

# TQM – Terrific Quality Marvel or Tragic Quality Malpractice?

Bjarne Bergquist;  
E-mail: [Bjarne.Bergquist@ies.ltu.se](mailto:Bjarne.Bergquist@ies.ltu.se)

Maria Fredriksson  
E-mail: [Maria.Fredriksson@ies.ltu.se](mailto:Maria.Fredriksson@ies.ltu.se)

&

Magnus Svensson  
E-mail: [Magnus.Svensson@ies.ltu.se](mailto:Magnus.Svensson@ies.ltu.se)

Division of Quality and Environmental Management  
Luleå University of Technology  
SE-971 87 Luleå, Sweden

**Key Words:** Total Quality Management, Criticism, Debate

## Abstract

Total Quality Management has seen a tremendous rise of popularity in the eighties and nineties. However, questions of effectiveness, utility and use of TQM arose among many people, practitioners as well as academics.

In this paper, the lack of common interpretations when discussing TQM is emphasised, based on literature study.

The answer to the question if TQM is a marvel or malpractice depends on several factors, for instance, in what kinds of organizations TQM is applied and what interpretation of TQM is made, and what input the theorists and practitioners have, i.e. their earlier environment, culture and values. Often respondents and opponents use the same word but mean different things.

TQM should not be rejected as a whole if one or even if many applications fail. TQM should however be applied with considerable consideration of the specifics of the target organization, the purpose of the organization, and the purpose of applying TQM.

## Introduction

Total Quality Management, TQM has gone from buzzword to fad in many people's opinion. Having seen a tremendous rise of popularity in the eighties and the early nineties, questions of the effectiveness of TQM arose, as many of the implementers did not collect the rewards of their investments. A *Wall Street Journal* article where executives were asked if their TQM involvement had a significant impact on the financial outcome received a lot of attention, since only one third of the respondents were positive (Fuchsberg, 1992). This was followed by an article in *Quality Digest* posing the question "Is Quality Dead?" by Paton (1994). The article included material from several sources including the results of a Rath & Strong survey, where it was claimed that only 20% of the Fortune 500 companies were satisfied with their TQM processes. These results were of course unpleasant for the TQM advocates while bringing grist to the mill of the adversaries. Some people thought that they recognized the shortcomings of the TQM concept, added and retracted a few components and sold similar concepts under different names, such as Business Excellence, or recently Six Sigma (Dale et al., 2000).

But there is also more recent criticism. Park Dahlgaard (2002) has, by referring to other authors, identified two main forms of negative criticism against TQM. One group concerns implementation of TQM and its failure to deliver what has been expected. There is a debate about whether the failing organizations really have adopted TQM or something else. The other form of criticism refers to the position TQM has as a general management theory. The criticism here is that there is a lack of consensus about definitions and that the main characteristics of TQM are not unique at the same time that TQM is not linked to other management theories.

The TQM movement has often responded to criticism or to failure by picking winning strategies, adding ideas or tools into the TQM definition. It is therefore difficult to give one definition of what TQM really is and what it is not, which is problematic if one is to examine the positive or negative outcome of such implementations. Several of the published definitions of TQM appear more as fairly vague descriptions. TQM has been described as a set of improvement tools useful in an organization; see Olsson & Bokor (1995), and as a management philosophy; see Hackman & Wageman (1995). TQM has also been described as a programme for changes based upon organization culture; see, for instance, Witcher (1995) and James (1996), and as a management system; see Boaden (1997), Dale (1999) and Hellsten & Klefsjö (2000). During the last decades, criteria for quality awards such as the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, have been used and seen as definitions of TQM by many different organizations in their work with quality, see e.g. Juran (1995). Some also propose that the label "TQM" should be replaced by "Business Excellence", see e.g. Dale *et al.* (2000).

This confusion or diverging opinions is partly due to the TQM evolution and that the meaning of the word *quality* itself has shifted over time and from author to author; see, for instance, Hellsten (1997), Kroslid (1999), Boaden (1997) and Hellsten & Klefsjö (2000). There is no general agreement on where and when TQM was first used. Leonard & McAdam (2002) refer to Boaden (1997) when claiming that TQM was not developed by one person. Rather, they argue that quality efforts have always existed, in one form or another.

