



International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-7302

available at <http://www.serialsjournal.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 15 • Number 15 • 2017

The Importance of Process Approach in selected Business Excellence Models

Radoslav Jankal¹ and Miriam Jankalová²

¹Department of Management Theories, Faculty of Management Science and Informatics, University of Žilina, Žilina, Slovakia

E-mail: radoslav.jankal@fri.uniza.sk

²Department of Communications, Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications

University of Žilina, Žilina, Slovakia, E-mail: miriam.jankalova@fpedas.uniza.sk

Abstract: Excellent companies propose, manage and improve processes in order to fully satisfy customers and other stakeholders. The aim of this paper of this study is to identify the importance of process approach in selected Business Excellence models as one of the criteria for assessing the excellence of business subjects, on the grounds of comparative analysis. This study is based on information gathered through extensive literature review (research publication, research studies, documents about selected Business Excellence Models) using internet and research databases and the author's own experiences. The application of analysis, comparison, selection and mathematical-statistical methods was required by this study. Results of the analysis showed that the process approach is an important part of Business Excellence Models.

Key words: excellence, process approach, attributes of excellence, business excellence models

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of Business Excellence originated at the beginning of the 1980s from an intensive discussion between American government experts, scientists and industrialists regarding the manner in which to achieve competitive advantage for American enterprises and their products on domestic and foreign markets (Sroka and Hittmár, 2015). This concept came to awareness in Europe at the beginning of 1990s, when the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) presented its model. In the theory and practice are many approaches to defining the notion Business Excellence (see table 1).

As W. Edwards Deming said (Baxter, 2016): „If you can't describe what you are doing as a process, you don't know what you are doing". The quality management system consists of interrelated processes. Authors have been dealing with the problematic of quality management from many points of view

Table 1
Definitions of excellence

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Definition</i>
R. Mann, M. Mohammad, T. A. Agustin	Business Excellence is about achieving excellence in everything that an organization does (including leadership, strategy, customer focus, information management, people and processes) and most importantly achieving superior business results.
D. Adebajo, R. Mann	The excellence in strategies, business practices, and stakeholder-related performance results that have been validated by assessments using proven Business Excellence Models.
EFQM	Excellent Organizations achieve and sustain outstanding levels of performance that meet or exceed the expectations of all their stakeholders.

Source: Mann, Mohammad and Agustin, 2012; Adebajo and Mann, 2008; EFQM, 2012

(Dalimunthe, Fadli, Muda, 2016; Durrah, Allil, Kahwaji, 2015; Panahy, Doniavi, 2016). The adoption of process approach promotes also the International Standard ISO 9001 when developing, implementing and improving the effectiveness of quality management system, to enhance customer satisfaction by meeting customer requirements; understanding how results are produced by this system enables an organization to optimize the system and its performance (ISO, 2016). Process approach is one of the seven quality management principles on which is based this International Standard (ISO, 2016).

The objective of this study is to identify the importance of process approach in selected Business Excellence models as one of the criteria for assessing the excellence of business subjects. The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 is briefly characteristics of selected Business Excellence models; section 3 describes the methodology approach; section 4 compare the points (weight) assigned to results and non-result criteria and also points (weight) assigned to criteria related with processes in the mentioned BE models; section 5 is the conclusion.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF BUSINESS EXCELLENCE MODELS

An overview is focused on briefly characteristics of selected Business Excellence models with an emphasis on processes and process approach. We have included models that are, according to BPIR.com (BPIR, 2017), used by 100,000's of organisations worldwide as a basis for organisational improvement (*Australian Business Excellence Framework, Canadian Framework for Business Excellence, The EFQM Excellence Model, Singapore Business Excellence Framework and The Baldrige Excellence Framework*). To these models have been added another 5 models (*Malaysia Business Excellence Framework, South African Excellence Model, The Management Excellence Model (MEG) in Brazil, Chilean Business Excellence Framework, Ibero-American Model of Excellence in Management*) to cover each of the continents.

2.1. Australian Business Excellence Framework

The model known as ABEF (Australian Business Excellence Framework) was created in Australia in 1988 (SAI Global, 2012) by SAI (Standards Australia International) Global. The model is based on the nine

principles: *Leadership, Customers, Systems thinking, People, Continuous improvement, Information and knowledge, Variation, Corporate and social responsibility, Sustainable results* (SAI Global, 2011).

