Auditing and continual improvement in the meat industry in Canada. *British Food Journal*, 106(7), 553–568.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700410545746>

- Hofer, C., Eroglu, C., & Rossiter Hofer, A. (2012). The effect of lean production on financial performance: The mediating role of inventory leanness. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 138(2), 242–253.
- Hornby, A. S. (2005). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586015>
- Hu, G., Wang, L., Fetch, S., & Bidanda, B. (2008). A multi-objective model for project portfolio selection to implement lean and Six Sigma concepts. *International Journal of Production Research*, 46(23), 6611–6625.
- Hutchins, G. (2001). The state of quality auditing. *Quality Progress*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp 25-29.
- Imai, M. (1986). *Kaizen: The Key to Japanese Competitiveness Success*. Random House Business Division, New York.
- Ionica, A., Baleanu, V., Edelhauser, E., & Irimie, S. (2010). TQM and Business Excellence. *Annals of the University of Petroșani - Economics* -, 10, 125–134.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (1991). *Guidelines for Auditing Quality Systems*; (ISO10011th–1st, 1st ed.). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2005). *Quality Management Systems - Fundamentals and Vocabulary*. (ISO9000). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2015). *Quality management systems – Requirements* (5th ed.). (ISO9001:2015). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2015a). *Quality management systems - Fundamentals and vocabulary*. (ISO9000:2015). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2011). *Guideline for management system audit*. *International Organization for Standardization* (ISO19011:2011, 2nd ed., Vol. 2). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2008). *Quality Management System: Requirements* (ISO9001:2008, 4th ed.). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- Johnson, R. A., Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J. E. (1964). Systems Theory and Management. *Management Science*, 10(2), 367–384. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2627306>
- Kaplan, R. S. (2009). Conceptual foundations of the balanced scorecard. *Handbooks of Management Accounting Research*, 3, 1253–1269.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard Translating Strategy In Action* (Kaplan & Norton, 1996, Harvard Business School Press).pdf. *Proceedings of the IEEE*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.1997.628729>
- Karapetrovic, S., & Willborn, W. (1998). Integrated audit of management systems. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 15(7), 694–711.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/02656719810218220>

- Karapetrovic, S., & Willborn, W. (2000a). Generic audit of management systems: fundamentals. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 15(6), 279–294. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900010344287>
- Karapetrovic, S., & Willborn, W. (2000b). Quality assurance and effectiveness of audit systems. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 17(6), 679–703. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710010315256>
- Karapetrovic, S., & Willborn, W. (2001a). Audit and self-assessment in quality management: comparison and compatibility. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 16(6), 366–377. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900110395505>
- Karapetrovic, S., & Willborn, W. (2001b). Audit system: Concepts and practices. *Total Quality Management*, 12(1), 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09544120020010066>
- Karapetrovic, S., & Willborn, W. (2002). Self-audit of process performance. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 19(1), 24–45. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710210413435>
- Kast, F., & Rosenzweig, J. (1985). *Organisation and Management: A Systems and Contemporarv Approach*. 4 1 h Edition. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Kolberg, D., & Zühlke, D. (2015). Lean automation enabled by industry 4.0 technologies. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 48(3), 1870–1875.
- Kornfeld, B. (2013). Selection of Lean and Six Sigma projects in industry. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 4(1), 4–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20401461311310472>
- Kumar, U. D., Saranga, H., Ramírez-Márquez, J. E., & Nowicki, D. (2007). Six sigma project selection using data envelopment analysis. *The TQM Magazine*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09544780710817856>
- Lee, J., Bagheri, B., & Kao, H.-A. (2015). A cyber-physical systems architecture for industry 4.0-based manufacturing systems. *Manufacturing Letters*, 3, 18–23.
- Leung, H. K. N., Chan, K. C. C., & Lee, T. Y. (1999). Costs and benefits of ISO 9000 series: a practical study. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 16(7), 675–691.
- Lu, D., Betts, A., & Croom, S. (2011). Re-investigating business excellence : values, measures and a framework. *Toatal Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 22(12), 1263–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2011.631336>
- Mader, D. P. (2007). How to identify and select lean six sigma projects. *Quality Progress*, 40(7), 58.
- Manders, Basak; Henk, H. (2012). Does ISO 9001 pay? - Analysis of 42 studies. Retrieved May 10, 2015, from <http://www.iso.org/iso/news.htm?refid=Ref1665>
- Mann, R., Mohammad, M. & Agustin, M. T. (2012). *Understanding Business Excellence: An awareness guidebook guide book for SMEs*. Asian Productivity Organization. Retrieved July 13, 2015 from www.apo-tokyo.org/coe/files/Understanding-Business-Excellence.pdf
- Martínez-Costa, M., Choi, T. Y., Martínez, J. A., & Martínez-Lorente, A. R. (2009). ISO 9000/1994, ISO 9001/2000 and TQM: The performance debate revisited.