There are several ways of describing the evolution of TQM. Three ways of Dale (1999), Kroslid (1999) and Park Dahlgaard (2002) are shortly described here.

According to Dale (1999), one common description of the historical development of quality improvement is the use of four stages 'quality inspection', 'quality assurance', 'quality control' and finally 'Total Quality Management', the latter with a focus on external and internal customers, processes and quality improvements. The four stages represent the broadened and shifted focus of systems for improving and managing quality since the end of the 70s (Dale, 1999).

Kroslid (1999) suggests instead that the development should be described by the use of two different and parallel 'schools'. On one hand, there has been "the deterministic school", which had its starting point in 'taylorism' and has since then passed the stages 'standard development' and the 'zero defect principle'. On the other hand, "the continuous improvement school", which in its early state sought to reduce variation, has been developed. The continuous improvement school grew in time to what is now known as Total Quality Control and Company-wide Quality Control, meaning that quality improvement should involve everything and everyone in an organization.

A third view of the evolution of TQM is described by Park Dahlgaard *et al* (2001), who has suggested that it might be seen as a continuous process, as a "*fusion of eastern and western ideas*", which has gradually shaped TQM. The result is a theory, characterized by both the rational and logical parts stemming from western theorists, and by the holistic, dynamic and humanistic parts transmitted by Japanese practices, according to Park Dahlgaard (2002). There is also other development connected to TQM. TQM is a concept that has traditionally been connected to business life, commercial and industrial organizations for manufacturing and production. However, the domain of TQM is changing, and TQM has been applied also to public issues. Research has been conducted in the area of managing the third sector, such as non-profit organizations; see for instance Hudson (1995), Lyons (2001), Nutt & Backoff (1992) and Mertens (1999). Reavill (1999) discusses the current status and possible future of TQM as a major management concept.

Consequently, the different views of the evolution of TQM and the different views of the definitions of TQM generate problems both for those practitioners who are applying TQM, and for those theorists who are studying TQM. There are consequences when discussing the effectiveness, use and utility of TQM. The development of TQM implies new definitions, or modifications of existing definitions, for instance, the interpretation of the word *customer*.

## **The purpose**

Advocates and opponents of TQM often use the same word in discussions about TQM and quality, but how the words are defined depends on who is using them. So, the purpose of this paper is to emphasize the problems related to the lack of common interpretations when discussing the use and utility of TQM.

## **Method**

In this discussion the data-collecting method used is literature study. The intention is to give some representative examples from different types of organizations within society, and these choices depend on the authors' different research areas within the discipline. A society as a whole might be described as consisting of two main parts, namely households and organizations respectively. The organizational part can be divided into the three different sectors, 'the commercial sector', 'the public sector', and 'other organizations' (Johansson, 2004). The public sector in turn can, according to Tarschys (1978), be defined as the part of the society that is commonly called either governmental or municipal.

The organizations exemplified in this paper are shown in Matrix 1. The discussion in this paper is structured by use of these three different organizational sectors and the headings follow that structure. The order of the examples of organizations is due to the development of TQM, i.e. it started in the commercial sector, with manufacturing and production.

Since TQM evolved from business life, some examples from such organizations are given, and here the utility of TQM, in the sense of profits, is discussed, and literature positive to TQM is studied. In the public sector examples from educational organizations are given, and the examples concern more the interpretation and the use of TQM and we have focused on critical literature to see what this criticism is about. Lastly, some examples of applying TQM in other organizations than the commercial and public ones will be described, e.g. non-profit. The use of TQM is also discussed here. Mostly positive literature is commented on, since very little negative literature has been published.

**Matrix 1.** *In the matrix, the ovals illustrate issues discussed in the paper. In the examples of commercial organizations the output in the sense of profit is discussed. The example with TQM in educational organizations concerns more the interpretation and the use of TQM. Lastly, the examples from other organizations concern the use of TQM.*

	<b>Input</b>	<b>Total Quality Management</b>		<b>Output</b>
	<b>Earlier environment, culture and values</b>	<b>Interpretation of</b>	<b>Use of</b>	<b>Results</b>
Commercial sector, here in the sense of enterprises				○
Public sector, here in the sense of educational organizations		○		
Other organizations, here in the sense of non-profit organizations and temporary organizations		○		

### **TQM and results as profit in commercial organizations**

One of the main goals of a business is to stay in business and to be profitable to its owners. Other goals may be that the work environment should be good, that customers are satisfied, that the company has a good reputation and provides jobs. If the business is a loss, the other goals are of little value, as the business will go bankrupt. The big question for companies about to implement new strategies or working methods is thus often “Will it pay?” This is a difficult question to answer, but some have tried.

