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ABSTRACT

During the last twenty years, Total Quality Management and Business Excellence Models [BEMs] have been very attractive to organisations as an improvement strategy, as there has been a push by governments to encourage this trend in both public and private sector organisations through the development of national quality awards. There remain difficulties in the successful implementation of BEMs, as there have been high implementation failures rates in various industrial settings. It appears that these failures have been the result of a failure to identify key influential factors that might be incorporated into organisations’ BEM implementation guidelines. Therefore, this research attempts to identify the key influential factors for the successful implementation of a BEM and then examines the role of these factors when they are incorporated with the implementation strategy of a BEM in a public sector organisation in the United Arab Emirates, the Abu Dhabi Police.

The research takes a mixed-methods approach including a systematic literature review, a questionnaire survey of 300 employees and 25 interviews with top managers and BEM implementation team members in the Abu Dhabi Police. The quantitative data is assessed using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. A paired-samples t-test is used to compare perceptions and the actual presence of key influential factors. Additionally, the correlation between these factors and the implementation efficiency of the BEM is investigated by using a Pearson’s correlation coefficient analysis. The interviews are also subjected to thematic analysis.

The key findings are that there are 18 key influential factors which significantly impacted on the successful implementation of the BEM in this public sector organisation; therefore they should be considered as a whole during any such implementation. These factors can be grouped into associated stages of commitment, implementation and measurement, leading to the development of a conceptual framework to be used as a roadmap for the implementation of BEMs by public sector organisations.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This introductory chapter aims to provide an overview of the research undertaken to develop this thesis, including sections on the contextual background to the study, the research problem, aims, objectives and questions, the significance of the study and the organisation of the thesis, with a brief description of the purpose of each chapter.

1.2 Background to the research

Since the second half of the 20th century, the implementation of the principles of Total Quality Management [TQM] such as Business Excellence Models [BEMs] have been adopted across the world by organisations aiming to achieve competitive advantage by improving their quality of service, reducing operational costs and promoting the interests of all stakeholders (Douglas and Judge, 2001; Kluaypa and Onuh, 2010; Zu et al, 2010). Idris and Zairi (2006) argue that successful TQM implementation has a positive influence on the organisation’s performance at all levels. Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2000), Arjomandi et al (2009) and Nazemi (2010) all report that TQM practices and models have become attractive for many governments as a mechanism for increasing competitiveness in both the private and public sectors. Accordingly, during the last two decades, many countries have embarked upon developing a National Quality Award [NQA] initiative based on BEMs which have been developed from TQM principles to promote quality awareness, culture and process management, thus providing role models for other businesses in the country (Evans and Lindsay, 1999). Additionally, Chin and Pun (2002) refer to organisations which have successfully implemented TQM practices and models to improve productivity, while managing to increase customer satisfaction and their market share. On the other hand, Rusjan (2004) warns that although TQM models and BEMs tend to be popular for many organisations in different sectors, some organisations may encounter difficulties in applying these models to their specific contextual environments. Ghobadian and Woo (1996) argue that the BEMs underpinning quality awards, like most other models, have limitations. In effect, the most complex activity in BEMs is related to the implementation of these models (Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Asif et al, 2009a; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). This
issue is discussed by Sousa and Voss (2002), who argue that TQM cannot simply be integrated into existing organisation systems but may require the stimulation of culture, structural change, the redesign of work, the redefinition of managerial roles, employee development and alignment with organisational corporate strategy. Accordingly, the difficulty of TQM practice and the implementation of BEMs and other models may create the impression that TQM could fail to improve organisational performance. Nwabueze (2001) and Asif et al (2009a) argue that because of this difficulty in implementation, managers of many organisations tend to have their attention diverted away from adopting TQM, creating the opportunity for it to lose its credibility as an improvement strategy.

1.3 Research problem

As discussed in the literature review (Chapters 3 & 4), the successful implementation of TQM initiatives and models such as BEMs leads to superior organisational performance, which in turn helps organisations to achieve excellence (Kanji, 2002; Zairi and Alsughayir, 2011). While many cases of successful TQM practices and models have been reported, there are also numerous instances where failure has occurred. For example, Sousa-Poza (2001) reports that only 20 percent of companies which have implemented TQM have done so successfully, while Thiagarajan et al (2001) agree that the failure of TQM implementation is not an uncommon outcome. Indeed, Asif et al (2009a) and Varkey and Antonio (2010) state that up to 70% of strategic initiatives may fail to be implemented by the initiating organisation. Notwithstanding this poor success rate, Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2001) note a dramatic increase in the level of TQM implementations during the previous two decades. Miguel (2001) and Vest and Gamm (2009) explain that while many organisations try to implement TQM models, they tend to fail because of the complexity of implementation and its requirements in time and resources. The result of this widespread failure of TQM initiatives is that many management practitioners have lost faith in TQM; therefore there is a need to pay further attention to the implementation approach, which may have an impact on the success of a TQM initiative within an organisation, according to Asif et al (2009a).

Several researchers have investigated the failure of TQM implementation. Üstüner and Coskun (2004) report that 90% of respondents from two Turkish government ministries (Education and Commerce) stated that the main obstacle inhibiting the successful
practice of TQM in Turkey was related to the lack of appropriate implementation strategy and guidelines. Shin et al (1998) also argue that in most cases where TQM has failed, it has been due to lack of an effective implementation strategy or the application of a process not designed to execute TQM models properly. Therefore, Davies (2008) suggests that in order to achieve success in BEM implementation, organisations need to develop better implementation guidelines incorporating the key influential factors applicable to their contextual environment, which is consistent with the findings of Motwani and Kumar (1997) and of Yusof and Aspinwall (2000a) that implementation guidelines are considered to be among the most difficult aspects of TQM implementation.

Therefore, there is a strong consensus among researchers that long-term successful implementation of TQM is related to the appropriateness of the implementation guidelines and to ensuring the correct identification of the factors that influence the implementation strategy (Sitkin et al, 1994; Dean and Helms, 1996; Nwabueze and Kanji, 1997; Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Kanji et al, 1999; Nwabueze, 2001; Thiagarajan et al, 2001; Sousa and Voss, 2002; Sharma and Hoque, 2002; Meers and Samson, 2003; Bauer et al, 2005; Tarí, 2006b; Davies et al, 2007; Davies, 2008; Asif et al, 2009a; Varkey and Antonio, 2010; Smith, 2011; Zairi andAlsughayir, 2011). These authors argue for the need to identify the factors that influence the implementation strategy in order to develop better implementation guidelines for the application of TQM principles and BEMs. Research into this new management phenomenon in the public sector is very limited, as the initial literature research found that the majority of case studies referring to the implementation process have been conducted in private sector organisations (Motwani and Kumar, 1997; George et al, 2003; Tarí, 2006b).

Although a review of the literature review reveals many examples of TQM implementation from a range of industries, very little attention has to date been paid to developing proper guidelines for implementing BEMs in the public sector. Specifically, most studies reported in the literature tend to focus on the level and the impact of the BEM on organisational performance, identifying only some of the factors that need to be considered during implementation. There appears to be a gap in the literature in that there is no comprehensive study that proposes a detailed list of all of the key influential factors and incorporates them into the implementation strategy in order to develop
effective guidelines for successful implementation of BEMs in the public sector. For instance, two studies, by Bauer et al (2005) and Davies (2008), investigate BEM implementation but acknowledge that they have not identified all of the factors that must be incorporated within a successful implementation strategy. Davies (2008) examines issues related to the implementation of the European Foundation for Quality Management [EFQM] in universities in the United Kingdom [UK]. The study does not present a comprehensive list of implementation guidelines, as it examines only five factors, classified as integration factors, which influence EFQM implementation in UK universities. In the second study, Bauer et al (2005) investigated the influence of four factors on BEM implementation strategy, concluding that these factors were not sufficient to ensure successful implementation. Hence, both authors argue that more factors need to be identified and incorporated into any BEM implementation project.

Given the numerous deficiencies found within the literature, the following points provide the rationale for this study, which seeks to enhance their understanding. First, the study aims to provide additional understanding of the implementation of a BEM in a public sector organisation. Motwani and Kumar (1997) and Tarí (2006b) report that most studies of the application TQM principles through the BEM implementation process have been conducted in private manufacturing organisations; therefore more attention should be given to the implementation of BEMs in the public sector.

Secondly, the study aims to identify key influential factors in successful BEM implementation in the public sector. TQM researchers including Kanji et al (1999), Huq et al (2001), Baidoun and Zairi (2003), Meers and Samson (2003), Davies (2008) and Asif et al (2009a) highlight the need to identify the key influential factors that help to achieve successful implementation of BEMs. A preliminary literature review suggested that there were key influential factors for successful implementation of business excellence in the Western context (Thiagarajan et al, 2001). Although a few studies have been conducted in Arab countries, most have reported that TQM adoption has faced many problems and barriers (Zairi and Alsughayir, 2011). Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2000), Al-Zamany et al (2002), Baidoun and Zairi (2003) and Al-Marri et al (2007) emphasize the need to develop effective implementation guidelines by identifying the key influential factors associated with the successful implementation of BEMs in Middle Eastern countries and in particular the UAE. Smadi and Khawaldeh
(2010) argue that although great efforts have been made by the UAE government to encourage organisations to implement TQM principles and BEMs to improve productivity and quality, the literature makes it obvious that little empirical research has been conducted in that country in the area of TQM implementation. The present study is thus a pioneering investigation, as there has been no extensive research to date that addresses BEM implementation in the UAE public sector.

The complex nature of TQM model such as BEMs has led to a relatively high failure rate of BEM implementation, which in turn can cause the diversion of organisational effort and resources to other priorities. This research attempts to bridge a gap in the literature addressing this problem by exploring the key factors influencing BEM implementation, examining their roles and how they are incorporated into the strategy of implementing BEM in a public sector organisation.

1.4 Research aim

This study aims to explore the role of the key influential factors in the successful implementation of a BEM in a public sector organisation; in particular, it examines how these factors have affected the implementation of a BEM by the Abu Dhabi Police [ADP].

1.5 Research questions

To meet the above aim, the following research questions are addressed:

- What are the key influential factors associated with successful BEM implementation?
- How do these key influential factors facilitate and affect the successful implementation of a BEM?
- How are these key influential factors perceived and actually implemented in a public sector organisation in the UAE?
- To what extent do the key influential factors relate to and affect the efficiency of BEM implementation in a UAE public sector organisation?

1.6 Research objectives

The aim and research questions are addressed by pursuing five specific objectives:
• To identify the key influential factors in the successful implementation of a BEM in the public sector.
• To investigate how the key influential factors are deployed during the BEM implementation in a public sector organisation.
• To investigate how these factors affect the implementation of the BEM.
• To assess the degree of criticality of the presence of the key influential factors in enabling successful BEM implementation in a UAE public sector organisation.
• To identify the difference between the perceived and actual implementation of the key influential factors that are related to BEM implementation in a UAE public sector organisation.

1.7 The significance of the study

The preliminary literature review conducted in preparation for this study indicated a lack of consensus regarding key influential factors and the way that organisations, particularly in the public sector, take them into account to achieve successful implementation of BEMs (Bauer et al 2005; Tarif, 2006b; Davies, 2008). The study therefore seeks to contribute to knowledge by bridging this gap in the literature, which it attempts to do by exploring the key influential factors in successful BEM implementation and by examining how these factors are deployed within the ADP. It also seeks to assess the effectiveness of these factors in the case of the BEM implementation process followed by this particular public sector organisation. To the researcher’s knowledge, there has to date been no previous study of BEM implementation in a UAE public sector organisation. Therefore, this study will generate knowledge useful to public sector organisations in the UAE and other developing countries, providing a conceptual framework for the key influential factors that they should consider as a roadmap when implementing BEMs.

1.8 Organisation of the thesis

Chapter 1 has offered a general overview of the research, discussed its background and set out the purpose and significance of the study.
Chapter 2 provides general background information about the UAE, the contextual environment of the ADP and its relationship with other public sector organisations in the UAE.

Chapter 3 reviews the literature concerning the theoretical background to TQM and BEMs. It provides an overview and definition of TQM and related concepts, including the most popular BEMs and their implementation.

Chapter 4 presents the framework of the study and identifies the key influential factors for the successful implementation of a BEM as revealed by a review of the literature.

Chapter 5 describes and justifies the methodology adopted by the study. The research design and methods are discussed, along with the rationale behind the choice of methods of data collection and analysis, including validity and reliability testing.

Chapter 6 summarises the statistical analysis of the questionnaire findings.

Chapter 7 offers a thematic analysis of the interview findings, organised according to the key influential factors identified in the study framework.

Chapter 8 presents a comprehensive discussion and analysis of the data from all the research approaches. Based on the overall findings, this chapter attempts to explore and validate the key influential factors and to develop the conceptual framework for successful implementation of BEM in public sector organisations.

Chapter 9 summarises the findings of the study, considers its theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge and identifies opportunities for further research in the field. It also makes recommendations to the case study organisation and discusses some of the limitations which the researcher encountered.
Chapter Two: The UAE Context

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the background to the organisational and environmental context of the case study by providing an overview of the development of the public service sector in the UAE. It also discusses the historical background of the ADP and its recent history of implementing improvement initiatives, which have included new public management [NPM], BEMs and strategic planning.

2.2 General background

The Arab Gulf states have undergone rapid development since their receipt of huge oil revenues in the 1970s (Rees et al, 2007). Consequently, the public sectors in each of these territories (Bahrain, Kuwait, UAE, Qatar, Oman and Saudi Arabia) have been substantially enhanced (Rees et al, 2007). Their greatly increased incomes have allowed the governments of these countries to gradually modernise their services to citizens, while simultaneously improving service quality and cost effectiveness in a common drive for excellence (Jakka, 2004). In order to arrive at a sound appreciation of the dramatic changes in the public sector, it is necessary to explore the actual context in which government agencies function by examining the public sector reforms and the movement towards quality (Salem and Jarrar, 2009). This is a particularly interesting exercise in the case of the UAE, because of its unique system of government, not just among the Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC] countries but also in the wider Middle Eastern and Arab contexts (Salem and Jarrar, 2009).

The UAE has two formal layers of government, federal and local. This structure applies to each of the seven emirates: Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Sharjah, Ajman, Umm Al-Quwain, Ras Al-Khaimah and Al-Fujairah (UAE Yearbook, 2009). Constitutionally, local economic resources are managed and controlled by the local governments, which in turn contribute to the federal budget. The two wealthiest emirates, Abu Dhabi and Dubai, contribute up to 90% of the annual federal budget. Abu Dhabi is responsible for a contribution of 75%, since it is the largest and richest emirate in the federation (Salem and Jarrar, 2009). Public sector organisations and agencies such as ministries, municipalities and bodies responsible for hospitals, the police, the military, sports,
education, transport and telecommunications all receive their funding from the federal budget (Salem and Jarrar, 2009). Abu Dhabi is the capital of UAE. Geographically, it is the biggest emirate in UAE with the land surface of 87% of total area of UAE. Abu Dhabi is considered as the wealthiest emirate among other emirates in UAE with 8% of world oil reverse and nearly 3% of gas reserve (Abu Dhabi Department of Finance, 2010). Therefore, while UAE has federal political system and local government autonomy where each emirate has responsibility to role its natural resources and debts, Abu Dhabi contributes heavily in federal government functions such as: defence, police, UAE foreign activities (Abu Dhabi Department of Finance, 2010).

2.3 The nature of public sector organisations in UAE

It is necessary to appreciate the working practices and ethos of public sector organisations in the UAE, since they are somewhat different from their Western counterparts. Indeed, in all Gulf States, norms deriving from tribal, social and contextual influences underpin their mode of operation, such that both formal public management systems imported from the West and informal systems driven by tradition are in evidence (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008; Salem and Jarrar, 2009). In this respect, the observation is made by Salem and Jarrar (2009) that the antecedents of public administration in Arab countries are the legacies from the colonial period, culture, customs and religion. Hence, a dualistic approach is seen in government and public sector administration (Salem and Jarrar, 2009). The fact that the UAE is composed of seven emirates is also a consideration, according to Mustafa and Mansour (2008), who suggest that the federal and local authorities must co-exist comfortably and that this co-existence is facilitated by a mixture of both formal and informal administrative practices by which each sheikh informally controls and manages his own emirate’s economic and other resources in the Majlis (assembly) without there being any conflict with federal policy.

In Arab culture, and particularly in the UAE, the Majlis operates as a vehicle for local or social democracy and is the means by which the individual sheikhs or sub-sheikhs meet with their citizens to discover their opinions on certain socio-political issues and to discuss their needs (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008). Citizens’ requests are considered rationally at the Majlis and the sheikh may act as an advocate with the federal system on behalf of the local citizens (UAE Yearbook, 2009).
This relationship between the sheikhs and their individual populations is helpful at the federal government level, since it enables the particular circumstances of each emirate to be properly known, so that the federal machine is able to ensure that wealth is evenly distributed and that all citizens’ wellbeing is cared for (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008). The outcome, not surprisingly, is loyalty towards government and the belief that the UAE’s unique social and cultural character is being maintained through the preservation of the rights of citizens—and particularly tribal members—to communicate directly with the sheikh responsible for their needs (UAE Yearbook, 2009).

2.4 Public sector reform in the UAE

Widespread public sector reform has been enabled in the GCC by large oil revenues, particularly over the last 25 years (Rees et al 2007). There have been great improvements in the provision of services to citizens and indeed in the conditions of work enjoyed by employees of public sector organisations (Rees and Althakhri, 2008). In the UAE, such reform has taken the form of NPM initiatives, introduced in an effort to secure sufficient strength within the public sector to cope with the demands of economic growth (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008). Approaches of this kind are common in Arab countries, where the public sector assumes a dominant role in stimulating such growth (Rees and Althakhri, 2008). The promotion of sustainable economic growth is one of the UAE’s strategic goals announced in 2007 by the Prime Minister, Sheikh Mohammed Bin Rashid Al-Maktoum, in his first federal government strategy (UAE Yearbook, 2009). In this policy statement it was stressed that widespread public sector upheaval was needed in order to modernise its delivery and guarantee service quality, cost effectiveness, high productivity levels, effective management of human resources and the empowerment of all public sector agencies. The Prime Minister stated, “Our vision is that we become one of the best governments in providing quality services, nurturing creative minds, building national talent, innovating solutions and adopting international best practices” (Al-Maktoum, 2010). This was to be achieved by ensuring the compatibility of all government systems with quality service demands. To this end, the Cabinet Office established a Ministerial Council for Service, responsible to the federal government for the implementation of public sector reform initiatives (Official Website of the Prime Minister of the UAE, 2009).
However, the implementation of public sector reform initiatives has not been easy. The difficulties encountered have arisen from the social and cultural traditions that dominate the administrative structure of Arab countries, creating barriers which are associated with prevalent traditions of tribal, social and political patronage and which need to be overcome (Salem and Jarrar, 2009). Ayish (2005) observes that the UAE has been unique amongst Arab countries in its public sector reform strategy, through its robust political leadership, the provision of sufficient resources and the adoption of administrative flexibility. The creation of the existing culture in public organisations has facilitated the effective implementation of the reform measures (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008). In health, media, telecommunications, police, sports and many other areas of government activity, there has been clear acknowledgment since the mid-1990s that new public sector values and principles such as NPM are part of the future of the organisations responsible for these functions (Kirat, 2006). However, Kirat (2006) identifies room for improvement in the relationships among the different organisations and the need for stronger interagency communication systems.

The last two decades have witnessed great strides forward in the way government bodies collaborate within the UAE, resulting in improvements to service quality and cost effectiveness, according to Salem and Jarrar (2009), who conclude that the UAE government has moved from a ‘silo’ mode of operation to a ‘competitive’ one. Jakka (2004) comments on this categorisation, marking a change from the traditional hierarchical method of communication in which feedback from users regarding service quality is not encouraged (the silo) to a more responsive approach, achieved by re-engineering to provide competitive advantage. This strategy has indeed afforded the UAE a highly competitive position in the Middle East, but Salem and Jarrar (2009) remain cautious, observing that the UAE public sector still suffers from an unwillingness to share information and a generally low level of trust amongst competing individuals and groups, a situation which is again blamed on the prevailing Arabic social and cultural context. UAE public sector managers recognise these issues and are addressing them by creating an appropriate cultural orientation for the development of trust, politically, socially and technologically; and it is successes in these three dimensions of trust that have placed the UAE government in a better position in respect of collaboration (Salem and Jarrar, 2009).
As part of the push to improve public sector performance, the UAE government has shown evidence of a desire for greater collaboration between its agencies and its citizens. The different modes of governance which it is possible to observe having developed in the UAE, according to Salem and Jarrar (2009), are indicated in Figure 2.1.
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**Figure 2.1: Modes of governance** (Salem and Jarrar, 2009)

As part of the development of greater collaboration with and among all public sector agencies, there has been a push to develop the infrastructure to support it. Al-Mashari (2007) observes that the UAE has ambitions to become a knowledge economy and that in order to achieve this aim, a new government model is required. In response, e-government is being introduced as a means of facilitating the transfer of information and knowledge between the general public and government (Al-Mashari, 2007). The federal government has provided fundamental support for this initiative through the establishment of the General Information Authority to promote e-government services in all seven emirates (Ayish, 2005; Salem and Jarrar, 2009), although the emirates are expected to vary in their application of the e-government system (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008). In practice, Mustafa and Mansour (2008) warn that a lack of ‘e-awareness’ and
readiness among much of the UAE population is likely to limit the number of users. While citizens may not be aware of and ready for the use of technology, however, there has been a focus within the government agencies on training staff to benefit from the advantages that information technology can bring their home organisations (Salem and Jarrar, 2009).

Another initiative, launched in response to globalised competition, is the Government Excellence Programme (Salem and Jarrar, 2009), which has received strong support from the UAE executive leadership. When presenting the Federal Government Excellence Award in 2009, the Prime Minister said that “excellence would be achieved through creative initiatives based on scientific methodology and the adoption of world-class best practice” (Salama, 2010). The government’s first steps towards the implementation of these new initiatives has included comprehensive reviews of government training programmes, human resource policy and structure, so that the concepts of excellence in all government operations can be properly underpinned (Mustafa and Mansour, 2008). That said, ‘excellence’ as a concept and a state to be aimed for is still very much a new idea in the UAE government; Mustafa and Mansour (2008) argue that the implementation of the excellence blueprint by public sector organisations must be facilitated by more scientific research and general support.

2.5 Movement towards excellence in the UAE

Although the UAE has been gradually moving towards excellence in its public sector in an effort to replace the traditional structure of administration, some of the emirates have been more successful than others. Dubai has spearheaded the development of public sector excellence and is recognised as a pioneer in this respect throughout the Arab World (Thawani, 2007). The Dubai Quality Award [DQA], which was introduced in 1994, had as its goal to promote quality concepts and transfer this to the private sector. The DQA emulated best practice as represented by the EFQM, which was in use in both public and private sector organisations as a set of quality guidelines and a means of achieving excellence (Dubai Quality Group, 2010).

There is no doubt that this quality initiative has been a driving force in elevating companies in Dubai to the position where they meet all the standards required to place the Emirate in pole position in respect of quality in the entire region and where it
competes on an equal footing with the developed nations in the delivery of quality. Two years after the launch of the DQA, Abu Dhabi followed suit with the introduction of the Sheikh Khalifa Excellence award in 1996 (Djerdjouri and Aleter, 2007), thereby providing two quality awards that together introduced a new management philosophy to the UAE. Simultaneous with this new concept new training opportunities in the field of quality management and operation, while the consequent raising of quality awareness within society produced a quality imperative (Thawani, 2007). Additionally, the Dubai Economic Authority gave its approval for the establishment of the Dubai Quality Group, which has since been influential in ensuring that the DQA has been successfully acknowledged not only in Dubai but throughout the UAE. Subsequently, the Dubai Government Excellence Programme was introduced in 1997 at the request of Sheikh Mohammed Bin Rashid (Djerdjouri and Aleter, 2007), since when it has been highly influential in steering the public sector towards the new style of public administration.

As a result of the visible success of the Dubai Government Excellence Programme, other emirates have implemented their own public sector excellence programmes, such as the Abu Dhabi Award for Excellence in Government Performance [ADAEP] in 2007 (ADAEP, 2007) and the Ajman Excellence Programme in 2008 (Ajman Excellence Programme, 2008). These were established in order to secure improved public sector performance and higher satisfaction levels among government service recipients.

At the federal government level, the Prime Minister announced in 2009 the establishment of the Khalifa Bin Zayed Government Excellence Programme, aimed at improving the federal government’s performance and generating competition between its departments and agencies. This new programme incorporates best practice as identified internationally, in the hope that the government sector will aspire to excellence by following such models (Official Website of the Prime Minister of the UAE, 2009).

The movement to develop quality and excellence is also characterised by a significant increase in ISO certifications over the last decade, the UAE being a full member of the ISO in Geneva (Thawani, 2007). Zaramdini (2007) has observed that the UAE has the highest number of ISO-certified organisations in the Arab world, attributing this to its widespread implementation of ISO 9000, which provides its companies with a strong public image and competitive advantage. The extent of ISO certification clearly
demonstrates the awareness among both managers and employees within the UAE of the value of quality management in the private sector (Zaramdini, 2007). However in a study evaluating TQM readiness in three UAE public sector organisations, using the EFQM questionnaire as their research instrument, Djerdjouri and Aleter (2007) found that only a moderate level of awareness was present amongst both leaders and employees. That said, the organisations had implemented sound quality programmes and had achieved ISO 9000 certification, so the conclusion must be drawn that such certification is no indication that TQM can be successfully introduced. The situation described by Djerdjouri and Aleter (2007) may be explained by the observations that the Excellence Programme for Public Sector Organisations was in its infancy and that ISO certification is but a step on the journey towards excellence.

In summary, it can be said that there is a very significant interest in the pursuit of quality within the UAE (e.g. Djerdjouri and Aleter, 2007; Thawani, 2007). However, whilst work has been done in the field, other scholars (e.g. Al-Marri et al, 2007; Zaramdini, 2007; Jones and Seraphim, 2008) argue that insufficient work has been done and that there is a need to devote more attention to this issue in order to generate a theory-led framework for the implementation of TQM in the UAE.

2.6 The case setting: The Abu Dhabi Police

2.6.1 An overview of the Abu Dhabi Police

The Abu Dhabi Police Force is a branch of the Ministry of the Interior whose development and nature have been influenced by a number of historical factors. It is defined as a paramilitary organisation and was first developed from the traditional military support structures for the Caliph or ruler of Abu Dhabi, according to the Abu Dhabi Police Security Studies and Research Centre [ADPSSRC] (ADPSSRC, 2007). For historical reasons, the structure of the organisation was initially that of a military unit, with a strong top-down hierarchical command approach. While the ADP has changed over the years from this traditional military police mode of operation, it is still different in nature from other UAE government departments, as it retains the command and control structure of a paramilitary organisation. The modern ADP was established in 1957 by His late Highness Sheikh Shakhbut Bin Sultan Al Nahyan, then ruler of Abu
Dhabi, who was keen to establish a modern policing organisation within the Emirate (ADPSSRC, 2007).