ABEF contains 7 categories used for the assessment of the organization, which are further divided into 16 sub-categories (SAI Global, 2011; SAI Global, 2012; SAI Global, 2017):

- *Category 1: Leadership* (3 sub-categories – 150 points).
- *Category 2: Strategy and planning* (2 sub-categories – 95 points).
- *Category 3: Information and knowledge* (2 sub-categories – 95 points).
- *Category 4: People* (2 sub-categories – 100 points).
- *Category 5: Customers and other stakeholders* (3 sub-categories – 150 points).
- *Category 6: Process management, improvement and innovation* (2 sub-categories – 110 points) – explores the processes organizations use to supply value to stakeholders. It also examines how they encourage innovation and improvements to these processes and, therefore, improve the quality of their products and services.
- *Category 7: Results and sustainable performance* (2 sub-categories – 300 points).

2.2. Canadian Framework for Business Excellence

The Canada Awards for Excellence were introduced by the Ministry of Industry in 1984, and are administered by the National Quality Institute (NQI), then rebranded as Excellence Canada in 2011 (EXCELLENCE CANADA, 2016a). The framework is based on the 8 principles for excellence: *Leadership through involvement, Primary focus on stakeholders/customers and the market place, Cooperation and teamwork, Prevention based process management, Factual approach to decision making, Continuous learning and people involvement, Focus on continuous improvement and breakthrough thinking, Fulfil obligations to all stakeholders and society* (Porter a Tanner, 2011; NQI, 2007, EXCELLENCE CANADA, 2011, 2016a).

The framework contains 7 criteria used for the assessment of the organization, which are further divided into 27 sub-criteria, all the criteria must work together for an organization to achieve peak performance and effectiveness (Porter a Tanner, 2011; NQI, 2007; EXCELLENCE CANADA, 2011, 2016b):

- *Criterion 1: Leadership* (3 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 2: Planning* (3 sub-criteria – 80 points).
- *Criterion 3: Customer focus* (3 sub-criteria – 90 points).
- *Criterion 4: People focus* (5 sub-criteria – 140 points).
- *Criterion 5: Process management* (4 sub-criteria – 110 points) – examines how processes are managed to support the organization's strategic direction, with a specific focus on prevention (as against correction), as well as continuous improvement. Process management applies to all activities within the organization, in particular those that are critical (key) for success. Process improvement priorities are derived from goals established within other criteria, notably planning and customer focus.

- *Criterion 6: Supplier / partner focus* (3 sub-criteria – 60 points).
- *Criterion 7: Overall business performance* (6 sub-criteria – 420 points).

2.3. The EFQM Excellence Model

The EFQM Excellence Model has been created at the end of the 1990s by the institution European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) in cooperation with the European Commission and European Organization for Quality (EOQ) with the effort to improve the position of European enterprises in the competitive fight on global markets (EFQM, 2012). The EFQM Excellence Model is based on 8 fundamental concepts of excellence: *Adding value for customers, Creating a sustainable future, Developing organizational capability, Harnessing creativity & innovation, Leading with vision, inspiration & integrity, Managing with agility, Succeeding through the talent of people, Sustaining outstanding results* (EFQM, 2016).

The EFQM Excellence Model is based on 9 criteria; each criterion is further broken down into a list of 32 sub-criteria (EFQM, 2012; EFQM, 2017):

- *Criterion 1: Leadership* (5 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 2: Strategy* (4 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 3: People* (5 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 4: Partnership & resources* (5 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 5: Processes, products & services* (5 sub-criteria – 100 points) – Excellent organizations design, manage and improve processes, products and services to generate increasing value for customers and other stakeholders.
- *Criterion 6: Customer results* (2 sub-criteria – 150 points).
- *Criterion 7: People results* (2 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 8: Society results* (2 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 9: Business results* (2 sub-criteria – 150 points).

2.4. Malaysia Business Excellence Framework

The Business excellence framework was first introduced in 1991 and is based on the following guidelines principles of excellence: *Visionary, Driving innovation, Strategic direction, Managing information, Effective deployment, Customer satisfaction, Voice of customer, Employees' learning, participation, and well-being, Suppliers management, Process management and improvement, Performance management* (MITI, 2016; MITI, 2017).