Quality authorities such as Deming (1986, p. 2) think that if the organization redirected efforts to improve quality, costs would decrease, productivity would improve, the competitive position of the firm would improve, firms would provide jobs and people would be happier. Deming did not present empirical results in support of this, but relied on logical reasoning. Another model of thought is that high quality satisfies customers. Satisfied customers are loyal customers and loyal customers are profitable customers and profitable customers make lucrative businesses and happy owners and co-workers. A similar line of thought is proposed by Bergman & Klefsjö (2003, p. 332).

There is empirical evidence of a link between customer satisfaction and loyalty or repurchase behaviour; see, for instance, Fornell (1992), Söderlund (1998), Söderlund & Vilgon (1999), or

Kim *et al.* (2004), but the link is not as compelling as one might at first suspect, and correlation coefficients between such constructs are often below 0.5. The link is also strongly branch dependent, e.g. on the amount of competition that exists within a market and so on. People may be loyal to the companies that they are dissatisfied with or disloyal to companies that have completely fulfilled their expectations. You may be completely satisfied with a restaurant or a tourist resort or a car, but either you like to switch just to try something new or you switch simply because your needs have changed. A two-seat convertible or a party-oriented tourist resort may suit a single person without children, but as s/he forms a family of her own, her/his preferences will be directed more to sedans or minivans and her/his travel to more family-oriented locations. If you are not satisfied with a company, you may stick with it because a cost is associated with a switch (switch barriers could, for instance, be frequent-flier programmes and such), or there are no better options because of monopoly or oligopoly situations.

According to Reichheld & Sasser Jr. (2003), there is a link between customer loyalty and customer profitability. They claim that there is a strong link in service organizations, stating that a reduction of customer defections of 5% boosts profits by 25-85%. A more recent study of how willing customers are to promote a service, relates to the company growth-rate. The authors claim that a cause-and-effect relation between the two constructs exists because of a positive correlation for three types of services (Reichheld & Sasser Jr., 2003). On the other hand, Reinartz & Kumar (2002) have questioned the strong relationship between loyalty and profitability and claim that this link is weak and sensitive to the market type. Loyal customers are more demanding and often more costly to serve, and loyal customers also expect to get pay-cuts or other bonuses for being loyal, which reduces the profit margins of these customers.

These links between constructs, such as customer satisfaction and loyalty, and between loyalty and profitability are often present, but the longer the chain of reasoning is stretched, the harder it is to find correlations between constructs. It is possible to find research concluding that there is a relationship between customer satisfaction and profit margins as well as investigations where this link is not evident. Laitamäki (1997) claimed that such a relationship exists, whereas Söderlund & Vilgon (1999) did not find any correlation between customer profitability and customer satisfaction for a European paper wholesaler. From this we conclude that a strategy for improving profits by aiming for high customer satisfaction may be a very worthwhile proposition, although for some businesses and products it might be difficult to see the pay-off. This may be one of the reasons for some of the instances of TQM implementation failure.

In Hendricks & Singal (1999), the authors have used companies that have received a quality award as a token of these companies having successfully implemented TQM. The quality award could be a national or regional award as well as an award given by customers to their suppliers. The authors have studied some financial performance measures of these firms and compared them with a group of similar "average companies". Their conclusion is that during the implementation phase of TQM (defined as six years before until one year before receiving the award), there is no significant difference between the group of forthcoming winners and a group of control companies. In the time span including the year of the award up until four years after reception, the award winners outperform the control companies (Hendricks & Singal, 1999). Hansson & Eriksson (2002) show similar results as Hendricks & Singal (1989) in an investigation based in Sweden. The Swedish study compared financial performance of Swedish quality award (SQA) recipients, both regional and national and a control group of

companies selected from similar branches. These attempts to correlate profitability to TQM implementation also have drawbacks such as the difficulty in isolating which part of the profitability came from the implementation and which might have been a spin-off from receiving the award. Still, a conclusion that can be drawn is that top quality TQM implementation of TQM appears to be a profitable proposition.