Sheikh Shakhbut Bin Sultan Al Nahyan (1966, cited by ADPSSRC, 2007) saw the foundation of the ADP as the first step towards the modernisation and development of public sector institutions in the Gulf region. The foundation stage of the organisation was from 1957 to 1966, where it had to develop within the unique situation and circumstances of the UAE. As a result of the stability and security observed within Abu Dhabi, the other emirates followed suit, establishing similar police forces in the late 1960s (ADPSSRC, 2007). After the accession of Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al Nahyan in 1966, the organisation underwent a considerable development process (1966-1979) which included the acquisition of modern facilities and allocation of resources to ensure that it followed international best practice, including advanced technical approaches (ADPSSRC, 2007). The move to develop a greater accountability to the citizens meant that in 1979 the ADP merged with the UAE Ministry of the Interior (ADPSSRC, 2007). This merger has resulted in greater cooperation between the various regional policing organisations within the UAE, along with greater sharing of intelligence and best practice approaches (ADPSSRC, 2007). The next phase in the development of the ADP was in 1995, with the start of the Excellence Period (ADPSSRC, 2007), which coincided with the development of infrastructure and business enterprises in Abu Dhabi; thus a need was identified for a new security approach to meet the demands and potential challenges that this development could bring to the region (ADPSSRC, 2007). In response to these challenges, the then ADP Commander felt it necessary to review and update the existing institutional structure and approaches to ensure that the organisation was sufficiently flexible to meet them. As a result of the Excellence Period there were a great number of developments within the organisation, including new strategic units (ADPSSRC, 2007).

Al Nuaimi (2010) reports that in 2001 a comprehensive development project was launched within the ADP. One of the first indicators of this approach was that in 2003 the ADP implemented a five-year strategic development plan to improve the level of service and interaction with the public and to provide greater levels of accountability, knowledge and skills development within the organisation, while achieving the primary goal of ensuring the safety and security of Abu Dhabi (ADPSSRC, 2007). The second
strategic development plan, for 2008-2012, was launched in 2008, aiming to enhance cooperation with other government agencies, private enterprises and international organisations (Al Nuaimi, 2010). The 2008-2012 plan states the vision to make the ADP “the most operationally effective Police Force possible in one of the safest counties in the world” (ADP, 2008:5).

2.7 Organisational structure of the ADP

Figure 2.2 sets out the organisational structure of the ADP and its six constituent directorates.
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2.8 ADP administrative reforms

Since 1996, the management practice of the Abu Dhabi Police has been reformed through the use of decentralisation, the empowerment of unit commanders and officers, increased levels of training and the implementation of modern information systems,
aiming to reduce bureaucratic waiting times and heavy administrative processes while improving data collection (ADPSSRC, 2007).

At the start of these administrative reforms the ADP was characterised by a traditional and hierarchical approach to policing and constrained by bureaucratic procedures and job roles delineated between functional units (Al Nuaimi, 2010). Thus the executive management was concerned about alienation between the ranks within the organisation and wanted to implement human resource reforms to enhance respect and care by high ranking officers towards ordinary employees. Al Nuaimi (2010) continues that research dating from this time indicates that most employees were not independent thinkers but automatons who followed routine because they believed that they were expected to do so. As part of the administrative reforms, the organisational culture had to be changed and this was done through a number of activities and policy changes, including the Police Creativity Awards (ADPSSRC, 2007). Since 2001, according to Al Nuaimi (2010), there has been an identifiable change in organisational culture through new strategy implementations such as the competencies that all police officers must gain to confirm that they are able to perform their roles within the organisation. To ensure that these performance requirements were met, there was a focus on the training and development of current and new officers which was aligned with the strategic plans for the various units and the organisation as a whole (ADPSSRC, 2007). The organisational change was inspired by the leadership of Lt. General Sheikh Saif Bin Zayed Al Nahyan, who was then (and is at the time of writing) UAE Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

To support the organisational culture change, the ADP developed a programme of knowledge sharing and quality development activities within the various functional units. This new focus on knowledge sharing and development of quality best practice encouraged officers to review and improve their existing knowledge while developing new working practices reflecting the research and benchmarking activities conducted among similar organisations, such as the Singapore Police and various UK policing organisations (ADPSSRC, 2007; Al Nuaimi, 2010). From 2000 the ADP undertook a quality development and management review to enable it to gain ISO 9001:2000 (Al Nuaimi, 2010). As part of the incentive to participate in the knowledge and quality
development activities under the new administrative processes, a performance reward system was implemented to motivate and raise employee morale and to implement new quality standards and greater professionalism (ADPSSRC, 2007). The motivational rewards system was accompanied by a punishment system to address behaviour identified as unacceptable to the organisation, such as not participating in the new administrative processes and organisational culture. Its aim was to remove employees who persistently resisted change, thus undermining the process and the morale of their units (Al Nuaimi, 2010). These programmes were part of the organisational strategy to reduce the resistance to change that occurs within organisations such as the police where there are strong—almost familial—interpersonal bonds between colleagues and comrades. The internal culture within the lower ranks creates close comradeship, strengthened by historical links and traditions. The administrative changes were unsettling for many and the reward system helped to reduce their resistance to change while developing a new culture within the organisation (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

Any change process or administrative development executed in any public or private organisation is faced with resistance by certain staff, due to job security and stability reasons (Al Nuaimi, 2010:70).

To address these concerns about the changes, the executive management of the ADP developed a change management process which was designed to consolidate the management resolve that change was to occur within the strategic planning framework. To ensure that the organisation was not overwhelmed by a rapid change and to reduce the potential effects of resistance to change on operational areas, there was a phased approach which included preparation prior to implementation, continuous training and education about the changes, an operational management phase and then gradual implementation of the changes. This approach gave sufficient time for participants to identify any issues that they had, enabling management to address these in due time (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

One of the key actions that the ADP undertook to reduce the level of resistance of officers and various directors who were not convinced that the changes were necessary involve them in the change process. This allowed them to appreciate the benefits of
change for their organisational areas and in their own daily functions, so that many became organisational champions for change rather than resisters (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

The implementation of technology and new processes, including the development of officers’ attitudes to knowledge sharing and quality, enabled the organisation to move to the excellence approach, as the previous change processes had become stepping stones, enabling the new approach to be implemented within the organisation (Secretary of Excellence Awards, 2009). The ADP started the implementation of the BEM in 2007 at the same time as the implementation of the Abu Dhabi Award for Excellence in Government Performance. The participation of the ADP in this award scheme was not voluntary, as all government agencies were required to compete (Secretary of Excellence Awards, 2009). However, the ADP had already identified comprehensive quality planning as a necessary element of police work. The organisation believed that by strengthening its commitment to quality and professionalism, it would be able to meet the challenges of modern crime, of increased security pressures from the global community and of future technological challenges, as individuals and organisations develop new methods to misuse modern technology (ADPSSRC, 2007). As part of the excellence award process, according to Al Nuaimi (2010), the award implementation team identified in 2007 several challenges and weak points which needed to be addressed in order to improve organisational excellence:

- The old organisational structure was not compatible with the newly developed administrative system and processes.
- The existing vision and goals of the organisation were not clear or adequate for the new directions which the ADP was going in.
- There were no clearly defined job descriptions and roles throughout the organisation to match the new administrative system.
- There was an ineffective command structure for supervision, coordination and team working between divisions and units.
- There was a need to develop a proactive systematic approach, rather than reactive remediation.
- There was a need to improve the community policing concept and to integrate its practices within standard operational activities.
There was poor sharing of security information and a need to develop working partnerships between teams.

There was poor use of human resource management techniques and approaches.

The operation of comprehensive police stations was ineffective.

Al Nuaimi (2010) states that in future all administrative procedures within the ADP will be based on the concept of excellence by encouraging and rewarding creative and outstanding personnel. With its new reward and punishment systems, the ADP is committed to addressing non-performers and making all employees accountable for their actions and decision-making. The rationale for improving performance and accountability is that the Central Executive of the UAE government wishes to improve the quality and standards of the services delivered to the public (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

In conclusion, during the last decade the ADP’s structure and culture has been adapted to accommodate a BEM with the aim of improving the quality and professionalism of the organisation. This change was prompted by the policy of the Ministry of the Interior to improve service provision for UAE citizens and enhance the quality of life of society as a whole.

2.9 Chapter summary

This chapter has introduced the UAE in the context of the other Gulf States and described the contextual background of the case study organisation, the ADP. It has presented a brief overview of NPM and the excellence movement within the UAE. Additionally, it has given an account of some of the stages of historical organisational development so that the current changes within the organisation are understood contextually. It has detailed how the existing organisational culture has developed, providing an environmental perspective of the nature of the ADP and the pressures upon it. The UAE government has initiated the development of excellence within the public sector; the ADP, while responding to this demand, has found that there is still room for improvement to accommodate a BEM and achieve excellence in its performance, as it has encountered challenges in meeting its strategic goals.
Chapter Three: Theoretical background to TQM and BEM

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the theoretical background to TQM and explains how BEMs have developed from the original theoretical idea into quality models for organisational practice. An understanding of the contextual background to BEMs makes their application easier and clarifies the need to focus on the key influential factors in order to ensure successful implementation of BEM. Therefore, this chapter covers the definition, concepts and elements of TQM and explains how the BEM is recognised as a means of TQM practice and application. To help explain the nature of BEMs when applied to the ADP, it compares the three main international quality awards: the EFQM, the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award [MBNQA] and the Deming Prize [DP].

3.2 Strategic overview of TQM

The past few decades have seen a growing worldwide momentum in marketing and customer service competition. Organisations have begun to adopt improvements in all aspects of their activities, according to Kluaypa and Onuh (2010), as a means of ensuring their survival and competitive advantage within the global marketplace. Consequently, since the second half of the 20th century, TQM has been recognised and regarded as a superior strategy, maintaining improvements in organisational performance (Idris and Zairi, 2006; Kanji and Sa, 2007). Baidoun and Zairi (2003) suggest that through management systems such as TQM, superiority is achieved in all aspects of business operation within the modern organisation. In praise of quality enhancement, Kruger (1999) states that TQM should be regarded as a strategy whose concepts and principles are valid for any organisation in any sector. However, Kanji (1998) advises organisations to consider the cultural and contextual features of their environment when implementing TQM principles. In short, he asserts that TQM implementation should be flexible enough to be applied in any situation.
3.3 Philosophy and definition of quality

Quality in its entirety should be regarded as relative, fuzzy and subjective (El-Bakry et al, 2010). Bou-Llusar et al (2009) identify a number of definitions of quality, while Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011) warn that within the extensive body of relevant literature there is no universal or agreed definition of quality. However, there is general agreement that quality management is a system of practices with the intention of improving quality performance within organisations (Kartha, 2004; Martínez-Costa et al, 2008; Dahar et al, 2010). In other words, the definition of quality may vary from time to time, from situation to situation and from business to business; El-Bakry et al (2010) note that no single definition of quality fits every situation with respect to measurement, usefulness to management and relevance to customers. Nevertheless, while this is regarded as potentially confusing, various authors (Dahar et al, 2010; El-Bakry et al, 2010; Al-Swidi and Mahmood, 2011) advise organisations to consider quality as an essential concept in all activities. Harvey and Newton (2004) argue that defining quality can be complex, because it can be both a personal and a social concept. Dahar et al (2010:504) define quality as “a structured process for improving the output …”, generally “based on common sense”.

In searching for a definition of quality, one must begin by examining the works of the early prominent contributors: the so called gurus or forefathers of quality management (Martínez-Lorente et al, 1998). In so doing, it is interesting to discover that each guru tends to have defined quality from his own perspective, basing the definition primarily on the form of involvement, experiences gained and environment in which his research work was undertaken (Martínez-Lorente et al, 1998). Hence, each explores a new dimension of the definition of quality. Juran (1988) defines quality using the expression “fitness for use”, giving a definition which may be considered particularly suitable for manufactured goods such as motor cars, implying that such finished goods should be free from any defects and hence serve their purpose satisfactorily. For his part, Crosby (1979) defines quality in terms of “conformance to requirements”, a concept which is commonly accepted in the manufacturing environment as implying the need to produce goods to serve the requirements of the market, hence assigning no role to the design aspect of the product. Deming (1986), on the other hand, portrays quality as being achieved through a significant reduction in statistical variation, leading to an
improvement in productivity and hence promoting the organization’s competitive positioning. Finally, Feigenbaum (1991) defines quality as an integral part of the day-to-day work of employees, managers and employers, helping to enable the marketing, manufacturing, production and service functions of the firm in order to maintain full customer satisfaction.

In addition to these four gurus, others authors (Scarnati and Scarnati, 2002; Dale, 2003; Goetsch and Davis, 2005) have provided definitions of quality from much wider perspectives, extending its horizon to satisfying and enhancing customers’ perceptions and expectations. Scarnati and Scarnati (2002), for instance, define quality as a philosophy or process whereby things are expected to be accomplished precisely, implemented effectively and finally measured to ensure the prevalence of an excellent level of performance. Dale (2003) and Goetsch and Davis (2005), on the other hand, are of the view that quality is all about maintaining full satisfaction for customers, based on their requirements, perceptions, expectations and needs. These definitions imply that the philosophy of quality is a general concept that has different dimensions dependant on the setting of the organisation and its application of quality.

3.4 The concept of TQM

Ishikawa (1985) explains that what is now regarded as TQM was first developed in the 1970s by Japanese engineers, primarily aiming to improve the manufacturing process. Garvin (1988), Kanji (1998) and Lau and Anderson (1998) assert that defining TQM is a rather complex task and hence there is no single specific definition which may be found to fit all organisations. Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011), for example, define TQM as a management philosophy that considers all the aspects of the operation in an organisation, while Zairi et al (1994) define it as an attempt to improve overall organizational performance by emancipating organizational structure and people through empowerment and development, within a set of defined targets, ensuring consistency and enhancing customer satisfaction. TQM in an organisation, argues Oakland (2000), is regarded as a sensitive and holistic approach which leads to improvements in competitiveness, effectiveness and flexibility at all levels of activity. In similar vein, Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011) note that TQM is becoming a separate discipline within management and that its application requires a philosophical approach.
that considers all aspects of the organisation and its contextual environment to enable it to operate flexibly and competitively within the local and global marketplace.

TQM has also been defined as an effort of continuous improvement in search of business excellence, requiring a defined set of resources, skills and a quality culture within the given organization, where efforts are made towards full customer satisfaction (Eriksson, 2003; Goetsch and Davis, 2005; Bou-Llusar et al. 2009). Dale (2003) simply defines TQM as a companywide initiative where everyone within the organisation is responsible for quality enhancement.

Based on the above definitions, different authors have attempted to define TQM from various subjective angles. It is therefore fair to argue that TQM is a comprehensive improvement philosophy which is used in order to gain competitive advantage over other organisations through the efficient use of resources. Given this definition of TQM, it is necessary to understand its elements in order to ensure successful implementation.

3.5 Elements and critical success factors of TQM

The literature review indicates that there appears to be no general consensus concerning the elements of TQM (El Shenawy et al 2007). Jabnoun and Sedrani (2005) argue that there are many similarities in the literature as to the use of particular elements in TQM, but differences are also marked. Thiagarajan and Zairi (1997) point out that it is common practice for researchers to identify and define critical success factors [CSFs] for TQM by means of respondent surveys or organisational case studies. El Shenawy et al (2007) suggests that in order to use the elements of TQM in the identification of CSFs, it is necessary to decompose the various constructs on which these elements are based, but that there seems to be very little consensus in the literature about the content of these constructs in TQM practice.

Motwani (2001) proposes a framework for attaining competitive advantage through quality management, based on the three pillars: Crosby’s 14 steps, Deming’s 14 prescriptive points and Juran’s Trilogy. The research by these three gurus has led to the identification of a set of key variables that are considered to be essential in achieving superior quality outcomes. These findings have been particularly useful in several comprehensive empirical studies identifying TQM elements (Saraph et al, 1989; Flynn et al, 1994; Powell, 1995; Ahire et al, 1996; Black and Porter, 1996).
Saraph et al (1989) have designed a revolutionary method to examine the CSFs of TQM, based on the quality management approach developed by Crosby, Deming and Juran. Saraph et al (1989) conducted a study in Minneapolis, USA, among 78 participants from 20 organisations within manufacturing and service industries. A total of 120 TQM items were identified and were formulated into eight constructs (see Table 3-1). This study was the first attempt at listing the CSFs for TQM and has become a platform for other empirical studies such as those by Flynn et al (1994), Badri et al (1995), Black and Porter (1996), Quazi and Padibjo (1998) and Antony et al (2002). In testing for internal consistency, criterion-related validity and construct validity, Quazi and Padibjo (1998) used the eight critical factors of Saraph et al (1989) on two different samples of small and medium sized companies in Singapore, concluding that the instrument appeared to be reliable and valid for the measurement and quality management practices in an organization.

In a study of 716 respondents from 42 organisations in the United States [US] manufacturing sector, Flynn et al (1994) examined the impact of TQM on organisational performance. They identified seven constructs (Table 3-1) of integrated TQM, using a similar instrument to that of Saraph et al (1989) and adopting Cronbach’s alpha for scale refinement. The seven constructs were based on 14 perceptual scales, assessed for reliability.

Badri et al (1995) conducted another empirical study of critical factors, with the objective of testing the instrument developed by Saraph et al (1989), using a larger sample of 424 service and manufacturing firms in the UAE. They claim that their empirical findings are indicative of the instrument being a reliable and valid measure of the CSFs for TQM.

Using the survey analysis of a sample of members of EFQM, Black and Porter (1996) conducted a post-hoc synthesis, based on the Saraph et al (1989) analysis relating to CSFs for TQM and aiming to determine the these CSFs as perceived by UK quality assurance professionals. The survey questions were developed from the MBNQA and 10 factors (Table 3-1) were found to be most critical and significant in TQM in any organisation. Black and Porter (1996) propose that a similar study should be conducted in the USA to determine whether the same pattern of TQM CSFs could be found among US quality assurance professionals. On the basis of this recommendation, Dayton
(2001) conducted such a study in the USA using the same 10 factors, concluding that the similarities were positive and significant.

Antony et al (2002) identified 11 CSFs associated with 72 TQM elements in a survey of 32 organisations in Hong Kong, concluding that the associations of seven CSFs with 38 elements of TQM were significant. They claim to have shown that these items were reliable and valid, hence offering new insight into the understanding of TQM CSFs in Hong Kong industries.

In a study of construction companies, Koh and Low (2010) identified eight CSFs for TQM implementation in the sector, listed in Table 3-1. Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011) also identified eight CSFs, for TQM initiatives to improve organisational performance in the Malaysian service sector. These factors were management leadership, customer focus, strategic planning, human resources management, service design, information and analysis, continuous improvement and benchmarking. In defining TQM and CSFs, Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011) argue that although philosophical approaches differ, the ideas underpinning TQM reflect a collective ethos, shared by the various national quality awards around the world, to improve the total quality of organisational performance, such as in the MBNQA and EFQM BEMs.

On the basis of the above discussion, it is fair to argue that many researchers have made attempts at identifying the CSFs for a given TQM system. While there seems to be no general consensus on the exact or optimal number of CSFs to use, there is nevertheless general agreement amongst these researchers that the BEM and National Quality Award approaches have encouraged TQM practice within organisations. In particular, authors such as Black and Porter (1996), Yusuf and Aspinwall (2000a), Sousa and Voss (2002) and Bou-Llusar et al (2009) have made direct reference to BEMs as representing TQM practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>TQM critical success factors</th>
<th>Source of factors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.6 BEM as TQM framework

The above discussion makes it evident that there is a widely shared belief that a BEM must consist of a set of quality principles and practices. In particular, researchers such as Black and Porter (1996), Ghobadian and Woo (1996), Quazi and Padibjo (1998), Bou-Llusar et al (2009) and Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011) have founded their studies on quality award frameworks such as EFQM and MBNQA as a means of identifying the TQM constructs.

From its origins as a theoretical approach to quality enhancement, TQM has become a practical and reliable framework used by EFQM, MBNQA and other award models. In particular, over the past 20 years, a large number of organisations in different sectors of the economy have adopted BEMs as vehicles for implementing TQM principles (Marwa and Zairi, 2008; Bou-Llusar et al, 2009; Al-Swidi and Mahmood, 2011). Van der Wiele (2000), Lee et al (2003) and Bou-Llusar et al (2009) have specifically and directly stated how their theoretical and empirical findings could be channelled to turn TQM into a practical model in the real world.

Based on a survey of 446 Spanish companies, Bou-Llusar et al (2009) examined the validity of the two BEMs (EFQM and MBNQA) as a TQM framework. Their findings suggest that TQM fits well within these BEMs for its reliability and comprehensiveness. Earlier studies by Adebanjo (2001) and Wang and Ahmed (2001) are in line with the conclusions drawn by Bou-Llusar et al. (2009), implying that BEMs offer a comprehensive set of quality principles and practices that can be fully implemented throughout an organisation.

Kanji and Tambi (2002) refer to BEMs as a special form of TQM models, as they tend to provide essential measures of organisational activities and identify the contributions of such activities to overall organisational performance. They further argue that such models are capable of recognising the very complex forms of co-existence between leadership, process and key objectives in an organisation.

Ghobadian and Woo (1996) highlight the impact of adopting TQM. Thus TQM benefit organisations through the encouragement of a consistent and systematic approach to self-assessment, a process which enhances the sharing of knowledge, skill development
and practices across the organisation through communication and collaboration to improve competitive performance (Ghobadian and Woo, 1996; Marwa and Zairi, 2008).

For nearly half a century many countries have adopted a proactive role in encouraging their organisations to deploy some form of quality improvement model. For the purpose of improving quality awareness and competitiveness in industries, NQA bodies have been established in a large number of countries worldwide (Marwa and Zairi, 2008). Grigg and Mann (2008) report that more than 80 national governments have now developed their own NQAs. McDonald et al (2002) note that a large number of NQAs tend to be principally based on the EFQM and MBNQA models, while Kluaypa and Onuh (2010) report that both MBNQA and EFQM are widely used as the basis of many Asian NQAs. More specifically, a comparative study conducted by Sharma and Talwar (2007) found 26 of 81 NQAs worldwide to be based on the EFQM, while almost all (53) of the remaining countries used MBNQA as the basis of their NQAs.

Comparative studies of NQAs conducted by Stading and Vokurka (2003) and by Sharma and Kodali (2008) found that three quality awards (DP, MBNQA and EFQM) were considered the best known and most popular ones worldwide. Sharma and Kodali (2008) further note that although the success of the Deming Prize may have inspired the emergence of the other two awards, the current trend is in favour of MBNQA and EFQM, which have been adopted much more widely.

In light of their predominance, the following subsections offer a comprehensive comparative analysis of the three major awards. This is followed by a section relating them to the Abu Dhabi Award for Excellence in Government Performance.

### 3.6.1 Deming Prize

Following Deming’s contribution to quality improvement in Japan, a prize model was established by the Union of Japanese Scientists and Engineers in honour of this American statistician, regarded as father of the worldwide quality movement, according to Stading and Vokurka (2003), who argue that Deming’s contribution has been particularly significant in his emphasis on so-called statistical process control. Ghobadian and Woo (1996) further identify the primary aim of the Deming Prize as being to recognise performance improvement from the implementation of total quality control based on statistical process control, while Dale (2003) and Stading and Vokurka
(2003) state that it honours private and public organisations for their successful implementation of quality control activities. Since the acceptance of the DP as Japan’s most prestigious award, the improvement in manufacturing quality has been highly significant, placing Japanese products at the top of the global quality ladder (Dale, 2003; Stading and Vokurka, 2003; Ghobadian and Woo, 1996). Ahire et al (1996), Conti (1997) and Dale (2003) all assert that the Deming Prize must be regarded as the first structured quality management model.

Stading and Vokurka (2003) contrast the Deming Prize with other national or regional quality awards, noting that it does not offer a framework for organising or prioritising criteria, but consists of 10 primary categories. Each primary category is divided into a total of 66 subcategories, and there is no set number of points allocated to the individual subcategories, but the maximum score for each is 10. In support of this structure, Dale (2003) reasons that it maintains flexibility. In examining the Deming Prize procedures, Miguel (2001) identifies certain areas which differ from those of other international award models; for example, all items are equally weighted and the checklist clearly identifies the factors and procedures which underpin the Total Quality Control process and their specific techniques and approaches.

3.6.2 The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award

Khoo and Tan (2003) state that the MBNQA was established to give national recognition to US companies that had achieved performance excellence. Only private or semi-private businesses located in the USA or its territories are allowed to compete for the award (Ghobadian and Woo, 1996). Vokurka et al (2000) stress that MBNQA assists organisations to increase their quality awareness by identifying the requirements for excellence and sharing information about successful quality strategies and benefits.

The US Congress passed the Establishment Bill for this award with the backing of President Reagan in 1987. Since then, the MBNQA, which is administered by the National Institute of Standards and Technology in cooperation with the American Society of Quality, has become the most widely recognised award body in the USA (Miguel, 2001).

Vokurka et al (2000) also state that the MBNQA is based on the core principles of TQM as a framework for performance excellence. Garvin (1991) asserts that it is not only
concerned with codifying the principles of quality management, but also gives companies a comprehensive framework for assessing their progress towards the new stages of management. The MBNQA criteria used to assess an applicant’s performance are divided into seven categories (see Figure 3-1), providing the strategic direction for the entire system (Vokurka et al, 2000). The model attaches greater weight to leadership and strategic planning; hence it is influenced by human resources and process management and supported by information and analysis. In the words of Stading and Vokurka et al (2003), the MBNQA focuses on customer and market strategy as an umbrella for all of the elements providing strategic direction for the system.

Motwani (2001) demonstrates that the seven criteria used in this model comprise results-oriented requirements and business results considerations. Wu et al (1997) offer further insight by stating that these criteria have been used by a growing number of organisations as a standard self-assessment tool to examine TQM performance. They also assert that the MBNQA has been one of the most frequently used models in different sectors, providing the basis for NQAs in many other countries.
Several studies have investigated TQM practices using the MBNQA criteria. In a cross-country study to examine the importance and relevance of theoretical TQM factors, Flynn and Saladin (2006) found support for the case that MBNQA helps organisations to practice TQM. Flynn and Saladin (2006) indicate that national cultural issues should also be considered when organisations attempt to implement such models. In an investigation of the relevance (significance and implementation) of TQM in China, using the MBNQA criteria, Lau et al (2004) found that implementing MBNQA tended to facilitate TQM practice in organisations, leading to superior performance and increased competitiveness.

In a comparative analysis of three countries—the USA, Mexico and India—Schniederjans (2006) attempted to determine whether the MBNQA criteria were perceived to be of equal validity and importance to quality managers within these countries. On the basis of nine different quality criteria constructs, the study identifies a number of similarities and differences in the perceptions and values of MBNQA.
criteria. Schniederjans (2006) reports that the results reflect the fact although there are significant differences in quality management practices between India and the other two countries, there appear to be similarities in assessment and agreement on perceptions of quality between Mexico and the United States.

Furthermore, a study by Bou-Llusar et al (2009) investigating the excellence model as a framework of TQM confirms that the MBNQA makes a reliable and valid framework for TQM, thus taking an essential and important step towards offering a widely accepted TQM framework. These empirical studies show that the MBNQA can be considered a reliable model for the development of TQM practice in an organisation.

### 3.6.3 European Foundation for Quality Management

In 1991, with the assistance of 13 leading European business organisations—namely Bosch, BT, Bull, Ciba–Geigy, Dassault, Electrolux, Fiat, KLM, Nestlé, Olivetti, Philips, Sulzer and Volkswagen—the European Foundation for Quality Management (now renamed EFQM) was launched in Paris (Hides et al. 2004). According to Dale (2003), the EFQM provides a quality framework within which applicants for the European Quality Award are judged and recognised for their successful implementation of business excellence. Miguel (2001) states that this award aims to identify and promote quality awareness and to recognise the development of effective TQM in all aspects of European organisational performance, hence enhancing Europe’s competitive position in world markets. Dale (2003) similarly describes the EFQM as a body which aims to enhance the competitive position of Western European companies in the world, by accelerating the acceptance of quality as a strategy for attaining competitive advantage, thus stimulating and assisting the development of quality improvement activities.