The framework contains 7 criteria, further broken down into a list of 19 sub-criteria (MPC, 2011; MPC, 2017; MITI, 2014; MITI, 2016; MITI, 2017):

- *Criterion 1: Leadership* (3 sub-criteria – 150 points).
- *Criterion 2: Planning* (2 sub-criteria – 90 points).
- *Criterion 3: Information* (1 sub-criterion – 90 points).
- *Criterion 4: Customer* (2 sub-criteria – 110 points).

- *Criterion 5: People* (5 sub-criteria – 120 points).
- *Criterion 6: Process* (2 sub-criteria – 90 points) – all products/services are produced/delivered through some processes. Naturally, process design affects quality of a product/service. Therefore, the present item asks organisations to look into its processes in order to support its policies and strategies and fully satisfy and generate increasing value for its customers and other stakeholders. The item examines how does the company design, manage and improve key work processes. It also look at how key stakeholders, especially, customers' requirements are used to design work processes and how processes are redesigned in view of the changing scenarios. Key work processes may include customer support, complaints resolution, product design and delivery, financing, and supplier contacts.
- *Criterion 7: Results* (4 sub-criteria – 350 points).

2.5. Singapore Business Excellence Framework

The history of this framework dates back to 1994; in 2016, the BE framework was reviewed and enhanced to reflect the dynamic operating environment and to keep pace with the changing business landscape (SPRING, 2017). The Attributes of Excellence describe key characteristics of high performing organizations: *Leading with vision and integrity, Creating value for customers, Driving innovation and productivity, Developing organizational capability, Valuing people and partners, Managing with agility, Sustaining outstanding results, Adopting an integrated perspective, Anticipating the future* (SPRING, 2017).

In the framework are 7 categories used to assess an organization, further broken down into a list of 21 sub-categories (SPRING, 2017):

- *Category 1: Leadership* (3 sub-categories – 120 points).
- *Category 2: Customers* (3 sub-categories – 100 points).
- *Category 3: Strategy* (2 sub-categories – 80 points).
- *Category 4: People* (4 sub-categories – 90 points).
- *Category 5: Processes* (3 sub-categories – 90 points) – focuses on the management of key and support processes to achieve the organization's strategic goals. The organisation has a systematic process to acquire, evaluate and implement creative ideas from all sources. The organisation's key processes have clear objectives and targets. External parties are involved in key aspects of the design process.
- *Category 6: Knowledge* (2 sub-categories – 70 points).
- *Category 7: Results* (4 sub-categories – 450 points).

2.6. South African Excellence Model

In 1996, the CSIR and the South Africa Quality Institute (SAQI) agreed to launch a South African Excellence Model (SAEM1997) (Schaefer, 2014). On August 1, 2014, the South African company Business Assessment Services (BAS) - acting on behalf of the new South African Excellence Foundation (SAEF) - publicly launched the latest South African Excellence Model (SAEMXIII) (Schaefer, 2014). The non-profit SAEF

will use the model as a basis for business assessment and development services for organizations in South Africa (Schaefer, 2014).

South African Excellence Model contains 7 main criteria, further broken down into a list of 21 sub-criteria (Van den Heever, 2015a; Van den Heever, 2015b):

- *Criterion 1: Leadership* (3 sub-criteria – 100 points).
- *Criterion 2: Strategy and planning* (3 sub-criteria – 70 points).
- *Criterion 3: Customer focus* (3 sub-criteria – 60 points).
- *Criterion 4: Employee management* (3 sub-criteria – 90 points).
- *Criterion 5: Resources management* (3 sub-criteria – 60 points).
- *Criterion 6: Core processes* (2 sub-criteria – 120 points) – focuses on core process design and process management.
- *Criterion 7: Organizational results* (4 sub-criteria – 500 points).

2.7. The Baldrige Excellence Framework

The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award was created by Public Law 100-107 (The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Improvement Act of 1987), signed into law on August 20, 1987 (NIST, 2013). The Baldrige Excellence Framework is based on a set of beliefs and behaviors; these core values and concepts are the foundation for integrating key performance and operational requirements within a results-oriented framework that creates a basis for action, feedback, and ongoing success: *Systems perspective, Visionary leadership, Customer-focused excellence, Valuing people, Organizational learning and agility, Focus on success, Managing for innovation, Management by fact, Societal responsibility, Ethics and transparency, Delivering value and results* (Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, 2017; NIST, 2017ab).