Journal of Operations Management, 27(6), 495–511.

- Medori, D., & Steeple, D. (2000). A framework for auditing and enhancing performance measurement systems. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 20(5), 520–533.
- Menda, R. (2004). The role of a manufacturing audit in crafting the production system. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 24(9), 929–943. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570410552126>
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). An emerging strategy of “direct” research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 582–589.
- Mohammad, M., (2012). *Development of a Guidance Model for the Selection of Organisational Improvement Initiatives* (PhD thesis). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Mohammad, M., Mann, R., Grigg, N., & Wagner, J. P. (2010). The right improvement initiative for the right situation: A contextual and systems approach. In H. Ishii, T. Nose, M. Gen, & S. Shiode (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Computers and Industrial Engineering* (pp. 1-6). Hyogo: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE).
- Mohammad, M., Mann, R., Grigg, N., & Wagner, J. P. (2011). Business Excellence Model: An overarching framework for managing and aligning multiple organisational improvement initiatives. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 22(11), 1213–1236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2011.624774>
- Nordin, N., Deros, B. M., & Wahab, D. A. (2010). A survey on lean manufacturing implementation in Malaysian automotive industry. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 1(4), 374.
- O’Cathain, A. (2010). Assessing the quality of mixed methods research: Toward a comprehensive framework. In *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 531–555). Sage Thousand Oaks, CA.
- O’Cathain, A., Murphy, E., & Nicholl, J. (2008). The quality of mixed methods studies in health services research. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 13(2), 92–98.
- Olhager, J. (2013). Evolution of operations planning and control: from production to supply chains. *International Journal of Production Research*, 51(23–24), 6836–6843.
- Otley, D. (2001). Extending the boundaries of management accounting research: developing systems for performance management. *The British Accounting Review*, 33(3), 243–261.
- Padhy, R. K., & Sahu, S. (2011). A Real Option based Six Sigma project evaluation and selection model. *International Journal of Project Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2011.01.011>
- Pakdil, F., & Leonard, K. M. (2014). Criteria for a lean organisation: development of a lean assessment tool. *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(15), 4587–4607.
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. Wiley Online Library.
- Paul Brunet, A., & New, S. (2003). Kaizen in Japan: an empirical study. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 23(12), 1426–

1446.