Bou-Llusar et al (2009) describe the EFQM model as built on nine elements grouped under five enabling criteria (Leadership, Policy & Strategy, People, Partnership & Resources and Process), representing the way the organisation operates; and four results (People results, Customer results, Society results and Performance results), representing achievements relating to the organisation’s performance (see Figure 3-2). The rationale for the splitting of the nine EFQM criteria between enablers and results, according to Nuland (1999), is that excellent performance in the enablers will lead to better results. On the issue of enablers and results, Calvo-Mora et al (2006) explain that an
organization could use the current results as a benchmark to learn, to improve and to reduce the gap between its current performance and its future objectives.

**Figure 3.2: The EFQM Excellence Model (EFQM, 2003)**

Ghobadian and Woo (1996) offer two main reasons for the usefulness of the EFQM framework and the European Quality Award (now known as the EFQM Excellence Award). First, they argue that EFQM gives directions to an organisation to understand and identify the key linkages and the potential causes and effects which may exist in the business. Secondly, it provides it with the discipline to conduct regular self-assessment as a diagnostic tool to identify potential strengths and weaknesses, enabling it to develop its improvement plans.

In praise of EFQM, Shergold and Reed (1996) state that its criteria provides a holistic approach enabling an organisation to consider all possible aspects of how it is operated, rather than just focusing on internal processes. Bou-Llusar et al (2009) add that the EFQM framework is based on a solid pillar that provides detailed information through the definition of the criteria, sub-criteria and guidance points, which prove useful in TQM practice. They claim to have found strong evidence in support of causal relationships between enablers and results. However, they concede that to achieve effective results, the enabling criteria must be implemented simultaneously, to satisfy the holistic characteristic of the EFQM in taking into consideration all elements of the model.
In short, for whatever it offers, the EFQM has become an increasingly established and popular among European organisations as a diagnostic tool (George et al. 2003). For its general framework and reasonably high degree of flexibility, the EFQM has, over the past few years, extended its popularity beyond Europe, making its framework the basis of NQAs in many countries worldwide (Sharma and Talwar, 2007).

3.7 Abu Dhabi Award for Excellence in Government Performance

In 2007, the Abu Dhabi Executive Council [ADEC] established the Abu Dhabi Award for Excellence in Government Performance [ADAEP], aiming to promote and develop quality performance within government departments and to achieve the highest standards of performance in the Emirate. Following the establishment of this award, it was announced by the Head of ADEC that for all government departments participation in the new award scheme was compulsory (ADAEP, 2007).

The culture of business excellence in Abu Dhabi is still in its infancy, but the ethos and the commitment to a culture of governance excellence is emerging strongly, branding Abu Dhabi as one of the best practice cases in the developing world for state and local governance (ADAEP, 2007).

ADAEP is seen as an excellence approach for all government agencies and organisations in Abu Dhabi, promoting awareness, practice and understanding of the requirements for excellence in government (ADAEP, 2007). Through government-wide interdepartmental competition, it requires various agencies and services to work to make improvements and where possible collaborate across departments to improve stakeholders’ experiences and expectations of quality service provision. One of the key aims is to produce a collaborative environment within government where information and knowledge of successful improvement strategies are shared (ADAEP, 2007). The use of a standardised award approach is also intended to encourage strategic and routine collaboration within all departments based on the well known and widespread use of the model (ADAEP, 2007). The implementation of the award is part of the national strategic plan and is one of the methods by which ADEC believes that the Emirate’s public sector can achieve top-five ranking in the world. Indeed, the Abu Dhabi government aims to achieve a level of excellence exceeding this target, so that it will be regarded as the best quality practitioner and a world-class city (ADAEP, 2007).
3.7.1 The ADAEP model

The ADAEP model is based on the EFQM Excellence Model, which is found embedded in other NQAs around the world. Thus, building the award on a strong worldwide model provides Abu Dhabi with a smoother journey towards excellence (ADAEP, 2007). Like the EFQM Award, ADAEP has nine elements: five criteria enabling the implementation of quality within the organisation (leadership, policy & strategy, partnership & resources, process) and four measurement criteria that assess the results of the implementation (people results, customer results, society results, key performance results), shown graphically in Figure 3.3.

![Figure 3.3: ADAEP Model (ADAEP, 2007)](image)

As discussed earlier, the studies by Tan (2002) and Flynn and Saladin (2006) have shown that the EFQM and MBNQA models are designed in a way that allows for cultural diversity, making them more flexible and acceptable worldwide. As ADAEP is based on EFQM, it thus satisfies two main criteria (ADAEP, 2007): it is based on a model which reflects international standards and best practice in TQM and it makes the process of developing a framework or award scheme much easier, since there is already an existing model to work from. ADAEP has already considered incorporating some aspects of culture into its award, enabling organisations to follow both local and international standards in their search for quality improvement (ADAEP, 2007).
3.8 Comparison between the BEMs

Detailed analyses of the main features of four NQA models (DP, MBNQA, EFQM and ADAEP) have been offered above. Given that ADAEP is based on the EFQM model in every respect—goal, content and structure—the comparison made here will be between the three main quality models: DP, MBNQA and EFQM.

Regardless of where and when they have been established, there is a common denominator amongst all three models, in that they all aim to increase the quality awareness and enhance the competitive position of the organisations in the market place. Thus, in the words of Vokurka et al (2000), all three models offer continuous improvement initiatives to retain their position as benchmark quality systems and principles in the formulation of global quality models. Furthermore, in their comparative study of five international awards, Stading and Vokurka (2003) state that whereas the DP is concerned with quality control for manufacturing products, the MBNQA and EFQM tend to place emphasis on continuous analysis of improvement and to focus on organisational quality management.

Referring to the core concepts of TQM present in all three awards, Stading and Vokurka (2003) argue that although there are some differences in approach, there are more similarities in criteria amongst these awards (see Table 3.2). Ghobadian and Woo (1996) are of the view that whilst the DP criteria place greater emphasis on quality assurance, the MBNQA and EFQM criteria are broader in scope but shallower.

According to Bohoris (1995), the DP is primarily oriented towards techniques and tools, unlike the other two models, adding that even its criteria such as policies and future plans are more concerned with quality assurance and less with details. Moreover, Bohoris (1995) states that compared to the other two, the DP is not a competitive prize, as there are no restrictions on the number of winners in each category. In a comparative analysis of the three awards, Stading and Vokurka (2003) also highlight the DP’s emphasis on process control and improvement and its much reduced consideration of customer and market knowledge. They add that some criteria such as human resources management, customer satisfaction, impact on society and operational results are not included in the DP.
In comparing the MBNQA with the EFQM, Stading and Vokurka (2003) are of the view that whilst the former pays close attention to results, the latter is differentiated by offering a separate category of criteria devoted to measuring a company’s impact on general society. Zink et al (1994) see the differences between MBNQA and EFQM in terms of the partnership and impact on society criteria, which are explicit in the latter, but embedded within other criteria in the former. Lee and Quazi (2001) refer amongst other things to the existence of information and analysis as separate criteria in the MBNQA, contrasting with their inclusion under the resources criterion in the EFQM. Conversely, they note that the resources criterion is not explicitly discussed in the MBNQA, but appears under leadership function.

In their analysis of award models, Stading and Vokurka (2003) argue that the DP should not be regarded as a framework linking content to results, but a list of quality-oriented management practices. The EFQM and MBNQA, on the other hand, are based on a process aimed at achieving performance results (Ghobadian and Woo, 1996). As can be seen in Table 3-2, criteria are weighted differently from one model to another: in the DP all the criteria are equally weighted for its 10 checkpoints, whereas in the other two models, the weights vary from criterion to criterion. The largest weight in the MBNQA is assigned to business results, while the EFQM attaches its heaviest weight to customer satisfaction (Stading and Vokurka, 2003).
### Table 3.2: All criteria and their weights in the DP, MBNQA and EFQM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFQM</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>MBNQA</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp;</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>Education and</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Customer &amp;</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>market focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>gathering,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>utilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership &amp;</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Information &amp;</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>Standardisation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer results</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>Control/</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People results</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>results</td>
<td></td>
<td>assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society results</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future plans</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.9 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented an overview of TQM and BEM literature, primarily reviewing the essential concepts of TQM from the perspectives of quality gurus and academic researchers. First, it was noted that there is no consensus on the definition of TQM, meaning that it is defined according to each specific situation and organisational context. This chapter has also reviewed empirical studies leading to the establishment of a list of critical success factors that have been used to operate TQM. BEMs have been proved by many empirical studies to provide a sound approach for implementing TQM theory in practice (Lee et al, 2003; Bou-Llusar et al, 2009; Al-Swidi and Mahmood, 2011). The chapter ended with a comparison of the three main models for national quality awards and their relation to ADAEP.
Chapter Four: Framework of the Study

4.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses and evaluates the findings of relevant empirical studies relating to the implementation of BEMs in the public sector and the key influential factors identified. Other issues relating to BEM implementation are discussed to ensure a comprehensive critique of the role of these influential factors on implementation strategy. Thus, the chapter covers the impact of BEM implementation, the implementation process and key factors influencing its success.

A systematic literature search was undertaken, focusing on the key factors affecting the implementation of quality management or excellence approaches in public sector organisations. It focuses on the public sector because policing is a public sector activity whose stakeholders and power relationships differ from those found in the private sector (Tarí, 2006b; Tarí, 2008). The implementation of any BEM in an organisation, according to Psychogios (2010), is influenced by the vast contextual disparity between public and private sector organisations. Considering only literature which discusses key influential factors for successful BEM implementation applicable to the public sector ensures the relevance of the contextual frame of reference for this study.

4.2 The impact of BEM implementation on organisational performance

The implementation of a BEM can give an organisation a competitive advantage by creating a culture of quality and better serving the interests of all stakeholders. The higher the BEM implementation level in an organisation, the greater this competitive advantage will be (Douglas and Judge, 2001; Fredriksson, 2003; Davies, 2008; Breja et al, 2011).

Implementing BEMs reinforces the culture of quality within public sector organisations. Sharma and Hoque (2002) studied the Fiji Housing Authority and found that the implementation of TQM promoted a quality culture by reinforcing leadership commitment, transparency and accountability within the organisation. This was
positively influenced by the support of the Fiji government and the introduction of a public sector reform policy. A similar situation is reported by Üstüner and Coskun (2004) in a study of the perceptions of employees in the Turkish ministries of National Education and of Industry and Commerce. Although the employees perceived slight improvements following TQM implementation in both cases, a need was identified for further government reform policies to overcome the challenges to implementation and to achieve the optimal benefits of TQM (Üstüner and Coskun, 2004).

In another study, George et al (2003) investigated the implementation of the EFQM framework within Stirling City Council in Scotland. Although the implementation evidence was scored as low compared with employee perceptions, via the Results, Approach, Development, Assessment and Review approach, the EFQM framework still provided some benefits, such as increasing TQM awareness, improving training and education, highlighting the value of the systematic approach to continuous improvement and fostering learning skills, which were acknowledged by service managers.

In the higher education [HE] sector in the UK, the implementation of the EFQM framework has reinforced an excellence culture by encouraging organisations to adopt a results-orientated approach to staff motivation. Hides et al (2004) found that this had facilitated the effective management of human resources [HR] and would help to overcome future challenges. Related evidence from Spanish universities comes from a study by Tarí (2006a), which found that EFQM implementation had led to the creation of a quality culture through service quality orientation, increased awareness, a systematic approach, identified improvement actions and increased employee involvement.

Kanji et al (1999) conducted a comparative study of BEM implementation in the HE systems of the USA and Malaysia; benefits were observed in both countries. In the case of the USA, benefits included customer satisfaction, upgraded student performance, increased revenue, enhanced communication, establishment of systems for future decision-making, improved performance of the institution as a community, employee development, benchmarking and effective HR. The marked differences identified in this comparative analysis are indicative of the different approaches used by these
institutions, the US HE system being more mature and geared towards strategic orientation than the Malaysian one (Kanji et al, 1999).

The potential advantages of implementing BEM in Brazilian healthcare organisations are illustrated by Miguel (2006). According to this study, 10 years of implementing NQA frameworks in Brazilian hospitals identified the achievement of some benefits and improvements, including a more patient-centred focus, increased customer satisfaction (from 84.7% to 93%) and employee satisfaction (from 55.4% to 90%). Throughout the 10 years, the Performance Excellence Framework and TQM implementation produced positive results at all levels (organisational, team and individual levels) in the hospitals (Miguel, 2006). In addition, the study found that a continuous improvement culture had been established, with increased leadership support for excellence.

Tarí (2006b) studied the implementation of the EFQM model in another segment of the public sector, the Spanish Police Service, observing benefits in the areas of service quality and of customer and employee satisfaction. These positive results were reflected in appropriate cultural activities such as encouraging involvement from management and employees, supporting teamwork, increasing the autonomy of officers, using effective methods for measuring performance and enhancing employee awareness of customer needs.

These studies indicate that implementation of the EFQM framework can motivate employees to be involved in a quality programme and can reinforce service quality in different public sector organisations, providing that the framework is correctly implemented. In short, although its positive effects on organisational performance have been verified by several authors, effective implementation cannot be achieved unless the key influential factors are fully addressed (Bauer et al, 2005; Davies, 2008). The aim of the present study, therefore, is to identify and investigate the key influential factors that relate specifically to the UAE public sector, in order to ensure the successful implementation of a BEM within the ADP.
4.3 Importance of the BEM implementation process

There is a strong consensus indicating that the long-term success of TQM implementation is related to the appropriateness of the implementation process (Dean and Helms, 1996; Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Kanji et al, 1999; Nwabueze, 2001; Sharma and Hoque, 2002; Tarí, 2006b; Kumar et al, 2011). However, Melan (1998) acknowledges that the process of implementation and any changes towards quality implementation are crucial to enhancing quality and therefore need to be clearly addressed. This means that ignoring the TQM implementation process loses this strategy its credibility for achieving organisational excellence. This view is supported by Nwabueze and Kanji (1997), who found that TQM failure in UK hospitals, was related to a lack of implementation guidelines. Kumar et al (2011) assert that 60-80% of TQM initiatives fail to demonstrate a significant impact, highlighting the need for a better understanding of the factors that influence the implementation process, as this could significantly improve performance and effectiveness.

Related evidence is offered by Üstüner and Coskun (2004), indicating that 90% of respondents from two Turkish ministries felt that the main obstacle to reaching a mature level of TQM practice in Turkey was the lack of appropriate implementation guidelines. In the USA, the Tennessee Valley Authority implemented TQM as a strategy to fulfil customer needs; Dean and Helms (1996) found that the Authority needed a clear awareness and understanding of the implementation process, including a defined task priority list for all activities which had to be completed during it.

There is consensus that the adoption of appropriate guidelines is both very important and the most difficult part of TQM implementation (Motwani and Kumar, 1997). Therefore, understanding the organisational situation helps to develop more appropriate implementation programmes. Leonard and McAdam (2002) support this view in reporting a study of 19 large organisations, which found that a better understanding of the implementation process was needed in order to achieve successful implementation of TQM in practice. Nazemi (2010) identifies a need to develop a road map for the change which occurs during EFQM implementation within an organisation, to ensure its success. Without such a clearly defined plan, Nazemi (2010) asserts that there will be
challenges to EFQM implementation in developing countries, increasing the likelihood of project failure.

Baidoun and Zairi (2003) concentrate on the case for TQM and BEM implementation guidelines in Middle Eastern countries, arguing for systematic studies in this area to help bridge gaps in the literature and facilitate the effectiveness of TQM implementation. Due to the paucity of studies set in this region, they call for further investigations in this context to enhance understanding, to clarify best practice and to improve TQM implementation. The cultural environment of the region also needs further research; Jones and Seraphim (2008) identify this as a factor which may create an unfavourable environment for BEM implementation within the UAE. The scarcity of literature which relates to the Middle Eastern context is still an issue for management practitioners, according to Salaheldin (2009).

4.4 Issues relating to BEM implementation

When implementing a BEM in an organisation, two distinctive types of discussion emerge: ‘what to do’ and ‘how to do it’ (Sousa and Voss, 2002). While the former deals with the content (the extent to which the different TQM practices or BEMs should be used), the latter embraces the procedure (how to conduct the change process by which the chosen TQM practice / BEM is embedded in an organisation) (Sousa and Voss, 2002). In other words, under ‘what to do’, organisations are expected to adopt and proactively use the whole set of TQM practices and all elements of the BEM to the same extent, regardless of their context. On the other hand, as explained by Sousa and Voss (2002), ‘how to do it’ represents the process of embedding the TQM practice in the organisation, requiring the redesign of organisational structure, the learning of new skills and the reorientation of organisational goals.

Hermel and Ramis-Pujol (2003) explain that quality prizes have been institutionalised to recognise organisations that excel in the implementation of quality practices. However, they warn that award models tend amongst other weaknesses to lack an integrated approach and to misalign strategic planning, which could lead to failure of implementation. This may mean that there is still a need to develop guidelines for
addressing these shortcomings and reducing their adverse impact on BEM implementation.

It is important to define terms, but Yusuf and Aspinwall (2000a) regret that writers have often used the term ‘framework’ in relation to TQM implementation with little regard to its definition. Whilst some authors have regarded it as being a prescriptive set of things to do, others have chosen to represent the framework diagrammatically. On a related issue, it is normally assumed that business excellence and quality award models provide answers to the question of what to do, whereas a framework explains how to do it, by outlining an overall way forward. Yusuf and Aspinwall (2000a) conclude that the framework provides a direction of thought for executives in dealing with quality awards and elements of TQM, but it fails to provide any guidelines for implementing the BEM and embedding it into the organisation.

Hermel and Ramis-Pujol (2003) also make special reference to the literature by highlighting the importance of implementation of TQM and BEM, which is still not addressed in full detail. They emphasise that ‘guiding’ should be considered an important component of excellence, especially in the implementation process. They further complain that implementation seems to be a somewhat forgotten issue in management theory; hence a new interest in guiding approaches must be developed to ease the implementation of change, innovation, BEMs and strategies.

As a result of a study of TQM in Malaysian industry, Thiagarajan et al (2001) propose a TQM implementation process which is capable of being used as a guideline in the selection and/or formulation of TQM practice. Having defined a framework for TQM implementation comprising practical steps and critical quality factors, they conclude that understanding the importance of the TQM implementation process has led to a significant improvement in the effectiveness of TQM implementation. In another study of TQM implementation by a small sample of organisations, Ghobadian and Gallear (2001) state that the TQM implementation process appeared to have influenced the success of TQM in both the short and the long term, and that they were able to derive a non-prescriptive model of TQM implementation from their findings. Newall and Dale (1991) report encountering problems in implementing TQM and other BEMs, which they believe to be mainly to do with a poorly defined TQM implementation process.
Dean and Brown (1994) also are of the view that the main reason for TQM failure must be found in the failure of implementation.

Many researchers, including Sitkin et al (1994), Nwabueze and Kanji (1997), Thiagarajan et al (2001), Sousa and Voss (2002), Bauer et al (2005) and Davies (2008), have emphasised the need for better implementation of BEMs. This argument is in line with the main theme of this study: identifying the key factors influencing BEM implementation. The literature review developed an appropriate non-prescriptive model of implementation guidance for the successful adoption of a BEM, defined by Ghobadian and Gallear (2001, p.353) as “a means of presenting pertinent ideas, pointers and guidelines, and emphasising recommended focuses and constituents in a non-prescriptive manner”. Ghobadian and Gallear (2001) offer several reasons for its adoption. First, a non-prescriptive model produces a useful framework within which practitioners and researchers can place other evidence in order to enhance their understanding of the complexities and salient features of the implementation. Secondly, it may prove to be suitable for organisations that have different contingencies in term of their internal and external environments, so that the details of implementation may differ substantially.

On the basis of the above discussion, the aim of the present study is to develop a non-prescriptive model capable of handling the complexities of implementation, hence enhancing the chances of achieving successful BEM implementation. A brief examination of the existing literature reveals a significant lack of research in several areas relating to BEMs. In particular, there appears to be a real gap in the literature regarding BEM adoption in the public sector, which further research in this area may help to bridge. It is therefore the aim of this research to explore the factors that influence BEM implementation, with a view to developing a guiding roadmap for doing so successfully in the UAE public sector.
4.5 Key influential factors for successful BEM implementation

4.5.1 Top management commitment

An essential factor in achieving successful TQM implementation is top management commitment, which has been widely studied and discussed at length in the literature. Carpinetti et al (2010) argue that the success of TQM implementation depends on total commitment from top management. In the public sector, this commitment plays a significant role, according to Fernandez and Rainey (2006), in the successful implementation of all change and improvement initiatives. Abdullah and Fuong (2010) agree that without the support of top management the implementation of TQM becomes a major challenge for any organisation.

According to Yaacob (2009), top management acts as the introducer of quality management within the organisation. Yousaf (2006:2) characterises top management commitment as an intangible social value between the “actor[s] and the entity”. Although it is difficult to define, he identifies behaviours where managers participate in organisational processes that enable employees to develop a perception that they are committed to BEM implementation.

Top management commitment plays a vital role in achieving the integration of TQM models through the introduction of a culture of quality into organisations and by developing accountability for TQM achievement (Rivers and Bae, 1999). Kanji (2008) suggests that the greater the power distance observed, the stronger is the commitment of top management which is needed to ensure that the organisation can integrate the quality vision by alignment and organisational readiness. Demonstrating commitment not only reflects management’s seriousness about TQM implementation; it also confirms its involvement in the project. Therefore, top management’s commitment must be demonstrated in the early stages of adopting TQM initiatives, in order to ensure the integration of TQM into the organisation (Ahmed et al, 2003).

Kumar et al (2011) highlight the critical necessity of top management participation in the TQM implementation approach of the organisation, to ensure employee participation. They argue that employees need top management participation to ensure...
motivation, while providing consistent communication of the quality goals and policies to staff at all levels. During the TQM implementation, Shum et al (2008) stress that top management commitment and participation encourage employees to be committed to further planned changes as they are implemented. Similarly, in Spanish universities, Tarí (2006a) found that top management commitment facilitated the effective use of self-assessment based on the EFQM model by giving its approval for improvement actions. The study further found that if commitment was made at an early stage, it gave a positive signal to employees that top managers were concerned to involve them in the implementation, as well as showing their seriousness in adopting the EFQM model. This in turn facilitated employee commitment and involvement in the implementing and reviewing of the improvement actions based on the self-assessment results.

From a case study of TQM implementation in a Turkish university, Hergüner and Reeves (2000) conclude that without top management commitment and participation there is likely to be a reversion to the previous organisational status quo. This would be particularly true in policing organisations, where Parson et al (2011) found that the hierarchal culture resulted in the commitment of commanders affecting the lower ranks. Without the commitment of top management, the implementation of improvement initiatives is likely to fail; Ford (2007) asserts that top management commitment is necessary to move forward and challenge the organisational status quo. Top managers must take a methodical approach to continuously develop the organisational change capacity with the facilitation of adequate resources and the creation of a workplace environment which is built on an improvement culture (Ford, 2007; Das et al, 2011).

Psychogios (2010) identifies commitment by top management as necessary for the establishment of a quality culture by empowering employees and encouraging them to participate in making decisions. The organisational culture can be modified by top management’s application of HR practices such as empowerment and involvement to foster active participation in the implementation process (Fernandez and Rainy, 2006; Mosadegh-Rad, 2006). In Arab society, according to Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2000), it imperative to have top management commitment, because changing the organisational culture is not an easy undertaking, so if it is not supported by the traditional hierarchy it will not occur. Rice (2003) recognizes that leaders and managers in Arab societies play critical roles as substantial motivators for their whole organisations.
Wahid and Corner (2009) claim that evidence for top management commitment can be observed from the executive team members participating in activities related to quality improvement. These include strategic planning, the setting and reviewing of quality objectives and policies, and the planning and allocation of various types of resources, whether financial, human or others (Bhat and Rajashekhhar, 2009; Salaheldin, 2009; Wahid and Corner, 2009). Top management also dictates and controls the level of resources allocated within an organisation to support TQM implementation (Chow and Ha, 2009). Within policing organisations, top management has very close control, according to Brunetto and Wharton, (2005) particularly in determining funding levels for each sector of the organisation; thus, it can create a sense of urgency by providing the appropriate funding levels to support change initiatives.

Among the roles of top management and tangible signs of its commitment to the excellence process are raising employees’ awareness and educating them about the quality management that they are asked to participate in within the organisation (Yaacob, 2009). Mosadegh-Rad (2005) warns that a lack of top management commitment can conversely restrain the participation of employees, thus creating a barrier to change. This is compounded in policing organisations, according to King (2003), by the command and control structure, which results in a hierarchal pyramid offering minimal incentives for low ranking officers to change the work practices that are personally adopted and rewarding if there is no support from upper management.

In a case of TQM implementation in the US Air Force, it was concluded that utilising a participative style of leadership maintained the commitment and encouragement of lower level employees (Moser and Bailey, 1997). A lack of both support and participative leadership style could discourage employees, while more leadership participation could help to overcome the bureaucratic systems that characterise the military hierarchy (Moser and Bailey, 1997).

Nwabueze (2001), in a study of UK hospitals, reports that a steering group of four managers was established to enhance the management’s participation in TQM implementation. Research into the implementation of the EFQM model in UK HE institutions recommended that a participative leadership style could be maintained
through the provision of education and training to deans, assistant deans and everybody involved in the implementation (Osseo-Asare and Longbottom, 2002).

Top management support is seen as a key influential factor for BEM implementation. Without it, it would not be possible to ensure resource allocation and strategic policy development (Yaacob, 2009). Management commitment facilitates the instigation and continuous following up of BEM, by exhibiting the importance of BEM as an ongoing improvement activity; personnel at the lower levels then become involved, whereas they would not do so without top management commitment and participation.

4.5.2 Setting a shared long-term vision

TQM in a BEM implementation is not a ‘quick fix’ programme, but requires the establishment of a long-term quality vision which is integrated within the organisation and provides accountability to achieve successful implementation (Rivers and Bae, 1999; El-Bakry et al, 2010; Kaluarachchi, 2010). Commitment to and understanding of the long-term organisational vision and goals must be communicated to employees so that they maintain their commitment over a longer period, even if they do not see instant improvements (Kaluarachchi, 2010). Smith (2011) identifies the organisational vision of the future as necessary to focus the organisation while directing the change. A study in UK hospitals showed that setting a clear organisational vision helped to clarify the aims of the improvement programme and encouraged employees to become effectively involved in the TQM implementation process (Nwabueze, 2001). Additionally, Cheung and To (2010) point out that if employees have bought into the adoption of TQM they will be more willing to contribute new ideas and suggestions for improvement of the project. When there is a long-term vision or strategic direction to improve practices, El-Bakry et al (2010) suggest that it helps leaders to undertake changes through a continuous improvement initiative.

Developing a long-term vision is always dependent on the role of leadership and organisational culture (Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Das et al, 2011). According to Das et al (2011), top managers, through their interpersonal networks and associations, influence employees to support the change initiative, thus developing a new quality improvement ethos within the organisation. From the top down, Smith (2011) asserts that the vision should be communicated widely throughout the organisation, not only
through language but also through the actions and behaviour of management. Niven (2008) suggests that the vision guides employees to illustrate how and where the organisation is heading, thus providing an understanding of what they need to do and how they can achieve this vision through their efforts.