## **TQM reaches the public sector**

From a situation where TQM was used only in goods producing companies, TQM has reached and also been used in the public sector. The interest in working with quality in this sector has grown during the last decade; see for instance Lagrosen (1997). This growth can also be illustrated by the establishment of a large number of regional, national and international quality awards in a lot of countries; see e.g. Eriksson (2002) and Chuan & Soon (2000). Examples of awards are the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (NIST, 2003) in the USA and the European Quality Award (EFQM, 2003) and the Swedish Quality Award (SIQ, 2002). In many cases, applicants from different parts of the public sector, including the school sector and health care sector, participate in these award processes. In year 2000, in fact, all these awards had recipients from the school sector. In Sweden a particular award for the school sector, the Swedish Schools Award (Svenska Kommunförbundet, 2003), was founded by the Swedish Association of Local Authorities in the mid-1990s. Another example of the increase of interest in TQM among public organizations, is the number of participants at quality conferences directed to the public sector.

An example of, and perhaps even an explanation of, the increased interest in quality management for the public sector in Sweden might be the escalating requirements made by different authorities. Since 1987, a new administrative law is in force in the Swedish public sector, which calls for counteracting of inconveniences and improving accessibility among authorities. For instance, the Commission on Advanced Vocational Education in Sweden requires, in the directions for educational organizations working with such education, that they use Quality Assurance and some form of evaluation. One part of the public sector consists of schools and universities, especially in Sweden, where most of the educational sector is owned by the government or local authorities. This is a strong motive for a study of TQM usage in the public sector.

## **TQM in the educational sector**

When studying the criticism against the use of TQM in the education sector, it seems that it can be divided into at least two different forms and that the criticism emanates from different perspectives. One of these forms is the criticism of the transfer of concepts from one context to another. One example is the introduction of methods and adaptation to ways of thinking and values that were developed in goods producing companies. Another form of criticism is also connected to the transfer of TQM to a new area, but also based upon an ideological view. In this paper the use of TQM in educational organizations is seen as a part of an economization within the education area.

## **Use of TQM as management concepts within the education area**

Kohn (1993) discusses the use of TQM in schools, and questions the use of TQM in the classrooms. He describes this as educators trying to transplant a model, methods and metaphors included, stemming from the business world, into classrooms. And, classrooms are not comparable to companies, Kohn says. Another example of a similar criticism is made by Scherp (2004), who claims that TQM originates from Japanese efficiency moves and that the use of TQM implies that quality is defined by the customers. According to Scherp (2002), learning within the TQM-field is emphasized by learning about 'doing' and best 'practice'. In his discussion he also says that students are customers and quality improvements might be carried through by influence of the customer's expectations. Consequently, according to this reasoning, quality will be a matter of marketing and having a good reputation, which is not necessarily connected to the performance of teaching. Scherp (2004) also says that the quality within the TQM perspective means putting customer experience in relation to customer expectation, and that quality in this view is measured by inquiries among customers in order to determine to what extent customer expectations are satisfied.

But this presupposes that quality defined in a customer perspective is based upon their expectations only. Other definitions also include customer demands; see, for instance, Dahlgard *et al.* (1998) and Bergman & Klefsjö (2003) base their definition of quality on both customer needs and expectations. The latter definition implies the importance of not just trying to satisfy explicit demands, but also implicit needs that customers sometimes even do not know of, or cannot appreciate at the moment.

The perspective of quality that is emphasized by Scherp (2004) is founded on a problem-based attitude seeking to create a learning environment for pupils based upon their different needs. So, even if there are differences between his preferred view of quality and the one presented by Bergman & Klefsjö (2003), these differences do not seem as diametrically opposed as he asserts. This is another example of the problem caused by the lack of an explicit definition of TQM, the differences in interpretation of TQM or the lack of a distinction between different conceptions in the field of quality work.