- Percin, S., & Kahraman, C. (2010). An Integrated Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Approach for Six Sigma Project Selection. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, 3(5), 610–621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18756891.2010.9727727>
- Psomas, E. L., & Fotopoulos, C. V. (2009). A meta analysis of ISO 9001:2000 research – findings and future research proposals. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 1(2), 128–144. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17566690910971418>
- Pyzdek, T., & Keller, P. A. (2014). *The six sigma handbook*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Radnor, Z. J., & Barnes, D. (2007). Historical analysis of performance measurement and management in operations management. *International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management*, 56(5), 384–396. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410400710757105>
- Radnor, Z. J., Bateman, N., Esain, A., Kumar, M., Williams, S. J., & Upton, D. M. (2015). *Public Service Operations Management: A Research Handbook*. Routledge.
- Rahani, a. R., & al-Ashraf, M. (2012). Production Flow Analysis through Value Stream Mapping: A Lean Manufacturing Process Case Study. *Procedia Engineering*, 41(Iris), 1727–1734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2012.07.375>
- Rajendran, M., & Devadasan, S. R. (2005). Quality audits: their status, prowess and future focus. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 20(4), 364–382. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900510592052>
- Ramly, E. F., Mohammad, M., & Yahya, M. S. (2016). A review on operations diagnosis to identify operational improvement opportunities. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management* (Vol. 8–10 March).
- Ramly, E. F., Yusof, S. M., & Rohani, J. M. (2007). Manufacturing audit to improve quality performance - A Conceptual Framework. In *Proceedings of the World Engineering Congress 2007* (pp. 25–31).
- Ricondo, I., & Viles, E. (2005). Six Sigma and its link to TQM, BPR, lean and the learning organisation. *International Journal of Six Sigma and Competitive Advantage*, 1(3), 323. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSCA.2005.008095>
- Ritchie, L., & Dale, B. . (2000). Self-assessment using the business excellence model: A study of practice and process. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 66(3), 241–254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273\(99\)00130-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(99)00130-9)
- Rother, M., & Shook, J. (2003). *Learning to see: value stream mapping to add value and eliminate muda*. Lean Enterprise Institute.
- Russell, J. P. (2004). 12 Ways To Add Value to Audits. *Quality Progress*.
- Russell, J. P. (2005). *The ASQ Auditing Handbook*, (3rd ed.). (pp. 208, 209). ASQ Quality Press.
- Russell, J. P. (2012). *The ASQ Auditing handbook* (4th ed.). ASQ Quality Press.
- Russell, J. P. & Regel, T. (1996). After the quality audit: Closing the loop on the

audit process. *Quality progress*.

- Society of Automotive Engineer (2011). Audit planning and organising an audit. Retrieved April 23, 2016, from http://www.sae.org/aaqg/audit_information/2008/LongBeach/audit_planning_and_organising_an_audit_mod_4_July_PH_Delegate.ppt
- Salah, S., Rahim, A., & Carretero, J. A. (2010). The integration of Six Sigma and lean management. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 1(3), 249–274.
- Saraph, J. V, Benson, P. G., & Schroeder, R. G. (1989). An instrument for measuring the critical factors of quality management. *Decision Sciences*, 20(4), 810–829.
- Sharma, M., & Kodali, R. (2008). TQM implementation elements for manufacturing excellence. *The TQM Journal*, 20(6), 599–621.
- Simons, D., & Taylor, D. (2007). Lean thinking in the UK red meat industry: A systems and contingency approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 106(1), 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2006.04.003>
- Singh, B., Garg, S. K., Sharma, S. K., & Grewal, C. (2010). Lean implementation and its benefits to production industry. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 1(2), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20401461011049520>
- Slack, N., Chambers, S., & Johnston, R. (2013). *Operations Management. Operations Management* (6th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Smith, A. D. (2010). Service quality programme developments and lean management aspects: a multi-case study. *International Journal of Services and Operations Management*, 7(1), 1–23.
- Smith, A. D., & Offodile, O. F. (2011). Service operations management: case studies of architectural firms' commitment to quality assurance. *International Journal of Services and Operations Management*, 9(2), 141–161.
- Smith, J. L. (1997). *The quality audit handbook*. ASQ Quality Press.
- Snee, R. D., & Rodenbaugh Jr, W. F. (2002). The project selection process. *Quality Progress*, 35(9), 78.
- Spasojevic-Brkic, V., Djurdjevic, T., Omic, S., Klarin, M., & Dondur, N. (2012). An empirical examination of quality tools impact on financial performances: Evidence from Serbia. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 7(1), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.5937/sjm1201077S>
- Stevenson, L., & Jain, R. (2005). Lean manufacturing in the food industry. *Food Science and Technology*, 19(3), 32–34.
- Stevenson, T. H., & Barnes, F. C. (2001). Fourteen years of ISO 9000: impact, criticisms, costs, and benefits. *Business Horizons*, 44(3), 45–51.
- Tahriri, F., Dabbagh, M., & Ale Ebrahim, N. (2014). Supplier Assessment and Selection Using Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process in a Steel Manufacturing Company. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 3(10), 1319–1338. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.861210.6084/m9.figshare.1008767>
- Tapping, D., Luyster, T., & Shulzer, T. (2003). Value Stream Management: Eight Steps to Planning, Mapping and Sustaining Lean Improvements. *Journal for Healthcare Quality*, 25(6), 47.
- Thawesaengskulthai, N; Thawesaengskulthai, D. (2007). Trends in Quality