In this regard, the case of an Isfahan healthcare organisation offers a clear example of the lack of long-term perspective, as one of the main strategic challenges to TQM implementation in developing countries in the Middle East and elsewhere (Mosadegh-Rad, 2005). Hofstede (1991) supports this view, highlighting the prevalence of short-term orientation in many eastern countries, where traditions are highly respected and social obligations very strong. In a comparative study of the USA and Malaysia, TQM was found to be more successful in the former, in terms of a longer-term vision (Kanji et al, 1999). A study by House et al (2004) found that Arab and Asian cultures had higher values in cultural dimensions reflecting traditional social obligations and cultural mores. The higher dimensional rankings in uncertainty avoidance, group collectivism and power distance affect organisational culture and create conditions where organisational strategic plans and vision may be seen as short-term trends before the inevitable reversion to traditional ways (Iles et al, 2006). According to Rees and Althakhri (2008), in Arab societies there is a high level of uncertainty avoidance and low future orientation, resulting in low tolerance of change, as employees are fearful about its potential impact on them (House et al, 2004). Due to the high uncertainly avoidance environment and reluctance to change, Rees and Althakhri (2008) advise that in an Arab society strong leadership is required to direct employees to follow the organisational goals and vision. El-Bakry et al (2010) and Kull and Wacker (2009) suggest that the traditional short-term view of planning can be overcome through the use of a long-term phased approach to continuous improvement, thus addressing any cultural resistance which may be found in the organisation. The use of a detailed plan is necessary to achieve vision, according to Rees and Althakhri (2008).

It appears that organisations should set long-term visions for TQM implementation processes and this should be made known to everybody in the organisation. The vision should clarify the implementation process by developing long-term plans for TQM success. Das et al (2011) identify committed top management leadership as necessary to
the implementation of TQM in order to communicate the vision across the whole of the organisation. This in turn will ensure the integration of TQM initiatives into the organisation for the long term, rather than their reactive use.

4.5.3 Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM

The level of awareness and understanding of TQM correlates positively with the level of successful implementation of TQM (Mosadegh-Rad, 2006). Yaacob (2009) implies that employee awareness of TQM enhances the implementation process and thus has a positive impact on the organisation in the long term. Nwabueze and Kanji (1997) argue that a lack of awareness amongst quality managers was the reason for TQM failure in the UK NHS; since awareness was low, the standard of implementation was poor.

In a study examining employee perceptions of TQM implementation in US hospitals, Huq and Martin (2001) report that the awareness of TQM received the second highest score, making it one of the main drivers of employee involvement, facilitating a cultural change for quality. Meers and Samson (2003) highlight a lack of awareness among top and middle managers as one of the main causes of TQM failure in three Australian cases.

In developing countries it appears that the implementation of quality programmes often fails due to a lack of understanding or awareness of TQM (Vermeulen, 1997; Al-Zamany et al, 2002). Al Mashari et al (2010) assert that without a clear understanding of the process (‘how’) and the rationale for the changes (‘why’), employees will not participate in any strategic change. Al-Zamany et al (2002) and Tannock and Ahmed (2008) identify the lack of information and training as a cause of TQM failure, especially in poorly resourced public sector organisations, where there may be a relative poor level of general management knowledge. In the Greek context, Psychogios and Wilkinson (2007) believe that the main reason for organisations not applying or integrating TQM models into day-to-day activities is a lack of managerial awareness and understanding of TQM principles and of the organisations’ objectives in using TQM.
Talavera (2005:34) states that managers often have unrealistic expectations when they have been enticed to adopt TQM as a result of the ‘bandwagon effect’. The short-sighted belief that TQM will provide instant results reflects a lack of understanding of the process and of how TQM needs an extended period of time—possibly years—to be successfully implemented (Talavera, 2005). Yaacob (2009) advises that the organisation should address the issue of TQM knowledge through the implementation of training and education for employees at all levels. To address the information and knowledge needs of the organisation, Wahid and Corner (2009) suggest that a continuous TQM training programme should be implemented by the HR department, because it is functionally responsible for addressing training needs analysis and maintaining personnel records.

The approach that some organisations take to TQM implementation excludes lower management and the majority of employees, while executive managers act as introducers and the quality department is responsible for observing implementation. This alienates everyone else and excludes them from fully understanding their roles in the process, as there is often not complete amalgamation between functional departments within the organisation (Yaacob, 2009).

TQM is a relatively new concept in Arab societies, according to Zairi (1996). Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2000) investigated the development of TQM in Qatar, where they identified reasons for a low level of quality management development, including a lack of awareness, low levels of understanding of TQM and a narrow body of practice within the country to network and develop understanding from practice. Similarly, Al-Zamany et al (2002) acknowledge the lack of awareness and understanding of TQM in Arab countries, including weak government support for the implementation of quality measures. Conversely, Djerdjouri and Aleter (2007) found that in the UAE, the government had committed financial resources and worked hard to promote public sector quality management, supporting the adoption of BEMs. To raise awareness among public sector employees, it established a major training programme to develop the consciousness and understanding of BEM concepts (Djerdjouri and Aleter, 2007; Thawani, 2007).

Yaacob (2009) warns that like all management initiatives, the initial stages of TQM implementation will encounter challenges which have to be overcome. With employee
buy-in, it is easy to sustain the introduction of any good idea; to secure this engagement, employees need to be educated about the initiative before it is introduced. To sum up, it has been noted that an awareness of TQM helps to facilitate the involvement of employees and reduces the chances of conflict with the organisation’s existing processes and activities. Furthermore, clearly understanding the objectives of using TQM can help to ensure top management commitment to TQM implementation (Wahid and Corner, 2009).

4.5.4 Establishing an excellence steering committee

Since BEM implementation is a long-term project and involves changes in the organisation, an excellence steering committee is needed to co-ordinate and support it, according to Yusuf and Aspinwall (2000b). However, they suggest in their implementation guidelines that such a committee should be set up separately from the other implementation factors, reflecting its importance in achieving successful implementation of TQM models. Recently, a number of researchers have emphasised that there needs to be a focus on the importance of setting an excellence steering committee as a key factor for successful implementation that provides strategic direction for adoption of BEM and developing appropriate plans for its implementation (Vrakking, 1995; Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Thiagarajan and Zairi, 1997; Ghobadian and Gallear, 2001; Baidoun and Zairi, 2003; Chow and Ha, 2009; Varkey and Antonio, 2010).

Alain and Crete (2009) identify the use of an excellence steering committee and one or more ‘idea champions’ as helping to boost employee commitment and raise the idea of change through the organisation. An idea champion is often someone highly respected in the organisation who takes personal risks to lobby and maintain the momentum for the commitment to change, according to Fernandez and Rainey (2006), who add that the excellence steering committee has the responsibility of planning the implementation and monitoring its progress, while implementation teams carry out the actions and report the results to the top management. These implementation teams, according to Jha and Joshi (2007), should be representative of all levels within the organisations to encourage employee involvement, while there needs to be some form of senior management representation to ensure that the team has the authority to make change happen.
Thiagarajan et al (2001) advise that in a large organisation there needs to be some coordination between the excellence steering committee and the various improvement teams, to ensure consistency and depth of implementation throughout the organisation. The co-ordinators who liaise between the committee and the teams also support the decision making process during TQM implementation (Thiagarajan et al, 2001).

To achieve successful BEM implementation, the excellence steering committee must be set up at an early stage and must have access to the necessary resources (Baidoun and Zairi, 2003). Therefore, it should be a high powered body, able to take crucial decisions as required, which justifies the emphasis of Thiagarajan et al (2001) on the need for it to be chaired by top executives. Chow and Ha (2009) argue that the members of the committee should come from the executive level so that the functional units within the organisation respond appropriately to changes and requests. The committee members need to have not only power and control within the organisation, according to Varkey and Antonio (2010), but also organisational knowledge, employee credibility and appropriate visibility to communicate the TQM to all levels. Smith (2011) asserts that the committee needs to establish a sense of urgency to change the organisational mindset and standard patterns of working. The emphasis on the urgency of change is in turn seen as an indicator of management commitment towards TQM implementation (Smith, 2011). The primary function of the excellence steering committee is to coordinate the changes that relate to the ability to manage and implement the TQM effectively (Chow and Ha, 2009). Therefore, the committee measures progress and reviews all TQM implementation procedures and activities (Yusuf and Aspinwall, 2000b). The roles and responsibilities of its members should be clearly defined in order to reduce conflicts between individuals and organisational units (Abdullah and Fuong, 2010). Chin and Pun (2002) agree, indicating that the committee’s main role is to manage and monitor the entire TQM implementation process. It must also provide guidance to project teams and maintain the motivation to make improvements within the organisation.

However, Varkey and Antonio (2010) also argue that the committee should have a cross-functional nature, to enhance its ability to access information and comprehend the barriers and challenges identified in all functional areas, while generating ideas and initiatives to overcome them. Thiagarajan et al (2001) state that the number of members
in the committee depends on the size of the organisation, but such committees usually have representatives from management and front line staff. Yusuf and Aspinwall (2000b) emphasise the importance of its having members from the managerial, supervisory and operational levels, thus enhancing its ability to manage and monitor the TQM implementation process and to make decisions about how the process will be completed (Al-Mashari et al, 2010).

4.5.5 Stimulating a change culture

A number of studies identify the stimulation of organisational culture as a necessary element for achieving successful TQM implementation (Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall, 2000; Herguner and Reeves, 2000; Huq and Martin, 2001; Meers and Samson, 2003; Mosadegh-Rad, 2006; Oschman et al, 2006; Davies, 2007; Zu et al, 2010; Smith, 2011). In addition, Samuelsson and Nilsson (2002) argue that consideration of organisational culture is important prior to developing the implementation strategy for EFQM. Shergold and Reed (1996) and Abdullah (2010) highlight the influence of cultural factors on the approach that organisations should take to conducting self-assessment. Kaluarachchi (2010) found that the presence of a supportive culture within the organisation created positive results in the implementation of TQM, while Zu et al (2010) report that many organisations have failed when attempting to implement TQM because they have ignored the impact of internal and external cultural and societal factors.

Oschman et al (2006) identify culture-forming as part of the TQM implementation process, since through the development of its culture, the organisation can embed TQM in all of its activities, making quality initiatives the responsibility of everyone in the organisation. With the formation of a culture which is conducive to quality initiatives, Smith (2011) argues that there will be specific traits such as a willingness to engage in self-evaluation and the prompt, appropriate and sensitive managerial action to remedy problems which is necessary for TQM. Jones and Seraphim (2008) assert that staggered change phases are necessary to ensure that the change plan is not too aggressive for the organisation to cope with. Varkey and Antonio (2010) advise organisations to change their culture to one which is more focused on quality, by establishing continuous, comprehensive training and education programmes. Mosadegh-Rad (2006) claims that
focusing on continuous improvement helps to create an appropriate culture, thus promoting acceptance of the TQM programme. Powell (1995) supports this view and argues that soft TQM features such as open culture, empowerment and managers’ commitment can be more beneficial in the TQM implementation process than hard features such as training, benchmarking and process improvement. Yusof and Aspinwall (2000a) note the importance of cultural issues including corporate mind-set for change initiatives, arguing that a unified culture can be a good starting point for TQM implementation. Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009) and López-Fresno (2010) explain that organisational culture includes attitudes, behaviours and decision-making processes. Davies (2007) claims that BEM implementation will involve a culture change; therefore, the cultural realities of the organisation need to be understood. He advocates a cultural assessment and the subsequent adoption of a contingency-sensitive approach to implementation, tailored specifically for the organisation. López-Fresno (2010) advises organisations to analyse the current attitudes of employees and the organisational work culture in order to develop strategies to make the culture compliant with the TQM implementation process.

Indeed, many authors including Al-Zamany et al (2002), Meers and Samson (2003), Mosadegh-Rad et al (2005), Davies (2008) and López-Fresno (2010) have argued that there is a need to assess organisational culture before and during the implementation of TQM, in order to ensure the compatibility of the existing culture with the quality culture. Yong and Pheng (2008) advise that adjustment of organizational culture should always take place prior to TQM implementation, as cultural change is one of its prerequisites.

Dellana and Hauser (1999) state that flexible cultures are generally expected to implement TQM successfully. Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2001) investigated the existing culture in Qatari organisations, using the Competing Values Framework to assess the current situation while identifying areas of development to help create a cultural environment which is supportive of TQM. According to Zu et al (2010), organisations can use this tool to assess the impact of culture on TQM implementation, identify the resources needed to support it and ensure their adequate allocation.
Al-Alawi et al (2007) describe the critical role that culture plays during change in organisations based in Arab societies and how this cultural factor will need to be addressed as part of the TQM implementation plans and overall strategy. Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall’s (2001) Qatari study provides an overview of the traditional cultural leader and the western results manager who can be found within the same organisation. Jones and Seraphim (2008) identify many similarities between the UAE and Qatar, including the high power distance which is characteristic of traditional managerial leaders. Although Hofstede (2001) and Rees and Althakhri (2008) both describe the Arab world as being strongly group oriented, with high masculine power distance and a low future orientation, the latter source also identifies a trend towards contemporary management theory and practice in the Arab world. Mostafa (2005) suggests that traditional behaviour and management practice are subject to gradual evolution because of the effect of continual exposure to western practice upon the long-standing attitudes within Arab organisations.

To summarise this subsection, it appears that assessing culture is essential to ensure a ‘quality-culture fit’ for implementing a BEM within an organisation. This in turn helps to provide behavioural changes towards accepting the TQM ideas and integrating these easily within the organisation. However, assessing culture seems not to be an easy task; therefore the change strategy should take account of the existing organisational environment (Zu et al, 2010).

4.5.6 Implementation plan

A detailed plan must be established before BEM implementation starts, to guide the organisation towards performance excellence (Hillman, 1994; Thiagarajan et al, 2001; Tarí, 2006a; Tarí, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). An implementation plan is needed, according to Fernandez and Rainey (2006), to enable public sector organisations to manage change successfully, as all parties need a clearly developed course of action to provide them with direction. Where there was sufficient planning, Abdullah (2010) found that organisations performed well when implementing TQM, compared to those which did not have appropriate planning in place. This finding is supported by Vrakking (1995), who deems lack of appropriate planning to be a cause of implementation failure.
Jackson (2001) believes that planning is a key influential factor for successful implementation of TQM and that failing to plan appropriately can be disastrous. A well-developed plan which covers all the possible factors which could potential influence the organisation’s adoption of TQM is necessary, according to Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009), while Varkey and Antonio (2011:270) state that any plan should be a holistic examination of “how the intended changes will affect the people, culture, performance, technology, structure, workday and processes of the organisation”. Establishing well-developed implementation plans depends on a number of factors: understanding the driving force for implementing TQM, identifying the intended gains and use of the TQM, involving people in developing the plan, and prioritising the implementation initiatives and associated project timescales (Jackson, 2001; Tarí, 2010). The benefits of the plan may be obvious to the planners, according to Mead (2005), but they often fail to communicate these to others; to avoid negative consequences, it is important that the management team efficiently communicate all aspects of the plan. Therefore, to ensure the success of improvement initiatives, Varkey and Antonio (2010) highlight the need for a communication plan within the implementation plan. Tarí (2010) emphasizes that is necessary to communicate the plan across all levels of the organisation so that employees are informed and encouraged to participate in the BEM implementation process. The rationale behind the changes and how they will affect the daily activities of each employee need to be clearly defined so that motivational strategies can be incorporated within the communication strategy. Yousef (2006) adds that publishing the implementation plan could encourage everyone in the organisation to be part of the TQM initiative, while top management should show its commitment to the published plan by providing proper resources, financial support and infrastructure.

The main point of the implementation plan, according to Mullins (2007), is to provide clarification of the aims to be achieved by the implementation of the change process. With a clear framework, employees are able to understand exactly what should happen and what is required of them (Mullins, 2007). The BEM implementation plan should detail and explain all the necessary phases, stages and initiatives, as well as milestones and ongoing monitoring of the plan; it should also cover training and resource allocation, the persons responsible for each task, the detailed communication plan for the project and when and how feedback will occur at each stage (Vrakking, 1995; Chin and Pun, 2002; Varkey and Antonio, 2010).
During implementation of the BEM, there should be no blind obedience to the plan, however; minor amendments may be required and should be undertaken if they are acceptable to the steering committee, implementation team or other employees (Jackson, 2001). Indeed, the organisation that has a flexible plan is more likely to be successful in its TQM implementation (Jackson, 2001; Abdullah, 2010). In the Arab world, according to Rees and Althakhri (2008), managers have control over planning, which is the reverse of the approach suggested by Tarí (2006b), who encourages employee involvement. Subordinates in traditional Arab organisations do not have or expect the authority to make plans (Rees and Althakhri, 2008); therefore, top management should encourage and train the workforce to participate in implementation planning.

It seems that developing an implementation plan clarifies the roadmap for the organisation before it embarks on a BEM implementation, but that it is not an easy task; therefore, the organisation needs to understand its current situation and where it wants to be in the future in relation to BEM.

4.5.7 Supportive organisational structure

Üstüner and Coskun (2004), Oschman et al (2006), Cagnazzo et al (2010) and Smith (2011) all argue that the organisational structure influences the TQM implementation process. Brass et al (2004) define organisational structure as how an organisation defines, distributes and manages the work done by different divisions, specialisations and processes. This definition also includes the coordination and distribution of responsibility and the integration of the process, either horizontally or vertically, through the organisation. Yet the organisation needs to be ready for the change, according to Shouroki (2009), which will require putting knowledge to work, in turn implying the need for strong decentralisation so that decisions can be made effectively and quickly. The organisational structure is the key to this process, according to Shouroki (2009), as it governs information flows and personal interactions. Nwabueze (2001) states that alignment is required between organisational strategy, systems and structures to maintain the transformation of an organisation to a TQM culture, while Smith (2011) asserts that the organisational structure needs to make clear what actions and behaviours are preferred or required to ensure a quality organisation. Carpinetti et al (2010) advise organisations to ensure that their structure makes the TQM
implementation team and the functional managers equally responsible for implementing the change, which depends heavily on the fit between organisational structure and requirements (Shouroki, 2009). Oschman et al (2006) argue that the implementation of TQM is dependent on suitable support structures which are flexible and galvanize idea sharing to improve quality management, while Yusof and Aspinwall (2000a) suggest that creating organisational structures with minimal layers of management could facilitate the visibility of the top management and help to increase the availability and flow of information, making communication more efficient and reducing the division of activities.

In a case study of two Turkish ministries, Üstüner and Coskun (2004) found that the existing organisational structures were acting as barriers to the implementation of TQM. They propose that the Turkish government should reform the public sector in order to support the organisational structural changes required for TQM implementation, arguing that the development of supportive structures would ensure a TQM-compatible organisational structure and thus resolve the problems related to the bureaucratic management practices and systems in Turkey.

Effectively placed supportive structures would help ensure the integration of new knowledge and TQM within organisations, according to Douglas and Judge (2001), who label organisational structures as ‘control’ and ‘exploration’ types. The former tend to facilitate the integration of quality within work activities, job descriptions, operations and other organisational procedures, while the latter provide a better work environment through access to information, involvement and empowerment to adapt processes towards quality and change. Jabnoun (2005) found that most practitioners in the UAE were already participating in some formalised quality practice, so that knowledge, skill and preparation were already in place for decentralized self-managed teams with reduced organizational layers, spinouts and extended boundaries. However, he argues that UAE organisations should be careful about relaxing their adherence to formal working procedures, as some employees and customers are not yet ready for this.

In a study examining the relationship between organisational context and successful BEM implementation, Bauer et al (2005) concludes that alignment of organisational
structures to reduce the complexity and formalisation of written rules, levels of supervision, autonomy and centralisation would increase the chances of success. Conversely, Carpinetti et al (2010) found that without formalised cross-department improvement and change processes aligned to the functional organisational structure, the implementation of change has the potential to undermine any performance improvements desired or expected of TQM. They suggest that when there is alignment throughout the organisation to the implementation of TQM, the number of extraneous bureaucratic processes can be reduced, but that the organisation needs to ensure that there is a strong communication and networking process between functional areas to facilitate cross-fertilization of quality initiatives and joined-up working towards the common goal of implementing the BEM.

Another issue which should be considered during BEM implementation is regionality, by which Carpinetti et al (2010) mean where issues at the plant level are not able to be communicated effectively across the organisation, mainly because there is no mechanism in the organisational structure which enables effective coordination or functional responsibility to address issues as they arise. This is likely to occur in large organisations when there is a central manager at headquarters who is responsible for the change or implementation of TQM but who has no direct interaction with the daily operations and functional managers in the regional office or plant locations (Carpinetti et al, 2010; Jones and Seraphim, 2008).

Paramilitary organisations have strong organisational cultures that are highly resistant to change. Cunningham and Kempling (2009) suggest that this due to the fundamental values and norms that underpin the organisation culture and are developed by the nature, environment and type of work undertaken. Large hierarchical pyramids are often used to describe policing organisational structures (King, 2003). These have two elements: horizontal and hierarchical. The breadth of the organisation includes the number and size of departmental specialised units and how tasks are broken down, while its top-down character ensures the allocation of resources by authority, status, seniority, skills and rewards. It is the control of the allocation of resources which separates the employees into hierarchical layers (King, 2003).
The literature reviewed above indicates that structure plays a crucial role in achieving successful BEM implementation, so simpler, less formal and flatter organisational structures would facilitate the integration of a BEM. To avoid regionality, the organisational structure must be suitable and the implementation project team consequently needs to have joint responsibility for implementing change, according to Carpinetti et al (2010).

4.5.8 Developing internal capabilities

Developing and funding the organisation’s internal capabilities is considered to be another significant factor during TQM implementation (River and Bae, 1999; Bhat and Rajashekhhar, 2009); the improvement of internal capabilities at the planning stage can be seen as helping to overcome contextual problems (Pyo, 2000; Ghobadian and Gallear, 2001). Conversely, failure to dedicate essential resources to improving capabilities can affect the flow and effectiveness of the implementation of any improvement initiative (River and Bae, 1999; Carpinetti et al, 2010; Fotopoulos et al, 2010). Cagnazzo et al (2010) further state that organisational capability is enhanced during the implementation of TQM if the necessary resources (technical and organisational) are available to the implementation team, whose members can be both internal employees and specialist consultants and which needs to have a strong quality knowledge base to ensure that the appropriate methodology and tools are utilised to start and sustain the momentum of the quality improvement initiative.

Oschman et al (2006) argue that TQM implementation is dependent on the structures and systems in place within the organisation and that change needs to be supported by adequate resources, while Varkey and Antonio (2010) contend that the needs of the organisation should be assessed in relation to operational readiness for change, participant interest, financial capability to support change, high perception of success, top management commitment levels and alignment with organisational vision and strategic direction. The availability of resources, according to Cagnazzo et al (2010), enhances the organisation’s readiness to adopt new quality initiatives. Others stress that internal capabilities can be developed by allocating resources, fostering knowledge, providing organisation-wide TQM education and encouraging problem-solving techniques, all of which need logistical and financial support from the top management team. The organisation therefore needs to build capability though high employee
involvement, continuous learning and thinking around issues of systems and process management to ensure that the TQM implementation process runs as effectively as possible (Ghobadian and Gallear, 2001; Ford, 2006).

Cagnazzo et al (2010) note that knowledge of quality methodology can be sourced internally or from an external consultancy, whereas Samuelsson and Nilsson (2002) and Al-Mashari et al (2010) recommend hiring experts or external consultants to enhance internal capabilities during a self-assessment exercise, as these consultants can develop a holistic overview of the organisation which is not biased by internal politics and previous working practices. Yusuf and Aspinwall (2000a) suggest that if an organisation wants to implement TQM it should use experts to identify its training needs and provide consultancy support. This viewpoint is supported by Bayazit (2003), who found that a lack of qualified quality consultants was one of the key obstacles to TQM implementation. The more experienced and qualified the consultants are the greater the benefit to the organisation utilizing their services (Al-Mashari et al, 2010). Due to the high complexity of implementing TQM, according to Cagnazzo et al (2010), an external consultant is more likely to be able to overcome the difficulties that arise. A study by Quazi and Padibjo (1998), investigating TQM practice through ISO 9000 in Singapore, concluded that where organisations were using external consultants to prepare them for TQM implementation, it was they who identified the training needs, provided the necessary expertise for implementation and prepared the certification documents.

It appears that developing internal capability is an important factor in BEM implementation. Therefore, organisations should provide sufficient funding and support resources (internal and external consultants, facilitators, training, etc) to ensure their capability. With sufficient knowledge, support and resources in place, Cagnazzo et al (2010) believe that most challenges can be overcome easily.

4.5.9 Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process

The organisation’s use of a BEM needs to be aligned with its strategic planning processes (Conti, 1997; Oschman et al, 2006; Davies, 2008; Smith, 2011). Breja et al (2011) advise that to sustain the success of a BEM it is important to align it with the organisational strategy, processes and practices. TQM must be embedded into the
organisational strategy and not remain a set of stand-alone practices, according to Asif et al (2009a).

A study investigating the integration of the EFQM model in a UK university (Davies, 2008) found that aligning its use with strategic planning was the main driver of effective implementation, facilitating the model’s integration into the university’s processes and boosting management and employee commitment and involvement. This is consistent with the findings of Conti (1997) regarding the conduct of EFQM self-assessment, implying that integrating this into strategic planning would reinforce the organisation’s focus on the efforts and resources that would be needed during its implementation. Samuelson and Nilsson (2002) regard self-assessment as an integral part of the strategic planning process and one of the most important factors in achieving a successful EFQM implementation. Oschman et al (2006) agree that TQM and strategic planning should be integrated and linked to long-term business goals and operations, therefore requiring the full support of senior management to ensure that the use of the model is aligned with overall organisational strategies.

In the case of three Australian organisations which failed to maintain their BEM, Meers and Samson (2003) report that the lack of alignment of the BEM with organisational strategy was perceived as the main cause of failure. Similarly, Nwabueze (2001) found that the TQM implementation would not succeed unless it was integrated within organisational strategy, structure and systems to ensure the compatibility of employee skills and attitudes with the implementation requirements. When it is not aligned with the rest of the organisational practices, according to Abdullah (2010), TQM is likely to fail, as its aim is to have quality at the heart of organisational practices and actions. Therefore, Breja et al (2011) recommend keeping the organisation focused on quality to ensure a strong link between the use of the BEM and the business strategy, which in turn has significant impact on the success of TQM implementation.

Lagrosen (2000) proposes that information is a critical factor in TQM success and that aligning implementation with strategic planning will ensure access to and availability of information systems during the implementation process. This is consistent with the argument of Berman et al (1995) that basing organisational strategy on the
transformation stage of TQM implementation ensures the organisation’s ability to provide the resources needed, such as consultants, information and finance.

Where a change has been successful, according to Varkey and Antonio (2010), the organisation absorbs it and as a result of the implementation, the processes, culture and people change to conform to the innovation. To ensure that the organisation adopts and absorbs the change there needs to be a strong alignment throughout the organisational strategies, processes, policies and practices to facilitate the smooth integration of improvement initiatives into the organisation (Varkey and Antonio, 2010). Thus there are strong arguments supporting the embedding of the BEM into the organisation’s strategic planning process as one of the success factors for implementation.

4.5.10 Effective communication

Another factor essential for integrating the BEM concept and organisational vision is effective communication with employees at all levels (Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Oschman et al, 2006; Kaluarachchi, 2010; Tarí, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010; Smith, 2011). Kaluarachchi (2010) asserts that a supportive communication environment improves the chances of successful TQM implementation. Communication, according to Brunetto and Wharton (2005), is the process whereby groups or individuals interact in an assortment of ways across different settings in the organisation with the intention of accomplishing organisational objectives. Carrière and Bourque (2009) define effective communication systems as all the formal and informal communication activities undertaken for the purpose of disseminating information to multiple audience levels throughout the organisation so that employees and management are provided with relevant, important and timely information.