The Baldrige Excellence Framework is based on 7 criteria categories, further broken down into a list of 17 sub-categories (Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, 2017; NIST, 2017ab):

- *Category 1: Leadership* (2 sub-categories – 120 points).
- *Category 2: Strategy* (2 sub-categories – 85 points).
- *Category 3: Customers* (2 sub-categories – 85 points).
- *Category 4: Measurement, analysis, and knowledge management* (2 sub-categories – 90 points).
- *Category 5: Workforce* (2 sub-categories – 85 points).
- *Category 6: Operations* (2 sub-categories – 85 points) – how organization designs, manages, improves, and innovates its products and work processes and improves operational effectiveness to deliver customer value and achieve ongoing organizational success.
- *Category 7: Results* (5 sub-categories – 450 points).

2.8. The Management Excellence Model (MEG) in Brazil

The model is currently in its 21th edition and incorporates the most recent and emerging issues concerning management and, at the same time, represents a significant change in the way it is proposed (FNQ, 2017b).

Model is based on 8 Fundamentals of Excellence, further broken down into a list of 31 sub-criteria, model expresses the technological, economic and social changes of the 21st Century (FNQ, 2017ac):

- **Systemic thinking** (2 sub-criteria – 42 average points).
- **Commitment to stakeholders** (5 sub-criteria – 131 average points).
- **Organizational learning and innovation** (4 sub-criteria – 78,5 average points).
- **Adaptability** (2 sub-criteria – 42 average points).
- **Transformational leadership** (5 sub-criteria – 113,5 average points).
- **Sustainable development** (3 sub-criteria – 71,5 average points).
- **Processes orientation** (3 sub-criteria – 71,5 average points) – recognition that the organization is a set of processes that need to be understood from begin to end and considered in the definition of organizational, work and management structures. The processes must be managed in order to seek the efficiency and effectiveness of the activities in order to add value to the organization and stakeholders.
- **Value creation** (7 sub-criteria – 450 points).

2.9. Chilean Business Excellence Framework

The Chilean Business Excellence Framework is based on 8 criteria, further broken down into a list of 24 sub-criteria (ChileCalidad, 2011; ChileCalidad, 2017; CNPC, 2013):

- *Criterion 1: Leadership* (2 sub-criteria – 110 points).
- *Criterion 2: Customers and market* (3 sub-categories – 80 points).
- *Criterion 3: People* (3 sub-criteria – 110 points).
- *Criterion 4: Strategic planning* (2 sub-criteria – 80 points).
- *Criterion 5: Processes* (3 sub-categories – 80 points) – focuses on how organization designs and manages processes to achieve the organization's goals.
- *Criterion 6: Information and knowledge* (2 sub-criteria – 80 points).
- *Criterion 7: Social responsibility* (3 sub-criteria – 60 points).
- *Criterion 8: Results* (6 sub-criteria – 400 points).

2.10. Ibero-American Model of Excellence in Management

Ibero-American Model of Excellence in Management and it is administered by the Ibero-American Foundation for Quality Management (Fundibeq) (Fundibeq, 2015). The model was developed in 1999 to be applied to any public and private organization; in 2015, it has conducted a thorough review that has taken into account the latest trends in management. It is based on the following values: *Cooperation, Transparency, Independence, Recognition, Innovation, Communication, Ethics, Efficiency, Sustainability* (Fundibeq, 2015).

The model is based on 9 criteria, further broken down into a list of 31 sub-criteria (Fundibeq, 2015):

- *Criterion 1: Leadership and management style* (5 sub-criteria – 120 points).
- *Criterion 2: Strategy* (4 sub-criteria – 120 points).

- *Criterion 3: People development* (4 sub-criteria – 110 points).
- *Criterion 4: Resources, suppliers and alliances* (5 sub-criteria – 90 points).
- *Criterion 5: Processes and customers* (5 sub-criteria – 110 points) – how excellent organization manages its processes, designs, develops, produces and provides goods and services, and how they manage relationships, in order to meet the needs and expectations of its current and future customers and other stakeholders.
- *Criterion 6: Customer results* (2 sub-criteria – 130 points).
- *Criterion 7: People results* (2 sub-criteria – 90 points).
- *Criterion 8: Society results* (2 sub-criteria – 90 points).
- *Criterion 9: Global results* (2 sub-criteria – 140 points).