- Management and Industrial Engineering Techniques. *IE Network*, 1000–1005.
- Thawesaengskulthai, N., & Tannock, J. (2008a). Fashion Setting in Quality Management and Continuous Improvement. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 38(2), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.2753/IMO0020-8825380201>
- Thawesaengskulthai, N., & Tannock, J. (2008b). Pay-off selection criteria for quality and improvement initiatives. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 25(4), 366–382. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710810865258>
- Thawesaengskulthai, N. (2010). An empirical framework for selecting quality management and improvement initiatives. *The International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 27(2), 156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656711011014285>
- Tickle, M., Adebajo, D., Mann, R., & Ojadi, F. (2014). Business improvement tools and techniques: a comparison across sectors and industries. *International Journal of Production Research*, (August 2014), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2014.933274>
- Van der Wiele, T., van Iwaarden, J., Dale, B. G., & Williams, R. (2006). A comparison of five modern improvement approaches Ton van der Wiele * Jos van Iwaarden Roger Williams. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, 1(4), 363–378.
- Voss, C. A., Tsikriktsis, N., & Frohlich, M. (2002). Case research in operations management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(2), 195–219. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570210414329>
- Williams, R., Bertsch, B., Van Der Wiele, A., Van Iwaarden, J., & Dale, B. (2006). Self-assessment against business excellence models: a critique and perspective. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(10), 1287–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360600753737>
- Williamson, A., Rogerson, J. H., & Vella, A. D. (1996). Quality system auditors' attitudes and methods: a survey. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 13(8), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004306>
- Wood, A. R., & Britney, R. R. (1989). Production operations management: Research and teaching opportunities in the 1990s. *Operations Management Review*, 8(3–4), 33–43.
- Yang, C.-C. (2004). An integrated model of TQM and GE-Six-Sigma. *International Journal of Six Sigma and Competitive Advantage*, 1(1), 97–111.
- Yang, T., & Hsieh, C. H. (2009). Six-Sigma project selection using national quality award criteria and Delphi fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making method. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(4), 7594–7603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2008.09.045>
- Yeung, S. M.-C. (2009). Using Six Sigma-SIPOC for customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Six Sigma and Competitive Advantage*, 5(4), 312–324.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods, revised edition. *Applied Social Research Methods Series*, 5.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and Methods*. *Applied Social Research Methods Series*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0b013e31822dda9e>

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2013). *Applications of case study research*. *Applied Social Research Methods Series* (Vol. 34). <https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0b013e31822dda9e>

Yusof, S. M., & Aspinwall, E. (2001). Case studies on the implementation of TQM in the UK automotive SMEs. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710110396058>

Zimmerman, J. P., & Weiss, J. (2005). Six sigma's seven deadly sins: while the seven sins can be deadly, redemption is possible. *Quality*, 44(1), 62–67.