Tarí (2006a) adds that communication tends to increase awareness amongst employees and maintains their commitment to implementing the project; thus, it was found that the value of the EFQM model to self-assessment plans in Spanish universities needed to be communicated clearly and feasibly to every employee who was involved in conducting self-assessment.
Varkey and Antonio (2010) highlight the importance of communication in the change process, as it empowers the employees to contribute to the implementation of quality within the organisation. This empowerment then enables employees to contribute to the development of strategy so that processes and procedures are more effective, based on their experience of operational activities. Conti (1997) states that a good communication system will help to clarify the aims of EFQM implementation and that this in turn will encourage employee commitment and involvement. Carrière and Bourque (2009) advise the use of a strong communication process that is effective and efficient, so that the job satisfaction and organisational commitment of employees can be enhanced, thus supporting the organisational improvement as resistance is reduced. Good role modelling of effective communication to subordinates and peers, according to Brunetto and Wharton (2005), stimulates employees by providing constructive praise to support their self-development, while giving them the knowledge or information they need to continue in their development and implementation of the BEM. Conversely, in Turkey, Üstüner and Coskun (2004) found that poor communication was considered a potential barrier to implementation, primarily due to resistance to change. In a study of the Spanish police force, Tarí (2006b) found that the success of a BEM and employee involvement could not be achieved unless the organisation developed effective communication channels, while Ahmed et al (2003) argue that poor communication causes error patterns, hence the need for action to be taken in order to ensure effective communication. For example, employees can be encouraged to pass on information and provide comments about the EFQM implementation process; it is also important during EFQM self-assessment to use standardised language, such as by providing glossaries, keywords, code numbers, specifications and phrases (Ahmed et al, 2003).

Mosadegh-Rad (2006) discusses the use of open communication in the early stages to increase decentralisation, which could improve employee involvement but could affect the TQM implementation process. George et al (2003), in a study of EFQM implementation by Stirling council, observed that a communication strategy was introduced by conducting regular communication sessions with all employees in an early phase of the EFQM implementation process. This strategy was deployed to increase employee awareness and involvement by explaining why and how the EFQM model was to be implemented by the authority. In the case of a university in Alicante,
Tarí (2008) found that communication was being conducted via signed letters being given to responsible people, who would then give talks to all employees in all departments. Varkey and Antonio (2010) recommend using a number of communication channels such as emails, websites, notice boards and information briefings to ensure that there is a regular and accessible communication chain. In addition to the formalised process, Varkey and Antonio (2010) advise that there should be informal opportunities for interdepartmental networking, so that further communication through phone calls, meetings and one-to-one dialogue is encouraged. Within the formal communication process, Varkey and Antonio (2010) advise that there should be a number of feedback mechanisms to enable an assessment of the effect of the change process or TQM implementation on the organisation. Carrière and Bourque (2009) concur and claim that improved communication within an organisation leads to greater employee satisfaction with the information they receive and less desire for additional information. They add that the desire for additional information is symptomatic of employee concern about the proposed changes and indicates possible resistance to change. Oschman et al (2006) and Kaluarachchi (2010) assert that it is necessary for the top management or organisational leadership to stress the importance and encourage the embedding of quality initiatives when communicating within the organisation. With top management communicating the key message, the employees are encouraged to buy in and become involved in the new strategic direction and practices (Oschman et al, 2006).

Policing organisations have strong power dynamics, even between mid-ranked and lower ranked officers, so that the frontline manager, who is normally a sergeant, often has power in his working relationships due to his rank, and this is reflected in the communication of information or new initiatives (Brunetto and Wharton, 2005). King (2003) notes that frontline managers often fail to provide the details necessary for the lower ranked officers to understand new policies and programmes. One way to address message loss during transmission down the hierarchy is to flatten the layers of the organisation so that it is leaner and to ensure that there is a strong communication strategy in place that meets the needs of the lower ranks (ibid).

On the manner of communication, Smith (2011) proposes a two-way communication process to enable management and employees to address potential problems and
challenges before they become a reality, thus ensuring better resource utilization and reducing the potential for resistance or failure of the change once implemented. Dale (2003) recommends that managers convey organisational messages to the “hearts and minds” of those whom they manage; and winning their hearts and minds means that employees must feel valued by the organisation, such as by being enabled to express feedback to management and see that it is acted upon. In the case of Arab culture, Rice (2003) identifies a pre-existing power dynamic and respect for seniority that need to be modified to prepare for BEM implementation: traditionally, a younger or lower ranked individual would not consider contradicting a superior and thus lower ranks can be reluctant to communicate frankly with management. Rees and Althakhri (2008) see ineffective communication between management and employees as a reason for the resistance to change in Arab society, whereas support and encouragement to develop upward communication channels would enhance organisational awareness and information flow, thus supporting the implementation of improvement initiatives.

It can be seen that a proper communication system should be in place during BEM implementation, facilitating it by helping to minimise employee resistance to change (Carrière and Bourque, 2009; Varkey and Antonio, 2010; Smith, 2011).

4.5.11 Aligning BEM with organisational processes

The chance of successful TQM implementation increases when it is integrated and aligned with an organisation’s processes (Rivers and Bae, 1999; Oschman et al, 2006; Asif et al, 2009a; López-Fresno, 2010; Breja et al, 2011). Hung et al (2009) denote the effort to implement and embed new processes into the organisation as organizational process alignment, while for Yang and Hsu (2010), this refers to the harmonious rearrangement of the various parts of a company so that all can seek common organizational goals, improve performance and sustain competitive advantage. Asif et al (2009a) call this formal and philosophical alignment of TQM ‘institutionalisation’, a process which is complete when the change has become accepted and settled as the normal way of working. To support it, they suggest that organisational processes may have to change and new structures and routines be established. Brunetto and Wharton (2005) emphasise that it is a major task of management to develop and implement new policy that ensures the realignment of workplace practices to organisational change.
The organisation, according to Asif et al (2009a), has become TQM institutionalised when all TQM activities are formally integrated into the organisational processes and procedures, while Smith (2011) asserts that the institutionalisation of new approaches occurs when organisations entrench changes and they become persistent within daily operations. Davies (2008) claims that aligning the use of the EFQM within the existing processes such as quality, performance and contract reviews, along with institutional audits, all lead to successful EFQM implementation. Asif et al (2009a) suggest that integrating and embedding TQM into the organisation’s processes will lead to a better fit between activities and thus reduce the duplication and overlapping of daily tasks. As TQM becomes embedded in the organisation’s practices, it prevents reversion to outmoded practices (Asif et al 2009a). Greasley (2004) notes that it may take time to get the new processes and practices embedded into the organisation. Tarí (2006b) reports that integrating EFQM into the processes of the Spanish police increased the level of employee involvement and positive opinions concerning the EFQM implementation process itself. In this sense, the integration of implementation overcame the problems relating to the hierarchical police system and supported learning among employees (ibid). When TQM is not aligned with the organisational processes, there is no motivation for employees to change from the status quo; thus TQM will have failed to become embedded and the change process will have failed to reach its objectives (Asif et al, 2009a).

If institutionalisation of TQM does not occur, according to Nwabueze (2001), the lack of integration of TQM into organisational processes results in partial implementation, whilst full integration creates an interrelationship which enhances employee involvement, effective communication and commitment. Ritchie and Dale (2000) reiterate that incorporating self-assessment into processes would deter any ‘added on’ processes that might cause increased workload. Asif et al (2009a) argue that for TQM to become institutionalised within an organisation, the implementation requires an environmentally customised design that encourages employees and management to buy in through the development of processes, routines and structures that creates a memory dataset of organisational knowledge. The organisation embeds and develops the
institutional TQM by developing TQM operating procedures and routines, thus encouraging supportive behaviour patterns amongst employees (ibid).

It seems that integrating BEM implementation initiatives with existing organisational processes can help to avoid overlapping and increases in workload which otherwise might have been caused by adopting the BEM on their own. With the appropriate integration and alignment of BEM into the organisational ethos and practices, the new quality model becomes institutionalised and thus provides greater opportunities for best practice to become routine in the organisation.

4.5.12 Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation

Increasing employees’ involvement in the BEM implementation process requires appropriate motivation schemes to ensure that they contribute to this initiative (Baidoun and Zairi, 2003; Salaheldin, 2009). Ahmed et al (2003) acknowledge that developing a recognition scheme to appraise employees’ efforts is one of the main factors affecting the success of EFQM self-assessment. Jiménez-Jiménez and Martínez-Costa (2009) note that managers and staff need to be motivated to ensure their contribution to the TQM implementation programme and recommend that this motivation for staff contribution be achieved through performance-related recognition and reward systems, which can then be formalised into a structured performance appraisal mechanism. By providing rewards and recognition, Das et al (2011) assert that the organisation provides motivational encouragement to employees so that they participate in TQM, while Allen and Kilmann (2001) note that when and if the reward system is considered part of the change process it can make a significant and positive contribution to its implementation. Kull and Wacker (2010) state simply that employees are motivated if the systems in place support their efforts.

Kanji et al (1999) indicate that although recognition systems differ between the USA (oriented towards social reward) and Malaysia (more towards money), the two countries tend to be in agreement concerning the critical role of reward systems in achieving successful TQM implementation, while differences in these systems are related to cultural differences. The use of reward systems inappropriate to the cultural values of the organisation may hinder its strategy to implement TQM, according to Allen and
Kilmann (2001), who warn that the traditional hierarchical individualist reward approach is not conducive to the TQM principles and practices of joint working and teamwork. Therefore, successful TQM implementation requires modifications to organisational strategy to include a motivation scheme that will ensure full employee participation (Melan, 1998). In public sector organisations, the central executive leadership must support the implementation of changes to made modifications to personnel and motivational approaches (ibid). Government reform policies are needed to develop an appropriate reward system to encourage people to integrate TQM implementation practices into their daily work in the public sector (Üstüner and Coskun, 2004). In externally examined awards, the victorious organisations are those which have recognised the need to make changes to their reward systems to support the implementation of TQM and which have developed recognition guidelines for TQM implementation, aligned to the organisational strategy (Allen and Kilmann, 2001).

In the military sector, Moser and Bailey (1997) highlight the lack of integration of a reward system with the TQM implementation process as a barrier to its success, stressing that individual efforts need to be recognised and rewarded in order to maintain employees’ support for implementation. The recognition of individual members should be undertaken in a manner which supports the team; for example, if a team performs well, all members should receive the same fiscal benefit. Allen and Kilmann (2001) agree that organisations should recognise and reward the team units and the individuals who make up these teams for their work and success at implementing TQM.

Wahid and Corner (2009) found in their investigation of the implementation of TQM in New Zealand that employee reward systems utilized company bonuses, promotion, performance bonuses and special incremental payments, enhancing the successful implementation of TQM. Similarly, Allen and Kilmann (2001) found that reward practice can be employed by the excellence steering committee to provide intrinsic and extrinsic (publicly overt) rewards, and that the use of the latter had a significant impact on the implementation of TQM.

The above discussions indicate that reward systems play a critical role in encouraging employee involvement in the TQM implementation process and ensure the integration
of TQM into their daily activities. Therefore, organisations should develop appropriate reward systems for evaluating and recognising employee efforts in the implementation of BEM (Kanji et al, 1999; Allen and Kilmann, 2001; Wahid and Corner, 2009; Kull and Wacker, 2010).

4.5.13 Providing sufficient training

To increase employee involvement in TQM, proper training needs to be delivered to all employees throughout the organisation (Osseo-Asare and Longbottom, 2002; Baidoun and Zairi, 2003; Oschman et al, 2006; Agus et al, 2010; Koh and Low, 2010). Tarí and Madeleine (2010) highlight the need for training when implementing EFQM as a way of motivating employees and a precondition for developing understanding and awareness of the self-assessment process. Training should occur in the early stages of EFQM self-assessment, in order to make employees aware of the EFQM working scheme and to allow them to review their own progress at each stage of implementation (Osseo-Asare and Longbottom, 2002). Tarí and Espinosa (2007) found that such training ensured employee understanding of EFQM and the processes involved in implementation, via self-assessment. Baidoun and Zairi (2003) stress that the skills required for TQM cannot be provided to employees unless training programmes are developed and integrated within the implementation process.

Agus et al (2010) define training as a knowledge and skills acquisition process where individuals learn to improve their abilities and performance to support the achievement of organisational goals, while for Van Eerde et al (2008) it is the development of proficiency through education and applied practice that enables employees to undertake their assigned duties effectively. Birasnav and Rangnekar (2009) consider training to be a component of human capital and a process in which individuals acquire expertise, beliefs or perspectives which enhance their performance in the desired organisational behaviour set.

In the US Air Force, the provision of training was seen as an indicator of management support, encouraging lower level employees to understand and become involved in TQM implementation, which in turn would help overcome the military’s hierarchical complexities (Moser and Bailey, 1997). Oschman et al (2006) found within a military
context that training provided the organisation a means of transmitting quality standards and procedures in a manner that enabled employees to absorb the TQM philosophy and demonstrate it in their daily activities.

Psychogios and Wilkinson (2007) found that the importance of training was directly related to the existence of an appropriately supportive culture and that the managers in some Greek organisations were not involved in or supportive of training programmes. In Yemen, some managers felt that well trained and innovative employees could threaten their positions, so they did not consider the need for improving employee skills (Al-Zamany et al, 2002). Fernandez and Rainey (2006) declare that managers, not just employees, must develop the TQM philosophy within their behaviour and practices; Kumar et al (2011) go further, arguing that top management needs training focused on quality improvement processes before other organisational areas. Resourcing for quality is directly influenced by management attitudes (Cheung and To, 2010); therefore more training resources will be provided if management has a strong commitment to TQM implementation.

Within organisations, according to Bhat and Rajashekar (2009), the implementation of TQM can create employee resistance and this resistance can be addressed through the use of appropriate training programmes. Chow and Ha (2009) assert that training can help to minimise operational errors and miscommunication opportunities within an organisation during the implementation of TQM. Additionally, numerous studies have highlighted the negative impact of a lack of training on factors such as TQM awareness, teamwork, problem-solving skills, technical skills, involvement, empowerment and resistance to quality improvement activities (Vermeulen, 1997; Huq and Martin, 2001; Al-Zamany et al, 2002; Sharma and Hoque, 2002; George et al, 2003; Üstüner and Coskun, 2004; Mosadegh-Rad, 2005; Tarí, 2006a). Rahman et al (2010) emphasise that training should be timely and appropriate to the processes being undertaken within the organisation. Tarí and Madeleine (2010) studied self-assessment via EFQM in Alicante University and found that giving each team 20 hours of appropriate, timely, extensive and detailed training in the EFQM model and its methodology was effective in facilitating its implementation. Regularly scheduled training, according to Shum et al (2008), is part of best practice for BEM education and training. Therefore, the human
resources department should identify the training needs to enable the organisation to develop employees’ understanding and knowledge of TQM (Wahid and Corner, 2009).

In short, training can be seen as a vehicle that is used to deliver the required BEM skills to all employees, to ensure their effective involvement in the BEM implementation process (Kumar et al, 2011). This in turn facilitates the integration of BEM into organisations through its employees’ daily activities.

4.5.14 Employee involvement

It is reported that employee participation enhances the application of TQM (Lagrosen, 2000; Talavera, 2005; Yousef, 2006; Asif et al, 2009a; Cheung and To, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). Similarly, Tarí (2006b) found in the Spanish police force that involving employees in self-assessment was a necessary condition for achieving effective EFQM implementation. Cheung and To (2010) define employee involvement as the extent to which employees are able to participate and control their work flow and work activities, including input and feedback to management and colleagues. Yousef (2006) characterises employee involvement as occurring through power sharing, rewards and sharing information and knowledge across the organisation. Varkey and Antonio (2010) argue that the involvement of people in the process creates a greater opportunity for eventual success when implementing organisational change, while Cheung and To (2010) note that job satisfaction increases when employees are encouraged and empowered to participate in change.

The institutionalisation of quality within an organisation, according Asif et al (2009a), requires employee involvement in a contextually explicit TQM design. El-Bakry et al (2010) advise that although TQM will possibly commence in one department, it needs to be embedded throughout the whole organisation through employee teamwork and involvement in interaction between all departments. Zu et al (2010) found that for effective TQM implementation to occur, the workplace environment needed to encourage open communication and employee participation. Using employees’ talents and ability to solve problems is one of the most effective approaches to embedding and implementing TQM within the organisation, according to Kumar et al (2011).
In a study set in Greece, a lack of employee involvement was found to be a real obstacle to TQM implementation, reflecting the current state of Greek bureaucracy (Psychogios and Wilkinson, 2007). Üstüner and Coskun (2004) also argue that the bureaucratic and administrative structures of Turkish ministries makes the potential movement of employees towards TQM implementation difficult, whilst effective implementation requires an environment that encourages employees to fully contribute to it.

Varkey and Antonio (2010) advise that convincing people to change behaviour is not effective on its own, but rather it is more pertinent to the organisation to give employees a compelling reason to support change. One method that they suggest is to highlight the risks and dangers of the current situation when compared to proposed change initiatives. Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009) emphasise that top and middle management should encourage employees’ participation in all phases of TQM implementation throughout the organisation. Yusuf (2006) suggests that top management should communicate with as many employees as possible to seek their opinions of TQM, as this provides an opportunity to gain an understanding of their existing knowledge and to identify potential challenges. Varkey and Antonio (2010) advise that the key resistors within the organisation should be recruited to the change implementation process. If the organisation can convince these individuals to participate, the challenges which they had to the process are more likely to be overcome; thus greater the chance of successful TQM implementation (Psychogios, 2010).

Baidoun and Zairi (2003) state that teamwork skills play an important role in enhancing employee involvement, whilst Mosadegh-Rad (2006) argues that the lack of team orientation acts as a barrier to employee participation and will reduce productivity, thus affecting TQM implementation. Chapman (2000) highlights the importance of developing teamwork throughout EFQM implementation and argues that this should be maintained by management support and resource availability.

Davies et al (2001) consider inefficient teamwork to be another obstacle to TQM implementation. This view is supported by Tarí (2006a), who found that Spanish universities faced similar difficulties in encouraging teamwork amongst employees. Therefore, training should be provided to employees to overcome their resistance to
team working and to improve their understanding of TQM (Bhat and Rajashekhar, 2009). Their education, background and TQM awareness level will affect employees’ teamwork and involvement in the implementation of TQM, according to Psychogios (2010).

It can be seen that employee involvement and teamwork facilitate the embedding of BEM initiatives within jobs and activities. However, encouraging employee involvement in improvement programmes is not an easy task, and attempts should be made to consider initiatives designed to ensure adequate involvement and teamwork. These factors could be facilitated by management support, training and rewards based on employees’ efforts in the programme, thus giving them the responsibility to take any decisions needed during the BEM implementation process.

4.5.15 Employee empowerment

The extent of empowerment in an organisation is viewed as an important factor that significantly impacts on the level of BEM implementation (Lagrosen, 2000; Talavera, 2005; Cheung and To, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). Kumar et al (2011) define empowerment as the sharing of power and ownership for action across all levels within the organisation, which enables employees to develop and take independent action to address situations they observe and encounter during their daily work. Smith (2011) alternatively defines employee empowerment as the delegation of authority to the work point affected by the decision, thus creating a simplified decision-making process. When employees have the ability to make essential decisions without management approval or control, they have greater job satisfaction (Cheung and To, 2010). In terms of quality management, Baidoun and Zairi (2003) make a significant point regarding empowerment: that it should be treated as a necessity for TQM success, through increasing employees’ commitment, involvement and ownership of their problem-solving skills. This argument is supported by Mosadegh-Rad (2005), who argues that the failure to empower employees will increase the probability of TQM implementation failure. Smith (2011) emphasises that empowered employees remove organisational obstacles, improve performance and practices, and undertake creative problem solving, while Mead (2005) argues that empowerment enables employees to have a greater sense of ownership, as it encourages and energises them to contribute to and participate in the
change implementation process. Sometimes a large organisation’s structure creates coordination issues with regional offices, according to Carpinetti et al (2010). To address this issue, Mead (2005) advises it to decentralise and encourage local decision making. The process of empowerment in public sector organisations requires a supportive management style for bottom-up initiatives to be in place, according to Morgan and Murgatroyd (1994).

Huq and Martin (2001) emphasise that empowerment should be considered a cultural dimension of the workforce in TQM. Research into TQM implementation in Greece found that the existence of an authoritarian leadership style affected the level of employee empowerment, thus reflecting the impact of prevailing culture on the way organisations work (Psychogios and Wilkinson, 2007). In developing countries, the lack of employee empowerment is one of the main difficulties facing TQM implementation, as reported by Al-Zamany et al (2002) in Yemeni organisations, where it was recognised as resulting from the traditional hierarchical models of management in the Arab context. Similarly, Jones and Seraphim (2008) found that employee empowerment was not known or understood by managers or employees in a UAE manufacturing organisation, where TQM implementation was therefore undermined. In countries which score highly on Hofstede’s power distance scale, according to Zairi and Alsughayir (2011), the management style is characteristically bureaucratic, centralised and authoritarian, and managers may be reluctant to accept the delegation of authority. In Arab societies with low levels of education this is particularly evident at the lower levels of organisations, as there is a preference for decisions to be made by management (Aycan et al, 2007). Therefore, Zairi and Alsughayir (2011) advise organisations that before TQM implementation, their attitudes need to be modified to create an environment where employees feel comfortable participating in the decision-making process and can increase their ownership during TQM implementation.

Yaacob (2009) argues that employees need a clearly defined boundary between what is and is not allowed; otherwise their involvement with empowerment will be meaningless. If employees do not have an understanding of the boundaries they may be unwilling to make decisions, as they fear a potential conflict with the management role of their line managers (Al-Zamany et al, 2002; Yaacob, 2009; Cheung and To, 2010). Rahman et al (2010) also find that employee inexperience with empowerment is a
barrier to TQM implementation. Yaacob (2009) warns organisations that they need to implement empowerment properly, because if badly practiced or misused it is likely to create poor employee relations and have other negative effects on the organisation. To address this concern, Yaacob (2009) suggests that the employee empowerment environment should be monitored regularly to ensure that there is no abuse.

Talavera (2005) advises the use of training to improve empowerment by changing behaviours and attitudes within the organisation. The greater the employees’ awareness of empowerment, the greater the organisational benefit (Yaacob, 2009), because employees who feel secure about their roles in the organisation are likely to solve problems and make decisions while experiencing greater job satisfaction and work flexibility, thus improving employment stability (Smith, 2011).

In summary, it appears that empowerment plays a significant role in ensuring employee involvement in the BEM implementation process. However, it seems that the level of empowerment is influenced by the organisational culture. When introducing empowerment to an organisation it necessary to provide training to support the concept and to set organisational boundaries so that staff members are willing to undertake creative decision making.

### 4.5.16 Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system

The implementation method or guideline is essential to the success of a BEM; therefore, it must be designed, managed and assessed as to whether the expected results have been achieved. Some authors (e.g. Chin and Pun, 2002; Kanji and Sa, 2003; Tarí, 2006b; Fryer et al, 2009; Cagnazzo et al, 2010) state that linking the use of the BEM with a performance measurement system is a key factor in a successful implementation of BEM. In a study of EFQM implementation in UK universities, Davies (2008) found that the EFQM was effectively implemented in one out of four cases through aligning its use with performance measurement. This provides strong evidence that aligning the measurement system is crucial for successful implementation. In policing, the improvement initiatives undertaken by the organisation must be aligned with its performance management and the accountability processes that monitor implementation (Brunetto and Wharton, 2005).
To ensure that the BEM is being embedded within the organisation, there needs to be a performance measurement approach to monitor how actions and behaviours are following the BEM (Fryer et al, 2009). According to Yousaf (2006), the purpose of measurement is to enable analysis and assessment, to ensure that there is sustained capability within the organisation; thus it is a continuous activity that exploits and supports management information throughout the implementation of TQM. The performance of the organisation is assessed throughout TQM implementation, so key performance indicators [KPIs] should be developed to match the organisation strategy so that organisational desired outcomes for performance is monitored on a regular basis (Wahid and Corner, 2009). These KPIs should be derived from the implementation guideline, according Vokurka et al (2001). Bourne et al (2000) state that effective measurement systems depend upon the measures that are derived from business strategy. In terms of TQM implementation, Thiagarajan et al (2001) agree that defining KPIs for each CSF of TQM facilitates the tracking of TQM implementation by the organisation. Tarí (2006a) emphasises that using KPIs helps to collect information in order to measure the implementation of EFQM, while Kanji and Sa (2003) explain that self-assessment can be used as a performance measurement tool to monitor TQM implementation. Similarly, Bauer et al (2005) state that the self-assessment score is used as a measure of implementation success, concluding that differences in the results may be associated with the extent of outcome improvement. Van der Wiele et al (1996) reach the same conclusion: that a change in self-assessment score would be related to quality maturity and thus to the level of BEM implementation.

Cagnazzo et al (2010) advise organisations that their existing PMS approach should be reviewed and assessed to ensure its suitability for the TQM implementation. If the existing approach is not fit for purpose, the organisation should adopt a new one that supports the implementation of TQM; it should include the measures for the TQM implementation (Fryer et al, 2009; Abdullah, 2010; Cagnazzo et al, 2010).

From the above discussion it can be seen that reviewing and aligning the measurement system and ensuring that relevant measures of progress are in place constitute a key influential factor in successful BEM implementation. It can also be said that after developing implementation guidelines, the organisation needs to align the measurement
system with it in order to obtain a good indication of how the BEM has been implemented and whether the implementation guideline has been conducted as planned.

4.5.17 Aligning BEM with information systems

Detailed information and guidance on BEM implementation are considered critical in ensuring its success (El-Bakry et al, 2010; Koh and Low, 2010). Ahmed et al (2003) emphasise that qualitative and quantitative data should be available, in order to support self-assessment. According to Bush et al (2009), the term ‘alignment’ in the context of information systems refers to the extent to which the organisation’s strategy is supported by its information systems. El-Bakry et al (2010) assert that the greatest impediment to realizing a TQM initiative is the lack of timely access to information. Information systems should provide rapid and accurate information that enhances and facilities BEM implementation (Martínez-Lorente et al, 2004). In the case of the Spanish police, Tarí (2006b) established that information systems relating to customers, employees, complaints, error rates and special data should be utilised to gain the maximum benefit from EFQM implementation. At the Isfahan University Hospital, the correlation between the success of TQM and access to adequate information resources was reported to be significant, while a lack of adequate information resources is regarded by Üstüner and Coskun (2004) as a critical barrier to implementing TQM in the Turkish public sector. Martínez-Lorente et al (2004) argue that information systems must be amalgamated with management systems to ensure that information is visible to decision makers. Failure to align these systems, according to Bush et al (2009), leads to resource wastage, to lost opportunities and subsequently to unfavourable performance.

Rivers and Bae (1999) highlight the importance to TQM implementation of integrated and accessible information systems, thus aligning information with the implementation of TQM and ensuring its availability and accessibility so that employees can make decisions, resolve problems and intervene appropriately throughout the implementation of TQM. They add that the teams responsible for implementing TQM require current information on clinical, financial and functional matters in all service areas. Martínez-Lorente et al (2004) assert that aligning information systems with TQM environments facilitates the smooth integration of TQM initiatives and ensures the utilization of information collected within the organisation, so that the application of TQM to all
activities becomes institutionalised. For their part, Marchand and Raymond (2008) insist that the information system should be developed to be user friendly and accessible at all levels of the organisation; if not, the information collected will be devalued and cannot be used to improve quality.