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The aim of the paper is to identify the importance of process approach in selected Business Excellence models. The fulfilment of the aim was preceded by:

- analysis of weights and points assigned to results and non-result criteria in selected Business Excellence models.
- analysis of weights and points of criteria related to processes within the selected models of business excellence in relation to the total weight of all non-result criteria in analysed Business Excellence model and in relation to the total number of points in the model.

Due to the structure and margin of differences in the pointing system of the analyzed BE models, that were identified, were for the evaluation of weights and points assigned to results and non-result criteria and weights and points of criteria related to processes used following statistical characteristics - average, median, lower quartile and upper quartile.

The results of these findings are stated in the following part. This study is based on information gathered through extensive literature review (research publication, research studies, documents about selected Business Excellence Models (BE models)) using internet and research databases and the author's own experiences.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Firstly, we compare the points (weight) assigned to results and non-result criteria in the mentioned BE models (see table 2). Only in two models (The EFQM Excellence Model and South African Excellence Model) is to results assigned the same weight as to the other criteria of the model together (50%). In other models, the weight is in the range of 30% (Australian Business Excellence Framework) to 45% (Singapore Business Excellence Framework; The Baldrige Excellence Framework; The Management Excellence Model (MEG) in Brazil; Ibero-American Model of Excellence in Management).

By the non-result criterion *process* was not compared the percentage weight against the total number of points of the model, but against the points assigned to non-result criteria of the models. (see table 3)

Table 2
Points and weights of result and non-result criteria of selected BE models

<i>BE model</i>	<i>results</i>		<i>non-result criteria</i>		
	<i>points</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>points</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>number of criteria</i>
Australian Business Excellence Framework	300	30	700	70	6
Canadian Framework for Business Excellence	420	42	580	58	6
The EFQM Excellence Model	500	50	500	50	5
Malaysia Business Excellence Framework	350	35	650	65	6
Singapore Business Excellence Framework	450	45	550	55	6
South African Excellence Model	500	50	500	50	6
The Baldrige Excellence Framework	450	45	550	55	6
The Management Excellence Model (MEG) in Brazil	450	45	550	55	7
Chilean Business Excellence Framework	400	40	600	60	7
Ibero-American Model of Excellence in Management	450	45	550	55	5
<i>average</i>	<i>427</i>	<i>42,70</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>57,30</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>median</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>lower quartile</i>	<i>405</i>	<i>40,50</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>upper quartile</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>595</i>	<i>59,50</i>	<i>6</i>

Table 3
Points and weights of process related criteria of selected BE models

<i>BE model</i>	<i>non-result criteria</i>		<i>process related criteria</i>	
	<i>points</i>	<i>points</i>	<i>points</i>	<i>%</i>
Australian Business Excellence Framework	700	110	110	15,71
Canadian Framework for Business Excellence	580	110	110	18,97
The EFQM Excellence Model	500	100	100	20,00
Malaysia Business Excellence Framework	650	90	90	13,85
Singapore Business Excellence Framework	550	90	90	16,36
South African Excellence Model	500	120	120	24,00
The Baldrige Excellence Framework	550	85	85	15,45
The Management Excellence Model (MEG) in Brazil	550	71,5	71,5	13,00
Chilean Business Excellence Framework	600	80	80	13,33
Ibero-American Model of Excellence in Management	550	110	110	20,00
<i>average</i>			<i>96,65</i>	<i>17,067</i>
<i>median</i>			<i>95</i>	<i>16,035</i>
<i>lower quartile</i>			<i>86,25</i>	<i>14,25</i>
<i>upper quartile</i>			<i>110</i>	<i>19,7425</i>

Criterion relating to *processes*, with an average weight and median of round 17%, is a core criterion in 2 models (in 1 case the first place in importance is shared with another criterions) between non-result criteria.

This criterion is most important in South African Excellence Model, where it is associated with the highest importance (24%) among all the non-results criteria and also in comparison to the others Business Excellence Models.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on a comparison of individual BE models/frameworks, we can say that they have a lot of common, because they are based on similar BE principles. The difference is in the assigned points of each criterion in the mentioned models.