## **Use of a customer-view in the education area**

The ideological aspects of TQM include among other things customer-view, system-view, continuous improvements and focus on processes. However, in this paper the customer-view is discussed. The ideological discussion often emanates from the use of the word *customer* in the TQM-perspective. This customer perspective often leads to TQM being criticised as something connected to a market perspective. Whether this is true or not partly depends on which implications a market perspective is given. In the TQM-perspective the word *customer* is usually not used as a synonym of *buyer*. In this perspective customers are persons or organizations that are the reasons for the existence of the organization and those that the organization should create value to; see Bergman & Klefsjö (2003), for example.

However, one criticism against quality work in schools emanates from the point of view that introducing TQM in the educational sector implies an economisation of that sector and at the same time an introduction of a new set of values that challenge the traditional educational ones; see Kenway (1994) and Kenway *et al.* (1995). Changes in educational organizations involving the use of approaches that incorporate managerial and market driven responses are also discussed by Mcinerney (2003). According to this discussion the use of the customer per-

spective might be seen as a means to increase the number of private schools. On the other hand, it could be asked whether use of TQM in schools in the public sector might strengthen the ability of public educational organizations to compete instead of being a threat. Now that the word *compete* has been mentioned in the educational field, it might be asked whether the use of TQM really opens up the ability for competition, or if the use of TQM is just one way to act in an environment already characterized by competition. In other words, it is possible that the use of TQM might not necessarily be a threat to the public sector, but an opportunity. So, it may be discussed to what extent TQM leads to economizing or to what extent a new environment leads to the need for perspectives like TQM in the educational sector.

Another aspect of the use of a customer perspective is that it might imply a shift of power to some extent. This because it reduces the possibility for some sort of 'experts' to make decisions founded just upon their own views and agendas. Once again the discussion of TQM in an ideological view appears, and a similar issue is discussed by, for instance, Mcinerney (2003). The shift of preferential right of interpretation about what quality is, a shift from 'experts' to customers, does not mean that an organization has to follow strictly what customers explicitly say about their wishes. Instead, Arnerup & Edvardsson (1992) think that an organization should listen to their customers, and through the professional knowledge in the organization, such as education and training for example, help their customers to express their needs and expectations. But in the end, customers always have the opportunity to leave for another supplier, as long as there are no legal obstructions.

At this point, the use of a customer perspective has called attention to the different needs of customers. A third aspect also appears; there might be more than one group of customers. It is possible that not just one person or group should be put in focus; there may be several persons or groups that should be focused on, whose expectations, demands, and needs should be taken into consideration. On the one hand this makes it possible to see other people than pupils or students as customers, which provides the opportunity to broaden the perspective. On the other hand, this might result in a more complex picture for an educational organization. A discussion about different customers might be necessary. The customer view involves work in order to find out and meet the needs of students, pupils, their parents, the next school or educational level, future employees or others, as the basis for the design of activities in an educational organization. But this condition leads to a fundamental question: whose expectations, demands or needs should be fulfilled? The reality might look that way and therefore require a broader overview of which customer needs should be prioritized and which should not.

## **Aspects of use of TQM in other organizations than public and commercial ones**

Reavill (1999) discusses the status and possible future of TQM as a major management concept and suggests that non-profit organizations could benefit from adopting TQM concepts. The systematic approach, the system view and the preventive thinking in TQM can be used not only in manufacturing and service-producing organizations, but also as a way of cooperating in societies.

The literature on organizations other than public or commercial ones includes experiences of using TQM concepts in cooperation between organizations to achieve improvements; see, for instance, Fredriksson (2003, 2004). The experiences of such applications are both positive and negative. However, there is not much criticism of TQM in the context of community issues. Here some experiences of applying TQM in communities will be presented in an at-

tempt to give examples of where and how people have worked with concepts from TQM in their societies, and applied to community issues.

### **Temporary organizations**

The American Society for Quality (ASQ) has, together with the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI), worked on a project where a community health improvement model (the ASQ/IHI model) has been created as an approach to working with community issues; see, for instance, Kinney (1998).