The generation of feedback via the information system provides an alternative information cycle which Koh and Low (2010) believe helps to develop the continuous loop of quality improvement within organisations that utilise amalgamated information and management systems for TQM. They explain that this continuous loop is supported by the use of quantitative and qualitative data collected in the information system so that it can support and generate action lists for areas of concern which need to be addressed. With the development of technology integration in all organisational systems, Marchand and Raymond (2008) advise organisations that workplace tasks can be used to ensure a focus on gathering appropriate information and performing daily tasks in a manner which enhances TQM performance. The communication of strategy can be incorporated into the information system, according to Bush et al (2009), as well as ensuring that the organisational strategies incorporate the use of information systems. Wahid and Corner (2009) and Mead (2005) argue that the effective use of information systems will ensure the right level of information for individuals and thus reduce uncertainty avoidance, as they are able to access the information they need, overcoming dispersed locations and middle management blockages by eliminating surplus levels in the communication hierarchy.

Bush et al (2009) advises organisations to align their information systems to their objectives, requiring the leadership first to identify these objectives, after which the executive management should decide how the organisation as a whole will accomplish them. From this action plan the information system has to be developed or adapted to support the implementation strategy and to enhance the collection of the necessary data to monitor and assess performance. Once the new system requirements have been envisioned and developed, the information technology department needs top management support to enable the development and implementation of information systems to meet the new organisational objectives, including the allocation of adequate
resources to support the implementation of information systems aligned to the TQM implementation (ibid).

In summary, the efficient and effective use of information systems ensures the effectiveness of BEM within the organisation. Martínez-Lorente et al (2004) assert that the more skilled the employees are in utilizing the information system the greater is the correlation with the success of BEM implementation. Effective information systems support implementation and when there is alignment between information and management systems, the BEM becomes embedded into everyday activities, creating an institutionalised focus on continuous improvement.

4.5.18 Developing an action plan

Many researchers (Van der Wiele et al, 1996; Van der Wiele and Brown, 1999; Samuelsson and Nilsson, 2002; Tarí, 2006a; Carpinetti et al, 2010; López-Fresno, 2010; Tarí and Madeleine, 2010) have stressed that an action plan must be established to ensure the following up of the BEM implementation results. Without such a plan, Tarí and Madeleine (2010) warn that EFQM self-assessment is more likely to fail. According to López-Fresno (2010), it is essential for organisations to utilise a follow-up action plan to ensure the successful implementation of BEM, while Tarí (2008) argues that developing an action plan drives improvement actions, thus enhancing the implementation of self-assessment. This action plan includes improvement actions, tasks, resources that are required for implementing the action plan, and the follow-up indicators needed to measure and monitor the implementation of the action plan (Tarí, 2008; Tarí and Madeleine, 2010). Van der Wiele and Brown (1999) illustrate how linking the action plan directly to the business planning process facilitates better management and implementation of the action plan, which in turn directly contributes to the overall organisation goals of BEM implementation.

Ford and Evans (2006) conclude that organisations which develop and focus on implementing action plans derived from self-assessment outcomes perform better than those which do not. To ensure organisational commitment to implementing the improvement action plan, it must be approved by top management or the excellence steering committee in order to provide resources that will be needed for the improvement action plan (Samuelsson and Nilsson, 2002; Tarí and Madeleine, 2010).
Samuelsson and Nilsson (2002) emphasise that top management teams must approve the action plan and its priority in the implementation. Considering the action plan gives the organisation an opportunity to decide the priority order based on the timeline, resources and employees’ availability, and to decide whether taking a few action steps will work more effectively than performing all the listed actions together, while linking the action plan to the strategic planning process ensures its effective implementation (Tarí, 2008). Van der Wiele and Brown (1999) found in their study of BEM self-assessment practice in Europe and Australia that if self-assessment was linked with strategic planning and became a strategic goal, this in turn created a very strong and reliable system to manage improvement actions across the whole organisation. Once the action plan is approved and linked with business planning, it must be handed to the appropriate personnel who are responsible for its implementation (Samuelsson and Nilsson, 2002). This team is responsible for action monitoring and reporting progress to the top management, helping the latter to take the right decisions to ensure that the action plan is implemented effectively (Ford and Evans, 2006; Tarí, 2008).

Tarí and Madeleine (2010) state that to ensure its effectiveness, the adoption of the action plan throughout the organisation needs to be reviewed on a regular basis. Periodic monitoring should assess the degree of action plan implementation which has occurred within the organisation with defined indicators contextually appropriate for the organisation (Tarí and Madeleine, 2010). Carpinetti et al (2010) stress that the monitoring and implementation of the action plan must be integrated with the improvement programmes, along with unified responsibility for the achievement of target metrics.

Thus, the action plan seems to be a key approach for embedding and developing a BEM within an organisation. By following up the implementation of BEM, the action plan provides a priority order and focus that allows the organisation to address key issues, ensuring top management support and involvement in developing and managing the organisation’s BEM action plan.
4.6 Chapter summary

This chapter has surveyed the literature on the key factors that influence the implementation of BEMs in public sector organisations, identifying 18 such factors. While not all of these have received the same emphasis from the authors of all of the selected studies, they were all covered in this chapter to ensure the comprehensiveness of the investigation and to avoid excluding any factor that might be critical in some places, if not in others. The role of each factor was discussed in some detail.

From this review it can be concluded that Arab culture is likely to influence BEM implementation in the UAE. The Western-based studies have provided a general overview of the key influential factors and how they affect organisations, while those set in developing countries and the Arab world identified some of the challenges which a public sector organisation would be likely to encounter due to cultural, contextual and environmental differences from Western organisations. The 18 key influential factors were selected for observation to ensure that the UAE public sector organisation which is the object of this research meets the challenges to successful implementation of BEM in its demanding environmental context.

The following chapter presents and discusses the research methodology employed in this study, whose aim is to investigate how the key influential factors identified above have been perceived and adopted within the case study organisation.
Chapter Five: Research Methodology

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents an overview of the research design and methodology, explaining the purpose of the study and identifying the research paradigm and methods adopted. Initially, there is a brief account of the theory and the reasons for choosing particular paradigms and methods, then the differences between the various types will be identified.

This chapter also offers an explanation and justification of the research strategy. Data collection methods are then discussed in detail, followed by a specific focus on the sources from which information was obtained and on the selection of the sample of participants. The chapter ends by explaining the methods of data analysis adopted to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings and ultimately to provide logical answers to the research questions.

5.2 Research definition and purpose
Hussey and Hussey (1997) note that in spite of significant discussion of research activities, there is no agreed formalised definition of research itself. For Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005), research is the process of preparing, performing and exploring a query about a phenomenon to find answers to enhance a specific situation, while Sekaran (2003) defines research as a scientific enquiry into a problem, based on data collection techniques, for the purpose of finding a solution. In the present context, it would be sensible to define business and management research as the undertaking of systematic investigations to discover facts about these fields (Easterby-Smith et al, 2008). Such research activity is undertaken to understand human activities and interactions through appropriate philosophical and methodological approaches so that the researchers have useful and appropriate data to enable them to answer their initial research questions (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Saunders et al, 2009).

The purpose of the research is likely to be best served by determining the research process which is most suitable to address the main objectives; therefore, Creswell (2009) argues that the researcher should choose an appropriate research method and
methodology, which define the way that the study is undertaken. Saunders et al (2009) assert that the term ‘methodology’ belongs to a larger construct and that it is linked to the theory of how research should be undertaken, including the theoretical and philosophical assumptions upon which a research study is based, while Hussey and Hussey (1997) define research methods as the approach by which data is collected, scrutinized, evaluated and then reported. These definitions indicate how the terms ‘method’ and ‘methodology’ are to be used to discuss different aspects of the research process. Method refers to the specifics of data collection, while methodology is all the methods utilised within the study (Hussey and Hussey, 1997; Yin, 2003; Easterby-Smith et al, 2008; Creswell, 2009).

5.3 Research paradigm

Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) define a research paradigm as a system of basic beliefs or worldviews that guides an investigation, while for Guba and Lincoln (1994), it is a set of beliefs, propositions or worldviews that defines the nature of the world and explores what constitutes appropriate techniques for undertaking an inquiry into that world. Gaining more knowledge about research paradigms helps to identify appropriate choices for research designs and data collection techniques. Creswell (2009) argues that the philosophical perspective of the researcher needs to be understood, since it will influence the research purpose and the methods used in any study.

Easterby-Smith et al (2008) identify four reasons for exploring philosophical issues: clarification, effectiveness, innovation and adoption of research design. For any researcher, the key to designing the research is an understanding of the philosophical viewpoint. Furthermore, the researcher needs this philosophical understanding in order to identify what methods are appropriate for the study circumstances, which might result in the adaptation of existing methods or the recognition that innovative ones are required to address the study questions (ibid).

Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) and Creswell (2009) identify four main paradigms of social science research: positivism, constructivism, advocacy/participatory research and pragmatism. The positivist viewpoint is the paradigm traditionally associated with quantitative scientific experimentation (Saunders et al, 2009), while the historically
opposed paradigm is constructivism, which seeks to understand the subjective meanings that individuals construct to explain the world around them (Creswell, 2009). The third paradigm, advocacy or participatory research, puts strong emphasis on empowering individuals through action, while the pragmatic paradigm acknowledges that all research occurs in an environment affected by social, historical, political and other contextual influences; thus the process is decided upon by the researcher according to his or her knowledge of what will work in that environment. The pragmatic approach is problem-centred and seeks to address the questions of what works and how, as answering the research question is more important than any individual method (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998).

Saunders et al (2009) argue that using the scientific approach and philosophical mindset of traditional science associated with the positivist paradigm is not appropriate to the business context, as it attempts to theorize by using definitive rules that do not fit the complex and dynamic social world of business and management. The positivist paradigm views research as being value-free; hence it fails to acknowledge that the results might be influenced by the researcher’s subjectivity (Easterby-Smith et al, 2008; Saunders et al, 2009). Due to the nature of the present study and the setting of the investigation, the positivist paradigm was eliminated from consideration as an appropriate philosophical approach.

The constructivist paradigm, according to Creswell (2009), is subjective and assumes that social phenomena are created from the perceptions and consequent actions of social actors who are concerned with their existence. It is through the continual process of social interaction that these social phenomena are in a constant state of revision (Saunders et al, 2009). Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) emphasise that this paradigm has the underpinning belief that methods and research investigations used in the natural sciences cannot be applied directly to the social world, since there is a need to interpret and understand human behaviour. Easterby-Smith et al (2008) and others (e.g. Hussey and Hussey, 1997; Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003; Saunders et al, 2009) note that constructivism is often adopted by researchers who wish to understand the implications which individuals construct and that qualitative research methods are associated with this paradigm. While rich findings could have been achieved by the use of
constructivism, it was felt that this approach and the use of qualitative research methods alone would not provide facts to support the causation of the emotive responses in the present case (Jankowicz, 2005).

Pragmatism is defined by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) as a deconstructive paradigm which focuses on what works in relation to the research investigation and recognises the values of the researcher, who plays a significant role in the analysis of the findings. Cameron and Price (2009) explain that in pragmatism the meaning comes from the consequences of the idea, while the contextual knowledge and activities cannot be separated from the research process.

*Pragmatism as a worldwide view or philosophy arises out of actions, situations, and consequences rather than antecedent conditions (as in postpositivism). There is a concern with applications – what works – and solutions to problems. Instead of focusing on methods, researchers emphasize the research problem and use all approaches available to understand the problem* (Creswell, 2009:231).

Since pragmatism is not aligned to one system of philosophy and reality, according to Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007), Cameron (2009) and Creswell (2009), researchers are able to choose what methods and approaches they will utilise in order to solve the problem they are investigating. This nonalignment to a specific methodological approach due to the philosophic stance, such as that found in positivism in relation to empirical methods, ensures that researchers evaluate and use a range of methods to suit their contextual circumstances (Cameron, 2009). Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) state that pragmatic researchers study what they want to investigate and believe to be important. The individual researcher’s value system influences the research, but this is not seen as a problematic issue within the research (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). The appeal of pragmatism is that it provides the researcher with an opportunity to utilise mixed methods and model design within a philosophy which does not value one method over another due to its philosophical alignment (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003; Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007; Creswell, 2009; Cameron, 2009). Pragmatism was selected as the philosophical approach for the present study because it allowed the
researcher to make decisions about the process iteratively (Fendt and Sachs, 2008) to make it work (Creswell, 2009) and to use a range of methods to suit the phenomenon under investigation, which is the implementation of a BEM by a public sector organisation. Pragmatism helps to understand the phenomenon of BEM implementation in the ADP through reflection on the human participants’ views, using judgment based upon the researcher’s experience in this field and within this organisation, along with the analysis of empirical facts and statistics concerning the phenomenon (ibid).

5.4 Research approaches

According to Easterby-Smith et al (2002), there are two principal research approaches: qualitative and quantitative. Remenyi et al (1998) explain that qualitative research attempts to interpret and describe phenomena, whilst quantitative investigators present numerical data as the basis of their observations. Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) state that both qualitative and quantitative researchers are interested in what people do and think, but approach their investigations differently.

Qualitative approaches often involve fieldwork and the collection of data by methods such as in-depth interviews, focus groups, observations and the reviewing of existing written documents (Patton, 2002). Saunders et al (2009) note that the main aim of qualitative research is to describe and understand the phenomenon under investigation by observing and involving the subjects. Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007) assert that the qualitative researcher collects, analyses and interprets data by observing what people do and say. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) emphasize this, stating that qualitative research is typically described as providing rich and meaningful conceptualisations of the social world.

However, qualitative research is more likely than quantitative research to be faced with the problem of the subjectivity of the researcher or data collector (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). Furthermore, Bryman and Bell (2007) argue that a lack of rigorous experimental controls and determinants are often associated with qualitative data collection and analysis, thus limiting their application to certain types of research. Hussey and Hussey (1997) identify a similar issue with rigour and subjectivity, warning
that the qualitative approach may be associated with additional costs in time and resources, as well as requiring complex data analysis.

In contrast, quantitative research utilises large sample sizes and statistical techniques. Studies following this approach emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables (Hussey and Hussey, 1997). As described by Saunders et al (2007), quantitative methods include experiments, surveys and the secondary analysis of quantitative data, which can be modelled through the use of mathematical techniques, enhancing the ability to test hypotheses, as the data is specific and precise (Hussey and Hussey, 1997). For many researchers, according to Bryman and Bell (2007), a key rationale for adopting a quantitative approach is that it enables the replication of the study and this helps in the systematic development of theory. Other features of the quantitative approach are that the researcher is not a participant in the research but an external observer and that he or she quantifies phenomena, rather than trying to interpret perceptions of them (Dawson, 2009).

The limitation of quantitative methods, according to Fowler (2009), is that they focus on the complications of adequately explaining the observed patterns, trends or relationships. Bryman and Bell (2007) argue that by this focus on explaining trends and a reliance on instruments and procedural practices, the measurement processes create a false sense of precision and accuracy. The second criticism of quantitative methods which they report is that the research approach fails to consider the foibles of human nature but attempts to use scientific generalisation from the natural world to describe humans. Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007) identify a common problem in the connection between the everyday and the research, particularly the participants’ perspectives. In contrast, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) argue that the quantitative approach provides researchers with specific, hard, generalisable results.

Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) explain that mixed-methods research combines the quantitative and qualitative approaches. This approach neutralises the various arguments between constructivism and positivism by attempting to address the criticisms of each approach and to enhance the research process by undertaking a more rounded study of phenomena (Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007). Saunders et al (2007) suggest that it is
healthier to use a mixture of approaches, as this enables researchers to triangulate and so to ensure the reliability and validity of their findings. Data triangulation, according to Cameron and Price (2009), enables the researcher to increase internal validity and reliability by seeking secondary or tertiary sources to support the findings of any part of the study. The cross-checking of results using varied research methods is the main advantage of the mixed-methods approach, according to Robson (2002), who argues that triangulation between methods can also enable researchers to identify anomalies or complementary relationships that one method alone would miss, thus providing greater understanding of complex issues.

As there are no specific rules or regulations governing researchers, according to Jankowicz (2005), the use of mixed methods gives them the freedom to make decisions based on their knowledge of what works in the circumstances they are investigating. Creswell (2009) argues that such research benefits from the philosophical assumptions of each method, while Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003) assert that it enjoys the strengths of all of its methods, which complement each other, whereas their weaknesses are avoided, as long as they are not common to all of the methods employed.

It was concluded that the use of mixed methods in this study would give the researcher the freedom (Jankowicz, 2005; Cameron and Price, 2009; Creswell, 2009) to identify the factors in the ADP which affected the implementation of its BEM. The use of a quantitative questionnaire would enable the examination of current perceptions in relation to these factors across the organisation, which could be further investigated through the use of semi-structured interviews with people involved in the implementation process to gather their views about the impact of the factors on the process. The review of published studies also indicated that the use of mixed methods was a key research approach for investigating TQM and EFQM in organisations (McAdam et al, 2002; Soltani et al, 2006; Bahzad and Irani, 2008; Tarí, 2008; Bhat and Rajashekhar, 2009). By means of an approach developed from reviewing the literature, the final data could be compared with that from earlier studies, thus extending the existing body of knowledge on BEMs.
5.5 Research strategy

Blaikie (2007) defines research strategy as the manner in which the ‘what’, ‘why’ and ‘how’ of the research questions are answered, adding that research strategy should be decided early, in order to be clear about the methods of data collection and the chosen sources of data. Robson (2002) lists three research strategies: experiment, survey and case study. Recently, Yin (2009) has added two more strategies to this list, as shown in Table 5.1: archival analysis and historical analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Form of research question</th>
<th>Requires control of behavioural events?</th>
<th>Focusses on contemporary events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yin (2009) states that choosing an appropriate research strategy is dependent on considering three factors: the type of research questions, the extent of control over events and the level of focus on contemporary events. Therefore, the choice of the case study strategy in the present research is justified for several reasons, but primarily because the researcher sought to investigate a phenomenon within the real-life context of an organisation (Yin, 2003).

In the case study approach, according to Creswell (2009), the researcher investigates in great detail the performance, actions, processes and systems of one or more organisations or individuals. This requires the researcher to use an assortment of data
collection processes to discover detailed information about the object of study (Cameron and Price, 2009; Creswell, 2009). Bryman and Bell (2007) state that case studies provide an opportunity for researchers to utilise a range of sources and methods to avoid dependence on a single type or source of information, while Yin (2009) argues that they are particularly suitable when the boundaries between the phenomena and the context are not clear. Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) agree that in business studies, when the phenomenon is difficult to separate from the context, it is particularly useful to employ the case study strategy, especially when the concepts and variables are difficult to measure. This is supported by Hussey and Hussey (1997), who argue that examining the relationship between a phenomenon and its context gives a clearer and more comprehensive picture.

The research problems and objectives are the features which determine whether the case study approach is suitable (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). Saunders et al (2007) state that the case study method is more appropriate for a researcher who wants to address ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions, while Yin (2003) argues that it enables the researcher to investigate the status quo within an organisation, rather than a historical situation. Flyvbjerg (2006) asserts that the case study approach maintains its potency in social science because it investigates occurrences in sufficient detail to enable them to be understood in context.

A review of the literature supports the adoption of the case study strategy in TQM and BEM research (Davies, 2008; Wahid and Corner, 2009; Carpinetti et al, 2010; Tarí, 2010; Smith, 2011). Davies (2008) conducted a case study to investigate the role of integration in effectively implementing the EFQM model in UK universities and found that it provided insight into the implementation process. Leonard and McAdam (2001) state that to achieve an accurate and coherent set of TQM theories would require the adoption of the case study strategy to investigate TQM-related events within an organisation. The use of the case study enables the researcher to engage in a discussion with members of the organisation in order to find solutions and identify factors creating problems in the application of TQM (Leonard and McAdam, 2001).
This study is concerned with the implementation of a BEM in the UAE public sector; the following two points are therefore worth noting. First, the events investigated are contemporary, since the use of BEMs is in its infancy in the UAE. Several authors have observed that this is true in other Middle Eastern countries (Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall, 2000; Al-Zamany et al, 2002; Al-Marri et al, 2007). Secondly, in the present case, it was not possible to define clearly the phenomenon (the implementation of a BEM) or the context (the UAE public sector), yet the study sought to identify the key influential factors associated with successful BEM implementation and to explain how they would facilitate and affect its implementation. In essence, such an examination required clear understanding of the ‘what’ and ‘how’, because the researcher had little or no control over the behavioural events in the ADP.

Based on the above reasoning, the appropriate strategy for this research was identified as the case study, which would enable the researcher to examine, explore and understand (Yin, 2003) the process of successfully implementing a BEM in the context of a UAE public sector organisation.

5.6 The limitations of the case study strategy

Saunders et al (2007) identify some limitations in the use of case studies, including descriptive bias, an emphasis on the researcher’s viewpoint, concern about the validity of generalisation from a single case and the cost in time and resources. A single case study should be used only for a case that is rare or critical, while multiple case studies are preferred otherwise (Yin, 2003). Flyvbjerg (2006) responds to criticism of the single case study by arguing that like any research strategy it will have advantages and disadvantages, repudiating the particular criticism about the ability to generalise from a single case study by noting that it depends on the individual case study and how the method was chosen by the researcher. Yin (2009) supports this rejection of the criticism by asserting that the case study relies not on statistical analysis but rather on analytical interpretation to provide generalisation. Suárez-Barraza and Ramis-Pujol (2010) used a single case study to investigate the implementation of Lean-Kaizen by a Mexican public sector organisation, justifying this approach by explaining that they were investigating how Lean-Kaizen could be implemented in a service process, rather than seeking empirical generalisation. According to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005), the case study is
used in business research to investigate a single organisation and to identify the factors involved in aspects of organisational behaviour or processes within that individual entity. Additionally, Flyvbjerg’s (2006) repudiation of the criticism of single case studies emphasises that most single case studies are actually multiple, in the sense that ideas and evidence from multiple sources may be linked and utilised in many different ways.

In the ADP, the situation is one that has not been reliably observed and the study of a single case in this context is supported by Yin (2003). While research into BEM implementation has been undertaken in a limited number of policing organisations (Oschman et al, 2006; Tarí, 2006b; Gomes et al, 2007; Fleming and Grabosky, 2009), these have been in developed countries with Western European cultures. The present research is set in a Middle Eastern developing country which is rapidly transitioning from underdeveloped to developed nation status and the social and cultural influences on the organisation are not the same as those found in western nations. Thus, it was appropriate to adopt the single case study strategy and a holistic approach, as there were no similar studies set in the geographical region and in similar organisational contexts.

The second criticism of the case study approach is its greater potential compared with other methods for descriptive or researcher bias. Flyvbjerg (2006) responds that although researchers may become more involved in the process, they also develop their judgement about the phenomena from their close association with the context being studied. This interaction between researcher and context means that understanding is based on actual practice rather than theoretical concepts, so that overall the case study is no more biased than other research methods (ibid).

In response to the criticism of excessive time and resource consumption, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) argue that data are usually collected from multiple sources. Indeed, the present researcher used mixed methods to gather more than one type of data at the same time when visiting each collection point. Such simultaneous collection of qualitative and quantitative data from each location saves time, according to Creswell (2009).
5.6.1 Unit of analysis

For Yin (2009), case studies may be distinguished on two dimensions, being either single or multiple and either holistic or embedded, thus giving four types of design. He argues that the choice of design will be dependent upon the research question and the type of phenomenon being studied: holistic designs are advantageous when no logical subunits are identified or when the relevant theory underlying the case study is holistic in nature, while embedded designs are useful when more than one unit of analysis is involved and incorporated into the case study.

The present study takes as its unit of analysis the public sector organisation itself. Although the ADP has many departments, the process of BEM implementation covers the entire organisation as one unit. In other words, this is a holistic case study of the ADP, in line with Yin’s (2009) recommendation that the global nature of the implementation of BEM in organisations means that a holistic design must be considered.

5.7 Sampling techniques

The literature suggests that there is a need to differentiate between the terms ‘sample’ and ‘population’. Bryman and Bell (2007) define a sample as a segment of the population that is investigated, while the population is the whole potential set of elements available which share a common feature that enables them to be defined as a set. Kumar (2000) explains that common predetermined characteristics create a set, which makes up a population group for the research study. While it may be possible to collect information from every individual within an organisation, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) see it as preferable to select a smaller representative group to gather the information and then make inferences regarding the larger group.

There are two approaches to defining and selecting a sample of participants: probability and non-probability sampling (Saunders et al, 2009). Probability sampling, which bases participant selection on chance, has three main types: stratified, cluster and random sampling (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). Non-probability sampling, according to Bryman and Bell (2007), is based on focused decisions, such as when the researcher decides to select those who have been involved in the implementation of a new process.
Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) identify three types of non-probability sampling strategy: convenience, judgemental and quota. Silverman (2005) explains that purposive or judgemental sampling takes account of case-based features or processes in which the researcher is interested; it demands a critical and careful examination that assesses the parameters of the population and the chosen sample. Convenience sampling bases the selection of potential participants on their easy availability or accessibility (Remenyi et al, 1998). Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) warn that convenience sampling, while possibly providing the greatest accessibility, can cause difficulties in generalising to the overall population. Thus, while it provides ease of access at low cost, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) advise that it should not be relied upon as the only sampling method.

The population of the current study was determined to include everyone in a paid association with the ADP. The researcher then used two non-probability sampling approaches: based on the planned use of mixed research methods, it was felt that the limitations of using convenience sampling for the questionnaire would be counteracted by the use of purposive sampling for the interviews (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). Silverman (2005) states that there is a general consensus on the use of purposive sampling in qualitative research and that it is used frequently in interviews. In the present study, the participants were chosen for their involvement in the implementation of the BEM by the ADP. A judgement was made by the researcher about each potential participant’s expertise and involvement in the implementation process. Sekaran (2003) supports this use of judgement by researchers to select specific types of people in the organisation who can provide the desired information.

5.8 Sample size

Sample size is a crucial consideration in research; Saunders et al (2007) argue that no particular size is suitable for all studies. Bryman and Bell (2007) support this view, stating that large numbers do not guarantee precision. Patton (2002) advises that for the purpose of evaluation the sample must be a credible representation, while remaining small enough to enable the researcher to study it in the depth and detail required to answer the research question. More details of the sample sizes employed in the two main data gathering arms of the study are given in sections 5.11.1 and 5.12.6.
5.9 Data collection methods associated with the case study strategy

Yin (2009) states that data collection affects the reliability and validity of case study research and identifies the six sources of evidence displayed in Table 5.2: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation and physical artefacts.

**Table 5.2: Data sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of evidence</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Stable – can be reviewed repeatedly</td>
<td>Retrievability – can be difficult to find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unobtrusive – not created as a result of the case study</td>
<td>Biased selectivity – if collection is incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exact – contains specific names, references, and details of an event</td>
<td>Reporting bias – reflects (unknown) biases of author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad coverage – long span of time, many events and many settings</td>
<td>Access – may be deliberately withheld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Records</td>
<td>Same as those for documentation</td>
<td>Same as those for documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precise and usually quantitative</td>
<td>Accessibility – due to privacy reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Targeted – focuses directly on case study topics</td>
<td>Biases – from poorly articulated questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insightful – provides perceived casual inferences and explanations</td>
<td>Response bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Observations</td>
<td>Reality – covers events in real time</td>
<td>Inaccuracies – due to poor recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual – covers context of ‘case’</td>
<td>Reflexivity – interviewee gives what interviewer wants to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-</td>
<td>Same as those for direct observations</td>
<td>Time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Insightful – into interpersonal behaviour and motives</td>
<td>Selectivity – broad coverage difficult without a team of observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Artefacts</td>
<td>Insightful – into cultural features</td>
<td>Reflexivity – event may proceed differently because it is being observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insightful – into technical operations</td>
<td>Cost – hours needed by human observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as those for direct observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bias – due to participant/observer manipulating events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yin (2009)

5.10 Choosing data collection sources

A review of the literature on TQM implementation tends to suggest that data and information should be collected from senior managers, project managers and directors who have been directly involved in the implementation of the BEM (Davies, 2008).
Bowen (2008) advises that for qualitative investigations an appropriate sample is composed of participants who best represent or have knowledge of the research topic.