When comparing, what weight is given to non-result criteria in the models, it is interesting to note, that only in one model (The EFQM Excellence Model) are all criteria weighted equally (see part 2.3.). In the rest of models, it is different.

Finding 1 - the occurrence of process approach in BE models: The importance of process approach also aware the authors of Business Excellence models, where the criterion relating to processes is included *in all analysed models*.

Finding 2 - the importance of process approach in BE models: The importance of process approach is different in each BE model. The process related criterion has the most points (120) and the highest importance (24%) from among other non-result criteria of the analysed BE models in *South African Excellence Model*, in 5 models has this criterion not less as 100 points. Average importance of this criterion is around 17% and average points is around 96.

The results of the study may represent a starting point for future research, oriented also on the importance of other quality management principles in the Business Excellence Models.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The paper was conducted within the project VEGA 1/0916/15 offered by The Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic.

REFERENCES

- Sroka W, Hittmár Š. (Eds.). (2015), *Management of network organizations: theoretical problems and the dilemmas in practice*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, p. 266.
- Baxter R. (2016), *Enterprise Excellence Handbook*, Florida: Value Generation Partners, p. 436.
- Adebanjo, D., Mann, R. (2008), "Business Excellence." *BPIR Management Brief*, 4(6), pp. 1-16.
- Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2017), *2017–2018 Baldrige Excellence Framework: A Systems Approach to Improving Your Organization's Performance*, Gaithersburg, MD: US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, USA.
- BPIR. (2017), *Business Excellence Models*. Retrieved December 30, 2016, from <http://www.bpir.com/total-quality-management-business-excellence-models-bpir.com.html>.
- ChileCalidad. (2011), *Guía de Autoevaluación del Sistema Escalonado de Mejora Continua*. Retrieved August 30, 2016, from http://media.wix.com/ugd/62a27a_782d414adef64af8fc51c6dae1db26b5.pdf.