This community health improvement model has similarities to other improvement practices, for instance, reliance on a team and attention to human and organizational dynamics. According to Kinney (1998), there are several important differences in applying improvement methods in community settings.. Examples are when the system boundaries and roles are unclear; when cause-and-effect relationships are complex in the community; when ownership of the community improvement aim is not always clear and is difficult to maintain; and when customer connections are diffuse.

Tacoma is another example. Residents of the community of Tacoma (Washington State) have worked with concepts from TQM. They have studied how compatible “The citizen-as-customer model” has been with community-wide improvement work. One assumption in that project was that collaboration across traditional community boundaries is a key ingredient for successful communities. Improvement community work requires that the work benefits and interests people from all walks of life; is preventive or proactive; offers both short-term and long-term benefits; has measurable results and offers opportunities for the residents to be involved. Jacques (1999)

### **Non-profit organization**

Åseda, a community in southern Sweden, is an example of applying TQM in a non-profit organization. The non-profit organization is the hub in improvement work that concerns a whole community, which indicates systematic improvement work and a system approach.

The improvement work started during a period of decreasing economic and demographic trends in Åseda. There was not enough public service, and it was difficult to get people to move to Åseda, and for the local industry to find competent personnel.

Some representatives of the local business life, who used to work with continuous improvements, discussed Total Quality Management in companies and how to transfer this experience to the whole community. The business representatives created a non-profit organization ‘Progressive Åseda’, which became the main foundation for the improvement work. (Fredriksson 2003, 2004)

The purpose of ‘Progressive Åseda’ is to engage the residents in continuous improvement work to support and stimulate the societal development in order to attain improved quality of life for everyone in the community. Total Quality Management is based on a common organization culture, and a common commitment in the work to reach the common goal. The idea and form of activity for the non-profit association is founded on the quality work in, above all

the manufacturing industry. Several positive results were reached, such as for the well being of the residents. However, during the improvement work the participants also experienced some difficulties, for instance, in engaging residents and some difficulties in communication with politicians. (Fredriksson 2003, 2004)

The new area of TQM application can be related to the more general criticism of TQM. Should TQM be applied to other contexts than in manufacturing and production? Another criticism relevant here is the lack of one sustainable definition of TQM and empirical support in academic contexts.

Furthermore, a strong criticism of TQM concerns its lack of connection to other theories. Foley (2003) refers for example to Kuhn and Popper when discussing the importance of theories in an academic discipline. Using Hempel's (1965) distinction, Foley states that quality management seems to have neither "support from above", i.e., theoretical support, nor "support from below", i.e., empirical support.

## **Conclusions**

In the long term, the openness to various types of criticism will hamper quality management, since the definitions are vague. It is not only the development of TQM that is the subject of different opinions. In international research there are several different descriptions of the concept of TQM, often lacking clear definitions.

### **TQM and results in commercial organizations**

One of the problems encountered when trying to answer the question whether TQM is efficient and effective for different types of organization is that there is a bewildering array of definitions of what TQM is. It is also common to confuse quality control and systems such as ISO9000 with the more proactive emphasis in total quality management.

The confusing definitions reflect not only the lack of a common theoretical basis, but also that the quality community has often responded to new ways of leading businesses as if they were methods within TQM. This was the case with Business Process Reengineering, and so is the TQM movement responding to Six Sigma. The quality movement's eagerness to respond to new challenges and working methods by adopting them and including them under the TQM umbrella is in line with the war cry of "continuous improvement", and indeed, TQM is constantly evolving. The major drawback of this is that the person who is a TQM enthusiast wanting to implement it, will have little guidance of what to actually implement. Another drawback is the academic discussion of the usefulness of TQM. It is like discussing apples and pears; researchers may arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions depending on what they want to prove or where they start to look. Critics will always find people who are not satisfied with what they have implemented or have been subjected to, and supporters can always refer to the ever moving TQM target that the studies were conducted on – something that is no longer the current state-of-the art.

### **The particular usefulness of TQM in educational organizations**

As described above, there is some criticism about the use of TQM in educational organizations. Whether the criticism is justified or not depends, among other things, on the critics'

definition or view of what TQM is. It is difficult to discuss the usefulness of TQM as long as there are different opinions about what TQM is. Scherp (electronic source, no date) criticised TQM and at the same time proposed a different approach for educational organizations. But it might be argued that the proposed approach has strong similarities to TQM. Other factors that might affect the improvement work is how the work is done, in what environment, and what culture and values, other than the TQM corner stones, characterize that environment.