Silverman (2005) asserts that data should be gathered from more than one source, in the triangulation method of data collection. Creswell (2009) observes that using or examining evidence by combining different data sources increases the reliability and validity of the findings. Yin (2009) agrees that case studies are more accurate when a researcher employs more than one data source. Such data source triangulation is facilitated by the use of mixed methods (Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007). Since there are different data sets from the interviews, questionnaires and literature review, the researcher has a number of sources from which to triangulate the findings.

5.11 Interviews

Hussey and Hussey (1997: 156) define an interview as ‘a method of collecting data in which selected participants are asked questions in order to find out what they do, think, or feel’. Yin (2009) justifies the interview as enabling human interactions to be reported and interpreted through the eyes of the interviewee, giving the researcher a specific perspective on the process or event.

Bryman and Bell (2007) distinguish three types of interview: structured, semi-structured and unstructured. Yin (2009) emphasizes that during any interview, the researcher should follow his or her own line of inquiry and should ask questions in an unbiased manner. Yin (2009) further advises that by recording the interview the researcher can gather accurate data and remain focused on note taking. Davies (2008) used interviews to gain further insight and understanding concerning the implementation of the EFQM model in UK universities. Soltani (2003) conducted an interview to try to identify the critical factors for accepting and successfully implementing TQM practice and to understand why and in what way they were important or influential. The development of interview guidelines was derived from the literature review on TQM and BEM (Bauer et al, 2005; Davies, 2008; Cagnazzo et al, 2010). See appendix (2)

This present research employed semi-structured interviews, enabling the formulation of a specific set of questions relating to the phenomena and events being studied. This
approach provided the researcher with a degree of freedom and opportunity to go beyond the set questions and to adapt them to suit important issues which emerged during the interviews. It also gave interviewees the freedom to answer the questions in their own manner. The interviewees were project managers and leaders of the selected ADP directorates and departmental units who had been involved in the implementation of the BEM. Some implementation team members were also selected for their specific insights into the implementation of BEM in ADP. In addition to taking extensive notes, the researcher planned to make audio recordings of the interviews, subject to permission being granted by the participants, but for cultural and personal reasons they refused to have their interviews recorded.

5.11.1 Number of interview participants

There are no guidelines identifying a particular number of interviews to be used to safeguard the accuracy and reliability of the research. Silverman (2005) states that it is understandable that there is no numerical standard for the number of participants in qualitative research, as the sample size is dependent on a variety of factors including the nature and type of the organisation or event being investigated, the time and financial resources of the researcher and the objectives of study. Bowen (2008) advises researchers to carry out as many interviews as possible until they feel that they have reached saturation in the data they have collected.

It was decided to conduct 25 interviews, representing about 20% of the implementation team, as there were 130 individuals in the ADP involved in the implementation of BEM. The selection focused on the managers and key experts amongst the implementation teams, so the sample size reflects their proportion within the implementation project processes. As indicated earlier, the selection process was based on purposive sampling and the participants were managers and members of implementation teams who had been directly involved in the implementation of BEM.

5.11.2 Interview analysis

Data analysis is seen as one of the most difficult stages in any case study strategy, but these difficulties can be minimised by developing a systematic strategy for analysing the data (Yin, 2009; Creswell, 2009). Silverman (2005) and Creswell (2009) argue that
organising and preparing the data, interview transcripts, scanned materials, field notes and other information are crucial prerequisites for data analysis in qualitative research. For this study the interviewer reviewed his notes after each session to ensure that they were legible and where half a jotted note was found he completed it while the interview was fresh in his mind. Saunders et al (2007) state that transcribing qualitative data helps to focus on the information and ensure the accuracy of the data, warning that this is a difficult and time-consuming process. Bryman and Bell (2007) indicate that listening closely and repeatedly to recorded interviews will ensure the accurate recording of data and will enable the researcher to extract the information which will lead to answers to the research questions. The refusal of participants to allow sound recording caused some concern for the present researcher about the quality of his notes and as to whether he had missed anything while noting interviewees’ earlier responses. To ensure that information was not missed, he was as careful as possible in his note taking and listening. Creswell (2009) emphasises that data must be transcribed and checked with care and in stages, which will help the researcher to design the roadmap for data analysis. He suggests that the researcher should thoroughly read and review all the data, the interviews and documents to identify the main findings and grasp the key themes and information relating to the research questions.

Bryman and Bell (2007) state that the coding of data ensures that the main themes that the researcher wants to find are covered. Creswell (2009) reiterates that coding ensures a systematic search for information relating to the research questions, providing categories for ideas, texts and segments, enabling the author to place relevant information in these categories. The data collected in the present study was repeatedly reviewed and colour coding was utilised to highlight developing themes and categories when found in the notes of more than one interview session. The categories identified were then reviewed to see if some could be merged and from this review specific themes within the text were identified. The coding process allowed descriptions of issues to be developed for the case study, relating to people, places, the organisation and the events in the research setting; thus, coding helped to generate a thematic framework in which to identify any relevant information and data relating to the themes (Creswell, 2009). Once the themes had been identified via categorisation, the researcher was able to undertake comparisons within the dataset and with the literature. After setting the
themes into tightly defined categories, he undertook a comparison between the respondent groups and the reports in the reviewed literature. This content analysis was the starting point of the discussion and led to a comparison between the interview and questionnaire results.

5.12 Questionnaire

To support the interviews and address the potential shortcoming of using only one research method (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003; Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007; Creswell, 2009) a questionnaire survey was conducted as an alternative research method to enable triangulation and cross confirmation of the phenomena.

The questionnaire, according to Saunders et al (2009), is a technique that uses structured written questions to assess individual perceptions and reactions on specific matters. When individuals complete a questionnaire on their own without the involvement of the researcher, this is referred to as a self-completion or self-administered questionnaire (Bryman and Bell, 2007; Saunders et al, 2009). Bryman and Bell (2007) and Cameron and Price (2009) suggest that the questionnaire is one of the key methods employed in business and management research. According to Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003), the researcher creates a form that participants complete. It may contain open-ended questions, which invite the respondents to express their own perceptions, or closed questions, where respondents select their preferred options from predetermined lists. It is recommended to use a mix of questioning styles but to ensure there is not an overload of data to analyse due to too many open-ended questions being used, particularly with a large sample; therefore most items should be of the closed type (Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007; Cameron and Price, 2009; Saunders et al, 2009). Saunders et al (2009) explain that in closed questioning the researcher provides a standardised set of questions which he or she is confident will be interpreted in the same manner by all potential participants. A small number of open questions in a self-administered questionnaire will give participants the opportunity to provide a rationale for their actions and additional insights which they believe are necessary for the researcher to understand their organisation (Cameron and Price, 2009). One of the main methods used for recording closed question responses is through the use of rating scales and in particular summated ratings scales, which are also known as Likert-like scales (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003).
The questionnaire developed for this study used predominately closed questions which required participants to respond on a Likert-like scale. The questionnaire aimed to explore and identify the key influential factors that participants perceived to be influential in the successful implementation of the BEM by the ADP. The use of these closed questions enabled the researcher to have access to a consistent dataset for comparison between variables and respondents or groups of participants (Bryman and Bell, 2007). To ensure that he had missed no factors, at the end of the questionnaire the researcher placed an open-ended question to enable additional responses and commentary to be gathered. Many researchers (Martínez-Lorente et al, 2004; Talavera, 2005; Oschman et al, 2006; Salaheldin, 2009; Yaacob, 2009; Cheung and To, 2010; Koh and Low, 2010; Kumar et al, 2011) have utilized self-administered questionnaires to investigate TQM implementation.

5.12.1 Questionnaire design
Saunders et al (2009) and Cameron and Price (2009) advise the researcher to develop a well designed questionnaire to ensure that the data collected is accurate and suitable for the study question, and to ensure the internal reliability of the research process by collecting the data in a consistent manner. The questionnaire response rate, according to Bryman and Bell (2007), is affected by the overall design, so it is necessary to ensure that the questionnaire is professional and easy to use (Easterby-Smith et al, 2002). Ease of use, according to Saunders et al (2009), includes ensuring that all the questions are understood in the manner intended by the researcher and that they address the research questions and objectives. Cameron and Price (2009) agree that the questionnaire should avoid ambiguity and collect the data in manner which assists the researcher to answer the study questions. Hussey and Hussey (1997) state that a well designed questionnaire will meet the research objectives by obtaining the information needed to complete the study in the optimum time and cost. The questionnaire in the present study was thus designed to investigate the phenomena of BEM implementation within the ADP and to discover the key factors influencing this process.

5.12.2 Questionnaire content
The key fact about the use of questionnaires, according to Saunders et al (2009), is that it provides a unique opportunity to gather individuals’ perceptions regarding a specific
subject, as it is difficult to return and collect additional information; anonymity also makes it impossible to identify individual respondents to seek clarification. Due to the limited access to the participants and the need to successfully engage with them, it is necessary to spend time and effort in planning and designing the questionnaire to meet the study requirements and objectives (Remenyi et al, 1998; Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Bryman and Bell, 2007; Cameron and Price, 2009; Saunders et al, 2009). Following this consensus on planning and preparation, the researcher spent a large amount of effort to carefully develop appropriately worded questionnaire items in non-jargonistic language in order to ensure that appropriate information was gathered to answer the research question. Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) advise engaging participants through the use of simple and familiar language so that they are not confused or alienated by the research process. Using the theoretical framework and knowledge base developed from the literature review and wider reading, themes and questions were selected for the questionnaire (Saunders et al, 2009). Many were taken or adapted from instruments described by authors including Belassi and Tukel (1996), Chrusciel and Field (2003), Martínez-Lorente et al (2004), Bauer et al (2005), Talavera (2005) and Abdullah and Fuong (2010). By using and adapting these instruments and approaches, the researcher created an environment where a comparison with previous research could be undertaken, thus extending the subject knowledge base while also providing replication to support previous studies. See appendix (1)

Both Jankowicz (2005) and Saunders et al (2009) classify information obtained from questionnaires into two groups: quantifiable facts and value perceptions. As a result, the questionnaire items were designed for each topic or theme so that there was one perception question followed by a question about what was actually happening within the organisation. This approach to questionnaire design was taken to enable comparison between the levels desired and observed by each participant for each factor that they believed affected the implementation of the BEM, such as the participation of top management in the implementation.

Other researchers have tended to include a demographic component in their questionnaires to ensure that they identified any independent variable affecting the study and that it did not significantly skew the results. It was found from the demographic part of the questionnaire in the present study that there were two distinct
groups more or less active in the BEM implementation process (see section 6.2.1), which resulted in participant and non-participant groups being identified. As a result of having clearly defined independent groups, additional statistical testing was undertaken and this included an independent samples t-test.

The questionnaire form began with a research briefing section that explained the study’s purpose, gave the researcher’s contact details, set out guidance on the ethical procedures and asked participants to confirm their consent. Before being asked to complete each section of the questionnaire, participants were given an initial completion briefing to ensure that they understood the circumstances and meaning of the questions in that section, along with written instructions about the appropriate way to complete Likert-like scales. To ensure consistency in the responses, the items were put in the same order for each theme. The first question asked for respondents’ perceptions or beliefs about the importance of the factor concerned for the successful implementation of TQM and the second asked for their observations of the application of the factor when the ADP implemented its BEM (reality). A total of eighteen themes or key influential factors were investigated using 45 question pairs (a total of 90 items).

The next section investigated the efficiency of BEM implementation in the ADP using four measures to gauge the participants’ views. Again, Likert-type scales were used, to maintain consistency throughout the questionnaire. At the very end of the questionnaire one open-ended question was asked, in order to engage the participants in identifying any further influencing factors which might have enhanced BEM implementation by the ADP.

5.12.3 Translating the questionnaire

The study was designed in English in accordance with advice gleaned from the literature review, to enable the University to participate in ensuring that ethical considerations were respected while ensuring continuity with the majority of the studies reported in the literature. As the official language of the UAE and the common language of the ADP is Arabic it was necessary to translate the instrument into that language. Care must be taken whenever a questionnaire is translated from one language to another to ensure that the intended meaning is retained, rather than attempting a direct word-for-word or lexicographical translation, which could create contextual miscomprehension.
due to different etymological and grammatical approaches within the languages concerned (Saunders et al, 2009). Therefore a bilingual (Arabic and English) subject expert was asked to produce the initial translation, which was submitted to a focus group of postgraduates who were also bilingual and aware of the subject area. The group was asked to comment on the clarity of the Arabic version and to identify any confusion or concern that members had with draft questionnaire items. Its recommendations resulted in amendments to the translation, which was then used in a pilot study.

5.12.4 Pre-testing the questionnaire

The importance of piloting or pre-testing the questionnaire is emphasised by a number of research methodology authors (Remenyi et al, 1998; Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Bryman and Bell, 2007; Cameron and Price, 2009; Creswell, 2009; Saunders et al, 2009). It is important for the researcher to arrange a critical review of the questionnaire by a small group of 3-5 potential participants from the study’s intended population (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). This evaluation not only ensures that the questions function well but also pre-tests the operation and processes involved in the administration of the questionnaire, ensuring that when it is implemented in the field it functions well and enables the researcher to collect the appropriate data. As part of the pre-test process, Saunders et al (2009) recommend that some initial statistical analysis is undertaken to ensure that the questions are providing the correct data to enable the use of the specific statistical test.

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2007) advise when piloting a questionnaire that it is important to assess the findings and act upon them. Pre-testing can be either formal or informal, according to Remenyi et al (1998); within the informal approach, the researcher can utilise colleagues, friends and other miscellaneous individuals they have access to, whereas a formal pilot is a small-scale replication of the main study.

An informal pilot study was undertaken in the present case: the questionnaire was distributed to bilingual PhD business management colleagues and some bilingual friends of the researcher within the ADP. As a result, some amendments were made to the structure and content of the questionnaire, including the merging of some items and
the addition of others. For example, a number of participants recommended that a fourth item be added to the implementation efficiency section.

5.12.5 Participant rating scales

Cameron and Price (2009) state that Likert scales were designed by the psychologist Rensis Likert in the 1930s to allow participants to express their attitudes quantitatively. Opinion data is often collected through the use of such rating scales (Saunders et al., 2009), a key feature being the use of odd numbered ranges (usually five or seven points) to provide a midpoint or neutral position (Cameron and Price, 2009). Scales larger than seven create conflict in participants by making decisions more difficult, while fewer than five points does not allow for a useful graduation of responses (ibid). The Likert-like scale should ask the respondents to rate how strongly they agree with each of a number of statements. Likert-like scales are widely used in the study of TQM implementation (Talavera, 2005; Yaacob, 2009; Abdullah and Fuong, 2010). A consistently ordered scale was used in the present questionnaire, with a range of five items. The order of the scale labelling was consistent throughout the instrument so that the participants developed familiarity with it, which created data integrity. The use of a fixed regular scale allowed the researcher to assign numbers to the response points, enabling data coding and improving data handling and statistical analysis (Remenyi et al., 1998; Saunders et al., 2009).

5.12.6 Questionnaire sampling

General convenience sampling was used for the questionnaire. With the assistance of the ADP Research Centre, the questionnaire was sent out to meetings where there would be enough representatives of the organisational population from whom participants could be recruited. The Research Centre handed out a total of three hundred questionnaires in batches of 50 at various organisational meetings and activities; sampling depended on who was present at each meeting. Remenyi et al (1998) explains that convenience sampling is undertaken when the most readily available individuals are accessed.

The sample size of 300 questionnaires was determined on the basis of the number of individuals within the ADP. With the assistance of the Research Centre it was
established that there were six Research Coordinators, each representing a general
directorate of the ADP; therefore 50 forms were distributed to each Coordinator, who
was asked to pass them on to potential respondents at directorate meetings. Saunders et
al (2009) suggest that the minimum sample size should be 30 and the Research Centre
advised that 50 would be a suitable maximum number of questionnaires to supply to
each Directorate Research Coordinator, as more would mean that they would not have
the opportunity to recruit sufficient research participants. Since the researcher was using
convenience sampling, this advice was heeded, especially as Ghauri and Grønhaug
(2005) refer to the difficulties of access, time and cost. The researcher believed that 50
questionnaires per directorate would allow the views of the members of each directorate
to be sampled in the most convenient manner.

5.12.7 Response rate

Of the 300 questionnaires which were distributed, 168 were returned to the researcher.
Four of these were excluded, three due to incompleion or missing sections and one
because the over-consistent pattern of responses indicated that the respondent had not
read the specific questions. The response rate for useable questionnaires was therefore
55.4%, using the formula for calculating total response rate proposed by Saunders et al
(2009), who state that the average response rate for the delivery and collection method
of distribution is between 30 and 50%. Thus, the 55.4% achieved must been seen as a
good response rate. The formula, as applied here, is as follows (Saunders et al 2009):

\[
Total\ response\ rate = \frac{total\ number\ of\ responses}{Total\ number\ in\ the\ sample - ineligible}
\]

\[
= \frac{164}{300-4} = \frac{164}{296} = 55.4\%
\]

5.12.8 Questionnaire analysis

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to gather demographic information
about the respondents and was used to create an overview of the participants and to
identify any significant independent variables such as organisational grouping which
might impact on the results. It was found that there were two distinct groups within the
sample population: those who had and had not participated in the implementation of the
BEM within the ADP. The demographic information was analysed using standard descriptive statistical approaches which included frequencies, means and standard deviation. The second section of the questionnaire addressed the study questions using items designed to enable the statistical analysis of the perceptions reported by the respondents. The statistical techniques used included measures of difference to assess the data type (parametric and nonparametric). As the data was found to be parametric, the following methods of statistical analysis were employed: repeated/paired-samples t-test, independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation (Pallant, 2010).

The paired-samples t-test was used to investigate the difference in perceptions of the respondents for each factor and the actual situation found within the organisation for each factor, while the independent t-test was conducted to compare the responses of the identified demographic groups of participants and non-participants for each factor. In order to examine the relationships between the factors (independent variables) and implementation efficiency (a dependent variable), Pearson’s correlation was used. As part of the analysis, the strengths of the relationships were computed and commented upon. Pearson’s correlation is widely utilised in research into the implementation of TQM (Das et al, 2008; Carrière and Bourque, 2009; Zu et al, 2010; Das et al, 2011).

5.13 Reliability and validity

Gomm (2000) identifies reliability and validity as two key terms in research. Validity, according to Gomm (2000), is akin to truth, while Fowler (2009) defines it as a psychological term which is used to describe the relationship between the answer in an experiment and some measurement of the true score. Validity can be described as indicating whether the question has measured what the study intended (Creswell, 2009). One requirement of validity is reliability, which according to Gomm (2000) is the ability of the study instrument to give the same results if applied a second or third time. Some authors, such as Saunders et al (2009), refer to reliability as the repeatability of the experiment or research process. Creswell (2009) extends validity to describe two components, internal and external validity. The latter is the ability of the researcher to draw correct deductions from the sample data and apply them to other settings, people and temporal contexts, while internal validity is the ability of the researcher to produce sound conclusions from the data collected within the study (ibid).
To ensure that the study was gathering data relevant to its focus and that the study question was addressed by a number of approaches, the researcher used mixed methods. The use of mixed methods, according to Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007), helps to create greater internal validity, as the researcher is well informed and conclusions are thus made on a sound understanding of the organisation. The mixed approach also provides external validity, as there are more than one setting, person and timeframe when the study question is asked. The literature review was used to develop the questionnaire and interview questions, which also supports the development of internal validity (Sekaran, 2003). Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009) argue that the use of literature to develop questionnaires within TQM implementation research enhances its content/internal validity. The use of a pilot study to test the initial questionnaire, according to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005), provides the researcher with a test of its content and face validity, while Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003), Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005), Easterby-Smith et al (2008) and Saunders et al (2009) argue that it establishes content or internal validity.

Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009) explain that the reliability of a questionnaire is its ability to generate consistent results. It is common in business research, according Saunders et al (2009), to use the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient to test statistically the overall reliability of the measurement scale for each item. This consistency is often referred to as internal reliability, showing that all items are actually measuring the same thing. The higher the value of Cronbach’s alpha, the more consistent the scores are, with values above 75% normally being considered strongly consistent (Nunnally, 1978). To test this consistency, Cronbach’s alpha values were determined for the overall average of items under the ‘perception’ and ‘actual’ categories for each factor. The results are discussed in section 6.1.1 of the next chapter.

5.14 Ethical considerations

Cameron and Price (2009), Creswell (2009) and Saunders et al (2009) all highlight the need to address ethical considerations when undertaking research, especially when human participants are involved in the data collection process. This study utilised briefing sheets and consent forms for the questionnaire and interview participants. Potential participants were briefed on their rights to refuse to participate and to
withdraw at any stage, along with the purpose of the study. It was clearly stated that the study was for academic purposes only and that participants’ information would be anonymized to protect them. Interviewees were asked about the use of recording devices during interviews and all asked for such devices not to be used. This is one way in which the researcher demonstrated his ethical approach and respect for individual participants’ wishes.

5.15 Chapter summary

This chapter has reviewed the methodological issues relevant to the themes of this study. In a search for an appropriate research methodology, the pragmatic paradigm was identified and appropriate research approaches and methods were then selected. The use of mixed methods was identified as appropriate and a justification developed for each method. The use of a range of mixed methods to investigate and provide a great deal of detail about one organisation, the ADP, makes it fitting to call this a case study. In using these mixed methods to identify the phases of BEM implementation within the ADP and the factors influencing it, it was concluded that a triangulation approach would best serve the research aim. The advantages of these various approaches have been investigated and discussed in this chapter, which has also reviewed a large number of recommendations in relation to conducting interviews, collecting data from documents, presenting the data and other relevant information. These recommendations and guidelines have enabled the researcher to effectively pursue the chosen research methods and to arrive at coherent answers to the research questions. The validity and reliability of the research process was also discussed, as were the methods of statistical analysis undertaken to assess the reliability. As part of the research methodology this chapter has also discussed the ethical procedures followed to protect potential participants and allow them to give informed consent.

The next chapter begins consideration of the research results by presenting a statistical analysis of the questionnaire responses.
Chapter Six: Quantitative Analysis

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and analyses the data generated by a questionnaire administered to address the aim and objectives of the current study. The questionnaire first explored some general demographic variables, before turning to the implementation of a BEM by the ADP. In this second main section, participants were asked to respond to each item twice, regarding how the factor concerned was perceived and its actual implementation. Eighteen key influential factors developed from the literature review were addressed by the questionnaire items (reproduced in Appendix 1) and responses in respect of each of these factors were averaged under the perception and actual categories. This chapter first presents the data using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, average or mean) and thereafter inferential statistics are used to determine whether there are significant differences between the factors when comparing answers under the perception and actual categories. The analysis also differentiates between the answers of participants and non-participants in the ADP’s BEM implementation process, as well as correlating the efficiency of BEM implementation with the responses in the actual category.

The analysis falls into two main parts, the first of which examines each questionnaire item under the perception and actual categories. Responses were given on a 5-point Likert-like scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree) and the analysis concerns the percentage frequency of each answer along with its mean score and standard deviation (SD). The second part examines inferential statistics, considering differences and correlation testing. Inferential statistics can be used to provide conclusions beyond the current sample (generalisation). The statistical tools used in part included the paired-samples t-test, the independent t-test and Pearson’s correlation.

6.1.1 Reliability of items

Before commencing the descriptive analysis of the data it is essential to examine the consistency of the answers between the items and/or questions. To do this, the value of Cronbach’s alpha was determined for the overall average of items under the perception
and actual categories for each factor, as explained in section 5.13 of the methodology chapter. The 18 key influential factors under the perception category generated an alpha level of 0.799 (almost 80% consistency), while for the actual category the consistency was much higher, resulting in an alpha value of 0.919 (91% consistency). As values above 75% are normally considered strongly consistent (Nunnally, 1978), it can be concluded that the items were consistent with each other and were measuring the same thing.

6.2 Descriptive statistics

6.2.1 General characteristics of respondents

The first section of the questionnaire yielded demographic information about the participants with respect to the following characteristics: job category, seniority rank, academic qualifications, job position, length of service and the individual’s participation in BEM implementation. The information obtained in this section is presented in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1: Participants’ characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant and below</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above lieutenant</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No military rank</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic qualifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of department</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of section</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of branch</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in BEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Job category

The questionnaire targeted all job categories in the ADP, both police officers and civilians doing ADP administration work. Table 6-1 shows that 115 respondents (70.1% of the total sample) were police officers, while 49 (29.9%) were civilians.

6.2.3 Seniority rank

Table 6-1 shows that 66 of the participants (40.2%) held the rank of lieutenant or below and that 67 (40.9%) were ranked above lieutenant. A further 31 participants held no military rank, being external experts, civilians or consultants.

6.2.4 Academic qualifications

As for education level, the majority of participants (79; 48.2%) held bachelor degrees, 20 (12.2%) held masters degrees and 65 (39.6%) had only a secondary school certificate. This shows that more than 60% of the sample were well educated, indicating that the ADP had invested heavily to improve the qualification levels and skills of its employees.

6.2.5 Job position

In term of job responsibilities, Table 6-1 shows that 6 participants (3.7%) were departmental managers in the ADP, while section and branch managers accounted respectively for 10.4% and 28.0% of the sample. The remaining 57.9% had non-managerial posts.

6.2.6 Length of service

The next question was about respondents’ length of service with the organisation. Table 6.1 shows that 24% had more than 15 years service in the ADP, 20.7% had between 10 and 15 years, 32.9% between 5 and 10 years and 22.0% had less than 5 years service in the ADP. In general, these results indicate that the majority of the sample had a reasonable length of work experience which would be reflected in their understanding of the ADP’s situation in relation to its BEM.

6.3 Participation in BEM implementation

The next questionnaire item asked participants whether they had participated in the implementation of the ADP’s BEM. Table 6-1 shows that two-thirds of them (110;
67%) had done so, whereas only 54 had not. This demonstrates that the sample was likely to provide sufficient data about the implementation by the ADP of its BEM, while also indicating how non-participants perceived this process.

6.4 Frequencies

This section presents statistical findings calculated for each key influential factor. The mean and standard deviation were calculated for the responses to each question on the perception and reality of each factor in order to identify the extent of any difference between participants’ perceptions of what were important factors for the successful implementation of the BEM by the ADP and the reality of these factors during implementation. Each of the factors listed below is assessed in terms of responses on a Likert-like scale as follows: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree.

6.4.1 Top management commitment

The literature indicates that top management support and commitment constitutes a key influential factor in the implementation of TQM (Mosadegh-Rad, 2005; Tarí, 2006b; Yousef, 2006; Yaacob, 2009; Kumar et al, 2011). The present study investigated both the perception and the actual influence of top management commitment. As can be seen in Table 6.2, respondents rated this factor highly, regarding both its perception and its actual implementation within the ADP.