- ChileCalidad. (2017), *Modelo Chileno de Gestión de Excelencia*. Retrieved February 01, 2017, from <http://www.chilecalidad.cl/#!products/cfvq>.
- CNPC. (2013), *Modelo de Gestión de Excelencia. Santiago – Chile*. Retrieved September 01, 2016, from http://media.wix.com/ugd/62a27a_17affa25b64d1917f8a5b51dd72525fa.pdf.
- Dalimunthe, D.M.J.; Fadli; Muda, I. (2016), “The application of performance measurement system model using Malcolm Baldrige Model (MBM) to support Civil State Apparatus Law (ASN) number 5 of 2014 in Indonesia.” *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, Vol. 14, No. 11, pp. 7397-7407.
- Durrah, O.; Allil, K.; Kahwaji, A. (2015), “Impact of service quality dimensions on hospital image: The mediating role of patient satisfactions.” *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, Volume 13, No. 9, pp. 6937-6951.
- EFQM. (2012), *EFQM Excellence Model 2013*, Brussels: EFQM Representative Office.
- EFQM. (2016), *Fundamental Concepts*. Retrieved September 03, 2016, from <http://www.efqm.org/efqm-model/fundamental-concepts>.
- EFQM. (2017), *Model Criteria*. Retrieved February 01, 2017, from <http://www.efqm.org/efqm-model/model-criteria>.
- EXCELLENCE CANADA. (2011), *Organizational Excellence Assessment Training Course*, Toronto: Excellence Canada.
- EXCELLENCE CANADA. (2016a), *Canada’s Authority on Organizational Excellence*. Retrieved September 05, 2016, from <https://www.excellence.ca/en/about-us/>.
- EXCELLENCE CANADA. (2016b). *Canadian Framework for Business Excellence – Overview*. Retrieved September 05, 2016, from <https://www.excellence.ca/en/knowledge-centre/products-and-tools/canadian-framework-for-business-excellence2>.
- FNQ. (2017a), *Modelo de Excelência da Gestão. Fundamentos*. Retrieved April 11, 2017, from http://fnq.org.br/avaliar-se/melhores_em_gestao/ciclo-de-premiacao/modelo-de-excelencia-da-gestao.
- FNQ. (2017b), *Modelo de Excelência da Gestão. Um Guia de Referência da Gestão para Excelência*. Retrieved April 11, 2017, from <http://fnq.org.br/aprenda/metodologia-meg/modelo-de-excelencia-da-gestao>.
- FNQ. (2017c), *Pontuações Máximas*. Retrieved April 11, 2017, from http://fnq.org.br/avaliar-se/melhores_em_gestao/ciclo-de-premiacao/pontuacoes-maximas.
- FUNDIBEQ. (2015), *Modelo iberoamericano de Excelencia en la Gestión*. Retrieved September 02, 2016, from http://www.fundibeq.org/images/pdf/Modelo_Iberoamericano_v2015_FUNDIBEQ-ES.pdf.
- ISO. (2016), *Quality management principles*. Retrieved August 29, 2016, from <http://www.iso.org/iso/pub100080.pdf>.
- Mann R, Mohammad M, Agustin TA. (2012), *Understanding Business Excellence. An awareness guidebook for SMEs*. Tokyo: Asian Productivity Organizations; 2012. Retrieved August 27, 2016, from <http://www.apo-tokyo.org/coe/files/Understanding-Business-Excellence.pdf>.
- MITI. (2014), *About the Awards*. Retrieved September 03, 2016, from <http://www.miti.gov.my/miti/resources/fileupload/About%20the%20Awards.pdf>.
- MITI. (2016), *AKI Booklet*, Kuala Lumpur: MITI.
- MITI. (2017), *AKI Booklet*. Kuala Lumpur: MITI. Retrieved December 30, 2016, from http://www.miti.gov.my/miti/modules_resources/bookshelf/Content_AKIBooklet_V2/index.html
- MPC. (2011), *Business Excellence Programme: Journey Towards Enhancing Productivity & Competitiveness*, Petaling Jaya: MPC.
- MPC. (2017), *Malaysia Business Excellence Framework*. Retrieved February 01, 2017, from <http://www.mpc.gov.my/malaysia-business-excellence-framework/>.
- NIST. (2013), *The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Improvement Act of 1987*. Retrieved September 10, 2016, from <https://www.nist.gov/baldrige/malcolm-baldrige-national-quality-improvement-act-1987>.
- NIST. (2017a), *Baldrige Excellence Builder. Key questions for improving your organization’s performance*. Retrieved April 03, 2017, from <https://www.nist.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2017/02/09/2017-2018-baldrige-excellence-builder.pdf>.

- NIST. (2017b), *2017–2018 Baldrige Performance Excellence Framework: Criteria Commentary*. Retrieved April 03, 2017, from <https://www.nist.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2016/12/13/2017-2018-category-and-item-commentary-bnp.pdf>.
- Panahy, E.; Doniavi, A. (2016), "Performance diagnosis of food industry in URMIA based on EFQM model." *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, Vol. 14, No. 10, pp. 6059-6072.
- Porter L, Tanner S. (2011), *Assessing Business Excellence*, New York: Routledge, p. 451.
- NQI. (2007), *Canadian Framework for Business Excellence – Overview Document*, Toronto: National Quality Institute.
- SAI Global. (2011), *GB02 - 2011 The Australian Business Excellence Framework*, Sydney: SAI Global.
- SAI Global. (2012), *2012 Australian Business Excellence Awards Applications Guidelines*, Sydney: SAI Global; 2012.
- SAI Global. (2017), *Australian Business Excellence Framework*. Retrieved February 01, 2017, from <https://www.saiglobal.com/improve/excellencemodels/businessexcellenceframework/>.
- Schaefer Ch. (2014), *A New Model for Excellence in South Africa*. Retrieved September 02, 2016, from <http://nistbaldrige.blogs.govdelivery.com/2014/08/14/a-new-model-for-excellence-in-south-africa/>.
- SPRING. (2017), *Business Excellence Framework*, Singapore: SPRING, p. 56.
- Van den Heever, J. (2015a), *SAEMXIII Launch v6*. Retrieved September 02, 2016, from <http://www.slideshare.net/EdvandenHeever/saemxiii-launch-v6-45643706>.
- Van den Heever, J. (2015b), "The New South African Excellence Model: Incorporation of 'PDCA' and 'RTCK' elements using Causality Based Assessment Scoring." *Oakbrook Business Review*, 1(2), pp. 11-15.