### **Conclusions on the use of TQM in other organizations than public and commercial ones**

The examples of TQM's usefulness in other organizations also show that different problems occur when transferring TQM to other domains than the traditional one. The examples from cooperation between different organizations, here called temporary organizations, and the example of the non-profit organization in Åseda, show that TQM is beneficial when used for community issues. The usefulness was seen in both pro-active and re-active perspectives. The conclusion is that TQM is useful in other organizations, but the concept must be customized to the particular organization.

### **General conclusions**

It is difficult to answer the question whether TQM is Terrific Quality Marvel or Tragic Quality Malpractice. The answer depends on several factors, for instance, to what type of organization the TQM concepts are applied and what definition of TQM is used. The definitions used by theorists and the studied practitioners must also be synchronized. Advocates and opponents often use the same word but mean different things. Although there are obvious problems with the concept, our findings have however led us to the conclusion that TQM still generates benefits if used properly. Since TQM is a concept that is hard to grasp, and since it is difficult to implement, another conclusion in this paper is that semantics is important.

### **References**

- Bergman, B. & Klefsjö, B. (2003). *Quality from Customer Needs to Customer Satisfaction*. Second Edition. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Boaden, R.J. (1997). What is Total Quality Management – and does it matter? *Total Quality Management*, 8(4) pp. 153-171.
- Chuan, T.K. & Soon, L.C. (2000). A Detailed trends analysis of national quality awards world-wide. *Total Quality Management*, 11(8) pp. 1065-1080.
- Dale, B.G. (1999). *Managing Quality*. Third Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Dale, B.G., Zairi, M., Van der Wiele, A. & Williams, A.R.T. (2000). Quality is dead in Europe – Long Live Excellence, true or false? *Measuring Business Excellence*, 4(3) pp. 4-10.
- Deming, W.E. (1986). *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- EFQM (2003). [http://www.efqm.org/model\\_awards/model/excellence\\_model.htm](http://www.efqm.org/model_awards/model/excellence_model.htm)
- Eriksson, H. (2002). Benefits from TQM for organizational performance, *Licentiate Thesis* 2002:46, The Division of Quality and Environment Management, Luleå University of Technology, Luleå.

- Foley, K. (2004). *Five Essays on Quality Management*. To be published.
- Fornell, C. (1992). A National Customer Satisfaction Barometer: The Swedish Experience. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(1), pp. 6-21.
- Fredriksson, M. (2003). TQM as a Support for Societal Development – Experiences from a Swedish Community. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 14(2) pp. 225-233.
- Fredriksson, M. (2004). Experienced Effects from Applying TQM in Societal Improvement Work in a Swedish Community. *The TQM Magazine*, 16 (1) pp. 6-13.
- Fuchsberg, G. (1992). Quality Programs Show Shoddy Results. *Wall Street Journal*, May 14, New York.
- Hackman & Wageman (1995). Total Quality Management: Empirical, Conceptual and Practical Issues, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 40, pp. 309-342.
- Hansson, J. & Eriksson, H. (2002). The impact of TQM on financial performance. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 6(4) pp. 44-54.
- Hellsten, U. (1997). *The Springboard A TQM-Based Tool for Self-Assessment*. Licentiate Thesis 1997:47. Luleå University of Technology, Division of Quality Technology & Statistics, 971 87 Luleå.
- Hellsten, U. & Klefsjö, B. (2000). TQM as a Management System Consisting of Values, Techniques and Tools. *The TQM Magazine*, 12(4) pp. 238-244.
- Hempel, C.G. (1965). *Aspects of Scientific Explanation*, New York: Free Press.
- Hendricks, K.B. & Singal, V.R. (1999). Don't Count TQM Out. *Quality Progress*, 32(4) pp. 35-42.
- Hudson, M. (1995). *Managing Without Profit*. London: Penguin Business Management.
- Kenway, J. (1994). *Economising Education: The Post-Fordist Directions*, Deakin University, Geelong.
- Kenway, J., Bigum, C. and Fitzclarence, L. (1995). *In Marketing Education: Some critical issues*. (Ed, Kenway, J.) (Geelong: Deakin University).
- Jaques, M.L. (1999). Applying Quality Concepts to Community Issues. *Quality Progress*, 32(3) pp. 49-56.
- James, P.T.J. (1996). *Total Quality Management*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Johansson, S. (2004). Teacher in economics at Luleå University of Technology, Personal communication.

- Juran, J.M. (1995), *In A History of Managing for Quality – The Evolution, Trends and Future Directions of Managing for Quality*, (Ed. Juran, J.M.) (p. 596), Milwaukee, WI., ASQC Quality Press.
- Kinney, C.F. (1998). Improving Community Health Through Collaboration. *Quality Progress*, 31(2) pp. 39-41.
- Kim, M.K., Park, M.C. & Jeong, D.H. (2004). The Effects of Customer Satisfaction and Switching Barrier on Customer Loyalty in Korean Mobile Telecommunication Services. *Telecommunications Policy*, 28(2) pp.145-60.
- Kroslid, D. (1999). *Searching for Total Quality Management – Rethinking and Reinterpreting*. Linköping Institute of Technology, Division of Quality Technology and Management, 581 83 Linköping.
- Laitamäki, J. (1997). Building and Deploying Profitable Growth Strategies Based on the Waterfall of Customer Value Added. *European Management Journal*, 15(2) pp.158-66.
- Lyons, M. (2001). *Third Sector*. New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Mcinerney, P. (2003). Moving into dangerous territory? Educational leadership in devolving education system. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6 (1) pp. 57-72.
- Mertens, S. (1999). Nonprofit Organizations and Social Economy: Two ways of Understanding the Third Sector. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 70(3) pp. 501-520.
- NIST (2003) *Criteria for Performance Excellence* (Gaithersburg: NIST).
- Nutt, P.C. & Backoff, R.W. (1992). *Strategic Management of Public and Third Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Olsson, P.D. & Bokor, D.W. (1995). Strategy Process-content Interaction: Effects on growth performance in small, start-up firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 33(1) pp. 34-44.
- Park Dahlgaard, S.M., Bergman, B. & Hellgren, B. (2001). Reflection on TQM for the new millennium (1). *The Best on Quality*. International Academy for Quality. Vol. 12. pp.279-312.
- Park Dahlgaard, S.M. (2002). *The Human Dimension in TQM: Learning, Training and Motivation*. Doctoral Dissertation No. 55. Linköping University. Linköping, Sweden.
- Paton, S.M. (1994). Is TQM Dead? *Quality Digest*, Vol. 14 (April) pp. 24-30.
- Reavill, L.R.P. (1999). What is the Future Direction of TQM Development? *The TQM Magazine*, 11(5) pp. 291-298.
- Reichheld, F.F. & Sasser, Jr., W.E. (2003). The One Number You Need to Grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(12) pp. 46-54.

Reinartz, W. & Kumar, V. (2002). The Mismanagement of Customer Loyalty. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(7) pp.86-95.

Scherp, H-Å. (2004). Quality Work from a Learning Perspective. Available: [http://www.pbs.kall.se/pdf/kvalitetsarbete\\_utifran\\_larandeperspektiv.pdf](http://www.pbs.kall.se/pdf/kvalitetsarbete_utifran_larandeperspektiv.pdf) [2004 Mars 3] (In Swedish)

SIQ (2002) *The SIQ Model for Performance Excellence 2002* (Gothenburg: Swedish Institute for Quality).

Svenska kommunförbundet (2003). Utmärkelsen Svensk Skola. Available: <http://www.lf.svekom.se/artikel.asp?A=4090&C=1979&ArticleVersion=9> (In Swedish)

Söderlund, M. (1998). Customer Satisfaction and Its Consequences on Customer Behaviour Revisited. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 9(2) pp. 169-88.

Söderlund, M. & Vilgon, M. (1999). Customer Satisfaction and Links to Customer Profitability: An Empirical Examination of the Association between Attitudes and Behaviour, *SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Business Administration*. Stockholm: School of Economics.

Witcher, B. (1995). The Changing Scale of Total Quality Management. *Quality Management Journal*, Summer, pp. 9-29.