Table 6-2: Descriptive statistics on top management commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 90% of respondents (N=164) agreed or strongly agreed with the perception that top management commitment was an important factor in the success of the ADP’s BEM implementation, in response to all three statements: (Q1) Top management participates in the implementation of BEM, (Q2) Top management allocates the resources needed, (Q3) Top management leads the implementation of BEM. However, these perceptions
were not matched by the actual implementation of this factor in the ADP, hence providing different mean scores on two questions (Q1 and Q3).

6.4.2 Setting a shared long-term vision

Shared long-term vision is seen as one of the key influential factors for successful implementation of a BEM (River and Bae, 1999; Nwabueze, 2001; Mosadegh-Rad, 2005; Das et al, 2011); therefore it was examined in two statements (Q4 and Q5) in order to investigate respondents’ perceptions and the actual implementation of this factor during the ADP’s implementation of the BEM. Table 6-3 shows that long-term vision was perceived as a highly important factor, while being only moderately adopted during the ADP’s actual BEM implementation.

Table 6-3: Descriptive statistics for setting a shared long-term vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3 presents the responses to two items concerning long-term vision: Q4 (clear and adequate vision for implementing BEM) and Q5 (communicating the vision of implementing BEM throughout ADP). It shows that nearly 95% of respondents (N=164) believed that long-term vision was important, giving a mean value of 4.3. However, in the actual category the mean value was only 3.2, due to a large percentage who were neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed that there actually existed a clear vision for the adoption of the BEM and that it was communicated throughout the ADP. This is clearly portrayed by comparing the SDs of the perception and actual categories for these two items.

6.4.3 Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM

Understanding the BEM and its purpose is considered to be one of the key influential factors for successful implementation of BEM by organisations (Kanji et al, 1999; Huq and Martin, 2001; Mosadegh-Rad, 2006; Yaacob, 2009). Table 6-4 reports the responses to a group of three statements that examined the respondents’ attitudes to the
perceived importance of this factor and to the extent that it was followed in reality in the ADP context.

Table 6-4: Descriptive statistics for understanding the use and purpose of the BEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.6 - 6.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.6 - 5.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-4 reveals that responses to all statements regarding perception had a mean values over 4 (4.2, 4.5 and 4.4). More than 90% of respondents indicated that understanding the use and purpose of the BEM was an essential factor in order to achieve effective implementation in the ADP, while only 0.6% strongly disagreed with items Q6 and Q8. However, it appears that there was disagreement between reality and perception reflected in the respondents’ belief that there was a lack of understanding of the use of the BEM in the ADP; hence it can be seen that in response to Q6 and Q8 under the ‘actual’ condition, participants scored relatively highly on neutral, disagree and strongly disagree, although on Q7 there was more agreement than disagreement.

6.4.4 Stimulating a change culture

Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall (2000), Huq and Martin (2001), Oschman et al (2006) and Smith (2011) argue that to embed a BEM within an organisation it is necessary to develop or stimulate the organisational culture to facilitate the change process of implementation. Table 6-5 below shows respondents’ attitudes to the perceived importance of stimulating an organisational culture for change and to its actual existence in the ADP, measured by responses to two statements.

Table 6-5: Descriptive statistics for stimulating a change culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.6 - 5.5</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>- 11</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to this fourth factor had high mean values for perception (more than 4.3 and 4.4), as more than 93% in the case of Q9 and 89% in Q10 indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that stimulating an organisational culture for change was necessary for the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM. However, results in the actual category did not match those for perceptions, the mean scores being 3.9 and 3.1. There were many neutral, disagree and strongly disagree responses to Q10 (more than 65%), although this was less true for Q9 (about 32%). Nevertheless, the mismatch between reality and perception was statistically insignificant, primarily due to the small differences between the mean scores in the actual and perception categories.

6.4.5 Establishing an excellence steering committee

Setting up an excellence steering committee and the coordination of implementation teams or groups are necessary for the implementation of a BEM (Thiagarajan and Zairi, 1997; Baidoun and Zairi, 2003; Jha and Joshi, 2007; Smith, 2011). Three statements were grouped in the questionnaire in order to investigate respondents’ views of this factor during the implementation of the ADP’s BEM. Table 6-6 reports the scores, means and SDs regarding the perception and actual adoption of this factor during BEM implementation.

Table 6-6: Descriptive statistics for establishing an excellence steering committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-6 shows that more than 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that establishing a quality steering and co-ordination group was an important factor in the effective implementation of the ADP’s BEM, with a mean score above 4.2. On the other hand, reality did not appear to match this perception, as Q11 and Q12 had lower mean scores in the actual category. However, the mean score for Q13 in the actual category was above 4, while most of the Q11 and Q12 scores in the actual category were around the neutral mark (3).
6.4.6 Implementation plan

The preparation and realisation of an implementation plan is considered another key influential factor in BEM implementation (Hillman, 1994; Tarí, 2006b; Abdullah, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). Table 6-7 lists responses to three statements designed to measure respondents’ views of this factor in the context of the ADP’s BEM implementation.

Table 6-7: Descriptive statistics for the implementation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-7 shows that there was over 94% agreement that the implementation plan was essential for the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM, with a mean score around 4.4. Once again, the respondents’ assessment of the actual situation regarding this factor resulted in lower scores than for the perception category; more neutral scores were recorded for Q14 and Q16, but there was more widespread agreement on Q15.

6.4.7 Supportive organisational structure

A number of authors have found a supportive organisational structure to be a key influential factor in the implementation of a BEM (Üstüner et al, 2004; Oschman et al, 2006; Smith, 2011). Two statements were presented to investigate this factor in the context of the ADP and the resulting responses are summarised in Table 6-8.

Table 6-8: Descriptive statistics for supportive organisational structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-8 shows that over 95% of respondents perceived that a supportive organisational structure was an important factor in the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM; the mean score on these two items was over 4.3 and only 1.8% of respondents indicated disagreement with the importance of this factor. In the actual category, there was 75% agreement on Q17 and nearly 60% on Q18, while scores were higher for the neutral option in comparison with those for respondents’ perceptions, resulting in lower mean scores in the actual than the perception category.

6.4.8 Developing internal capabilities

To ensure the successful implementation of a BEM, according to Pyo (2000), Ghobadian and Gallear (2001) and Cagnazzo et al (2010), it is important to develop the internal capabilities of the organisation, as this is another key influential factor. It was examined by three questionnaire statements, the responses being summarised in Table 6-9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 6-9 show that the majority of respondents (over 95% for Q19 and Q21, and over 83% for Q20) agreed or strongly agreed that the development of internal capabilities was important to the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM. Scores in the actual category were higher for the neutral option than in the perception category, while there was less agreement, with the result that the mean scores were lower.

6.4.9 Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process

Aligning the use of the BEM with the strategic planning process is seen as another key influential factor for the successful embedding of the BEM within an organisation (Nwabueze, 2001; Mosadegh-Rad, 2005; Breja et al, 2011). Table 6-10 summarises the
responses to three items assessing the level of perceived importance and actual implementation of this factor.

**Table 6-10: Descriptive Statistics for aligning the BEM with strategic planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that there was no significant difference in scores between the perception and actual categories in response to Q23, where the majority agreed on the importance of the allocation of strategic resources during BEM implementation and the actual level of allocation of these resources in the ADP, represented by mean scores of 4.33 and 4.26 respectively. The ‘actual’ scores across the three questions were lower than those for perceptions; there were more neutral responses to Q22 and Q24, although not to Q23. The result was that the overall mean score was lower in the actual category for this group of items.

**6.4.10 Effective communication**

Another key influential factor for effective implementation of BEM in an organisation is effective communication during the implementation of BEM (Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Tarí, 2006a; Smith, 2011). This factor was examined by two questionnaire items, Q25 and Q26, the results being displayed in Table 6-11.

**Table 6-11: Descriptive statistics for effective communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percepción</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-11 shows large differences between the perception and actual categories in the responses regarding effective communication during implementation. In response to
Q25, for example, in the perception category over 98% agreed with the importance of communicating the message of using the model throughout ADP prior to the implementation process, with a mean score of 4.4, while in the actual category the mean was only 3.3.

### 6.4.11 Aligning BEM with organisational processes

The alignment of the BEM with organisational processes and daily workflow activities is also considered to be a key influential factor in effective BEM implementation (River and Bae, 1999; Nwabueze, 2001; Asif et al, 2009a; Hung et al, 2009). Three statements were grouped together in order to investigate how respondents perceived the importance of this factor and the extent to which it was applied in practice in the ADP. Table 6-12 presents the data regarding this factor in the perception and actual categories.

#### Table 6-12: Descriptive statistics for aligning BEM with organisational processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 32.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 31.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-12 shows for the first time mean scores for perception below 4, mainly due to the existence of a relatively large percentage of neutral and disagreeing responses. The mean values in the actual category for all items were correspondingly low, below 3, maintaining the usual clear difference between the two categories. Moreover, the scores in the actual category reveal a much smaller percentage of participants (below 18%) who agreed that the BEM was aligned with the ADP’s processes. This finding tallies with the fact that concepts of organisational process and process management were new to the ADP and this unfamiliarity is reflected in the relatively large percentage of respondents being neutral in the actual category.

### 6.4.12 Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation

The development of a recognition and reward system has been identified as another key influential factor in the successful implementation of a BEM (Al-Zamany et al, 2002; Ahmed et al, 2003; Baidoun and Zairi, 2003; Wahid and Corner, 2009; Das et al, 2011).
Table 6-13 reports the data obtained in response to two questionnaire items exploring this factor.

**Table 6-13: Descriptive statistics for developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>- 4.3 45.7</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>- 1.2 3.1</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-13 indicates that in respect of their perceptions, over 95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with both statements (Q30 and Q31) concerning recognition guidelines and employee motivation, delivering a mean value of 4.4 for both questions. In the actual category, responses to Q30 indicate that only 36% agreed that the ADP had developed recognition guidelines for the implementation of its BEM and aligned it with the reward system, while in response to Q31 in the actual category, only 45% agreed that the recognition guidelines had helped employees’ motivation. Because of these differences between actual and perceived importance, the mean scores in the actual category were lower, but there was no statistically significant difference between the two categories.

**6.4.13 Providing sufficient training**

The provision of sufficient training about the BEM is seen as a key influential factor in the successful implementation of BEM by Osseo-Asare and Longbottom (2002), Baidoun and Zairi (2003) and Fernandez and Rainey (2006). Results regarding this factor are displayed in Table 6-14.

**Table 6-14: Descriptive Statistics for providing sufficient training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>- 1.2 3.1</td>
<td>46.3 49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>- 1.2 4.3</td>
<td>45.7 48.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-14 shows that about 95% of respondents perceived the importance of adequate training relating to BEM and its concepts being provided by the ADP, producing mean values of around 4.5. In actuality, around 45 to 50% of respondents agreed in response to Q32 and Q33 that the ADP provided sufficient training, producing mean values of around 3.5 and indicating that in reality adequate training had not been provided in a systematic manner within the ADP. Moreover, in terms of the actual category, well over one third of the respondents remained neutral in relation to adequate training.

6.4.14 Employee involvement

Employee involvement in BEM implementation is considered by some authors (Talavera, 2005; Yousef, 2006; Cheung and To, 2010) to be a key influential factor in successful implementation. The questionnaire results for this factor are shown in Table 6-15.

Table 6-15: Descriptive statistics for employee involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-15 reveals the existence of a perception in over 90% of respondents to the two relevant items (Q34 and Q35) that employee involvement was important in the implementation of the ADP’s BEM, producing mean value of 4.4. In contrast, only about 25% of respondent agreed that employees were actually involved during the implementation of BEM, while around half of respondents remained neutral regarding actual employee involvement, either because of a lack of information on the implementation of BEM or because they were unsure about BEM implementation within the ADP.

6.4.15 Employee empowerment

Employee empowerment is seen as another key influential factor in the implementation of a BEM, as a way to increase effective employee participation and buy-in to the BEM
culture that the organisation is developing (Talavera, 2005; Varkey and Antonio, 2010; Kumar et al, 2011). Questionnaire results are listed in Table 6-16 for this factor.

**Table 6-16: Descriptive statistics for employee empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q36</th>
<th>Q37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>0.6 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>0.6 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 6-16 indicate that around 90% of respondents agreed that employee empowerment was important during the ADP’s implementation of its BEM, producing a mean value of 4.4. In contrast, only around 30% agreed that employees were actually empowered during the implementation of BEM, giving mean values of 3.7 (Q36) and 2.9 (Q37). The main reason for these low mean values in the actual category for this factor is that around half of respondents were neutral concerning actual employee empowerment. Although there was a large mathematical difference in the mean values between the actual and perception categories for Q37, there was no statistically significant difference between them.

### 6.4.16 Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system

According to Chin and Pun (2002), Tarí (2006b) and Davies (2008), aligning BEM use to the organisation’s performance measurement system is a key influential factor in the successful implementation of the BEM. Table 6-17 presents the questionnaire results for this factor.

**Table 6-17: Descriptive statistics for aligning BEM with the performance measurement system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q38</th>
<th>Q39</th>
<th>Q40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>0.6 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>7.3 7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>- 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In terms of mean values and distribution patterns, the table indicates very little difference between the actual and perception categories for Q38, on defining proper measures of BEM implementation of in the ADP, and for Q40, on creating employee awareness about how the progress of implementation was measured. By contrast, there was a difference in mean scores between the actual and perception categories in relation to Q39, on aligning BEM use with the measurement system, where only 5% of respondents agreed that the ADP actually applied this alignment, while over 65% perceived it to be an important factor. This difference in the mean values is statistically significant.

6.4.17 Aligning BEM with information systems

In the modern workplace, the use of information technology is an essential part of the workflow. The aligning of the organisation’s BEM with its information systems is thus seen as another key influential factor in successful BEM implementation (Rivers and Bae, 1999; Ahmed et al, 2003; Koh and Low, 2010). Two items tested this factor and the results are given in Table 6-18.

Table 6-18: Descriptive statistics for aligning BEM with information systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the perception category, Table 6-18 shows nearly 98% agreement on the importance of alignment with information systems (Q41) and the availability of information during BEM implementation by the ADP (Q42), producing mean values above 4.4. However, responses to Q41 in the actual category suggest that only 4.3% agreed that alignment had occurred, with 54% being neutral, giving a mean value of 2.26, which is statistically significantly different from the perception scores. In relation to Q42, there was a large mathematical difference in mean values between the categories, but this was not found to be statistically significant when tested.
6.4.18 Developing an action plan

A final key influential factor in the successful implementation of BEMs within organisations, identified by Van der Wiele and Brown (1999), Tarí (2006a) and López-Fresno (2010), is the development of an action plan. This factor was examined by three items, Q43-45, results for which are given in Table 6-19.

Table 6-19: Descriptive statistics for developing an action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as Table 6-19 shows, scores in the perception category were higher than those in the actual category. In response to Q43, the percentages for agreement and strong agreement combined in the two categories were over 70% and 30% respectively; in the actual category by far the largest score was for the neutral option. The contrast was even more marked in the case of Q44, where the level of agreement in the actual category was only 15%, but responses to Q45, by contrast, were similar across the two categories, resulting in comparable mean scores.

6.5 Overall scores for each key influential factor

Table 6-20 presents the overall scores for each of the key influential factors under the perception and actual categories. It lists the minimum, maximum and mean scores with standard deviations for each of the two categories, within which the factors are also ranked by mean score.

It can be seen that in the perception category, the highest ranked factor was “developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation”, followed by “providing sufficient training” and “employee empowerment” in second and third places. It should be noted here that the mean score for these three factors was almost identical and that there was close agreement amongst them. The lowest ranked factors were “aligning BEM with the performance measurement system”, “aligning BEM with the strategic planning process” and “aligning BEM with organisational processes”.
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Under the actual category, the results differed in two ways: the overall mean scores were smaller than in the perception category and the rankings were somewhat different.

The highest ranked factor was “supportive organisational structure”, followed by “developing an action plan” and “top management commitment”. The lowest ranked factor was “aligning BEM with the strategic planning process”, followed by “aligning BEM with information systems” and “aligning BEM with organisational processes”. It should be noted that this last factor was also ranked last in the perception category, suggesting that it was seen as the least important of the key influential factors.

Table 6-20: Descriptive statistics for all 18 key influential factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Influential factors</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management commitment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2988</td>
<td>41875</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6463</td>
<td>.85857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting a shared long-term vision</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3537</td>
<td>48907</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2652</td>
<td>1.13697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.4106</td>
<td>47943</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5955</td>
<td>.92659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating a change culture</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.3598</td>
<td>59018</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.5488</td>
<td>1.14744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up an excellence committee</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3110</td>
<td>47015</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5549</td>
<td>.82089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4167</td>
<td>45578</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6423</td>
<td>.81780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive organisational structure</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3811</td>
<td>46951</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0579</td>
<td>7.3975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing internal capabilities</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3496</td>
<td>46236</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3821</td>
<td>.90837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9776</td>
<td>68196</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0467</td>
<td>.65103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4512</td>
<td>51128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3415</td>
<td>.96687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with organisational processes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7846</td>
<td>90875</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7114</td>
<td>.87729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4695</td>
<td>49752</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4756</td>
<td>.98735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing sufficient training</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4573</td>
<td>50580</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4268</td>
<td>1.08989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4024</td>
<td>62875</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0610</td>
<td>1.27238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4543</td>
<td>56159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2470</td>
<td>1.09025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2581</td>
<td>51339</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4431</td>
<td>.76664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with information systems</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3537</td>
<td>43797</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0081</td>
<td>.84759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an action plan</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3598</td>
<td>54421</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7409</td>
<td>.68389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Efficiency of BEM Implementation

The efficiency of the BEM implementation was tested using four questions with responses on a 5-point Likert-like scale, ranging from very low agreement to very high agreement. From the results listed in Table 6-21 it can be seen that the question “To what extent do you think that the implementation of the BEM within the Abu Dhabi Police was successful?” generated the highest mean of agreement at 4.32. The individual scores indicate that BEM implementation by the ADP was seen as very highly successful by over 60% of respondents, while a further 14.6% viewed the implementation as a highly successful activity. Secondly, the statement “The Abu Dhabi Police gained the ‘expected return’ from the implementation of its BEM” produced a mean of 3.95; 44.5% of respondents indicated very high agreement and 13.4% indicated high agreement with this item. Thirdly, the statement that the implementation of a BEM had allowed some individuals within the Abu Dhabi Police to advance themselves received moderate agreement, with a mean of 3.40; 50% of participants expressed a medium level of agreement, followed by 27.4% who expressed very high agreement. The question “How easy was the implementation of the BEM in the Abu Dhabi Police?” produced the lowest score, with 59.8% of respondents expressing a medium level of agreement that it was easy, followed by 20.7% who expressed very high agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you think that the implementation of the BEM within the Abu Dhabi Police was successful?</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How easy was the implementation of the BEM in the Abu Dhabi Police?</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Abu Dhabi Police gained the ‘expected return’ from the implementation of its BEM</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of the BEM has allowed some individuals within the Abu Dhabi Police to advance themselves.</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 Inferential statistics

This section is concerned with identifying differences between specific variables and finding whether some variables are correlated with each other. The results can be used to make generalisation from the study data to the general population.

6.7.1 Measures of differences

Measures of differences were analysed to discover whether there were any differences between the responses in the perception and the actual categories, and whether BEM participants had different scores from non-participants in BEM implementation. Before discussing these tests, it should be noted that the inferential tests are concerned with the data and its distribution. Generally, there are two types of statistical test: parametric and non-parametric. If the data is parametric, then a parametric test should be used; if not, then a non-parametric test should be used (Field, 2009; Pallant, 2010). The data is considered parametric if it has a normal distribution and can be expressed using an interval scale. An examination of the main variables and factors in the current study led to the assumption that the data was of an interval type and based on frequency testing, using histograms. Most of the variables could be assumed to be normally distributed; therefore parametric testing for differences was conducted.

6.7.2 Perception vs. actual categories of key influential factors

Given that this study assumed that there were likely to be significant differences between perceptions of importance and of the reality of implementation, it is essential to determine the significance of the potential differences. Therefore, a repeated/paired-samples t-test was conducted to examine the differences between responses in the actual and perception categories for each factor. This was done because all respondents answered each question under each category, making a repeated measures test appropriate (Pallant, 2010; Kumar et al, 2011). When conducting this statistical test it is essential to examine the following outcomes.

The alpha level is often used to determine the significance of the differences, it being generally assumed that any value below alpha=0.05 leads to a significant outcome (Kumar et al., 2011). This indicates a 5% probability of the results arising by chance – and 5% is the maximum acceptable value.
The t-value explains the difference between two numerical values, based on which the alpha level is determined (Pallant, 2010).

Overall, the paired-samples t-test revealed significant differences between the respondents’ perceptions of the importance of each key influential factor and their views of its actual application. Perceptions of importance for all factors scored significantly higher means than those in the actual category. It can be concluded that the application of most factors in the implementation of the ADP’s BEM was rated lower than respondents’ expectations of how they should be perceived. The significance level of the results was determined by large t-values when comparing the actual category and the perceptions of respondents for each factor. The significance level was below 5% in all cases, which reflects a very low probability of the results being caused by chance. The significance scores, the means and the t-values for each pair are shown in Table 6-2, which lists the mean, frequency number and standard deviation for each key influential factor under the perception and actual categories.
### Table 6-22: Descriptive statistical result for each key influential factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Influential Factors</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management commitment</td>
<td>4.2988</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.41875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting a shared long-term vision</td>
<td>4.3537</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.48907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM</td>
<td>4.4106</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.47943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating a change culture</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up an excellence committee</td>
<td>4.3110</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.47015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
<td>4.4167</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.45578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive organisational structure</td>
<td>4.3811</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.46951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing internal capabilities</td>
<td>4.3496</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.46236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process</td>
<td>3.9776</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.68196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>4.4512</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.51128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with organisational processes</td>
<td>3.7846</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.90875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation</td>
<td>4.4695</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.49752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing sufficient training</td>
<td>4.4573</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.50580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement</td>
<td>4.4024</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.62875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment</td>
<td>4.4543</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.56159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system</td>
<td>4.2581</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.51339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with information systems</td>
<td>4.3537</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.43797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an action plan</td>
<td>4.3598</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.54421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.8 Participants vs. non-participants in ADP’s BEM implementation

To test the difference between participants and non-participants in the implementation of the BEM by the ADP, an independent samples t-test was conducted. This measures the difference between two independent groups using the same variable (Pallant, 2010). Similarly to the repeated measures t-test, it also relies on the alpha level to determine the significance of the results.

This section of the analysis reports only those factors that showed significant differences between participants and non-participants, while all of the results are listed in Table 6-23.
Table 6-23: Independent samples t-test for differences between scores of participants and non-participants in the ADP’s BEM implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-participants</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Influential Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management commitment</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3212</td>
<td>.42098</td>
<td>4.2531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.8606</td>
<td>.70441</td>
<td>3.2099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting a shared long-term vision</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3909</td>
<td>.49484</td>
<td>4.2778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.3091</td>
<td>1.16914</td>
<td>3.1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4273</td>
<td>.51902</td>
<td>4.3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.7727</td>
<td>.83615</td>
<td>3.2346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating a change culture</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3909</td>
<td>.62583</td>
<td>4.2963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.7227</td>
<td>1.07641</td>
<td>3.1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing an excellence steering committee</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>.46706</td>
<td>4.2654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.6939</td>
<td>.80154</td>
<td>3.2716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4515</td>
<td>.46396</td>
<td>4.3457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.8515</td>
<td>.74957</td>
<td>3.2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting organisational structure</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4409</td>
<td>.46300</td>
<td>4.2593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>4.1591</td>
<td>.75094</td>
<td>3.8519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing internal capabilities</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3970</td>
<td>.48314</td>
<td>4.2531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.5909</td>
<td>.76714</td>
<td>2.9568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4515</td>
<td>.68318</td>
<td>4.1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.1333</td>
<td>.62598</td>
<td>2.8704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4955</td>
<td>.49072</td>
<td>4.3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.5045</td>
<td>.86866</td>
<td>3.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with organisational processes</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>3.6515</td>
<td>.93345</td>
<td>4.0556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2.7667</td>
<td>.88197</td>
<td>2.5988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.5182</td>
<td>.49737</td>
<td>4.3704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.6273</td>
<td>.94684</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing sufficient training</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4909</td>
<td>.50675</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.6500</td>
<td>1.02838</td>
<td>2.9722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.4773</td>
<td>.59964</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.1591</td>
<td>1.22274</td>
<td>2.8611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.5136</td>
<td>.54377</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.3227</td>
<td>1.09332</td>
<td>3.0926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.2909</td>
<td>.48653</td>
<td>4.1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.5485</td>
<td>.74957</td>
<td>3.2284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM with information systems</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3727</td>
<td>.43714</td>
<td>4.3148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.1394</td>
<td>.84035</td>
<td>2.7407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an action plan</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.3727</td>
<td>.56029</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3.7864</td>
<td>.69222</td>
<td>3.6481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Top management commitment* (actual): In the ‘actual’ rating of this factor, BEM participants had significantly higher mean scores than non-participants, $t_{(163)}=4.36$, $p<0.001$. 
Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM (actual): Again, BEM participants had significantly higher mean scores than non-participants, $t_{(163)}=3.62$, $p<0.001$.

Stimulating a change culture (actual): significant differences were indicated by higher scores for participants than non-participants, $t_{(163)}=2.83$, $p<0.01$.

Establishing an excellence steering committee (actual): Significant differences were found in favour of participants in BEM implementation, $t_{(163)}=3.18$, $p<0.01$.

Implementation plan (actual): A significantly higher mean was found for participants than for non-participants, $t_{(163)}=5.01$, $p<0.001$.

Supportive organisational structure (perception & actual): In the perception category, the significant difference was in favour of the participants, $t_{(163)}=2.36$, $p<0.05$; the same trend was found in the actual category, where non-participants scored significantly less, $t_{(163)}=2.54$, $p<0.05$.

Developing internal capabilities (actual): BEM participants had significantly higher mean scores when considering the actual development of internal capabilities, $t_{(163)}=4.02$, $p<0.001$.

Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process (perception & actual): In perception, non-participants scored significantly higher means than participants, $t_{(163)}=2.27$, $p<0.05$. However, the opposite was true of the ‘actual’ scores for the same factor, $t_{(163)}=2.46$, $p<0.05$.

Effective communication (actual): Participants in BEM implementation had significantly higher mean scores than non-participants, $t_{(163)}=3.16$, $p<0.01$.

Aligning the of BEM with organisational processes (perception): Non-participants had higher scores on perceptions of this factor than participants did, $t_{(163)}=2.87$, $p<0.01$.

Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation (actual): In the actual category, participants had significantly higher mean scores on this factor than did non-participants, $t_{(163)}=2.86$, $p<0.01$.

Providing sufficient training (actual): Participants again had significantly higher scores than non-participants, $t_{(163)}=3.90$, $p<0.001$. 
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Employee involvement (perception): Participants had significantly higher mean scores on their perceptions of the importance of employees’ involvement, $t_{(163)}=2.20$, $p<0.05$.

Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system (actual): Similarly, participants had higher mean scores than non-participants in the actual category on this factor, $t_{(163)}=2.55$, $p<0.05$.

Aligning BEM with information systems (actual): Finally, a significant difference was found in favour of participants in the actual category for this factor, $t_{(163)}=2.89$, $p<0.01$.

6.9 BEM implementation efficiency: participants vs non-participants

An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between BEM participants and non-participants when considering the overall scores for implementation efficiency. The results clearly revealed a significant difference between the groups: the participants scored a higher mean of 3.80, compared to 3.49 for the non-participants and the t-value was found to be significant at $t_{(162)}=2.44$, $p<0.05$. See Table 6-24.

Table 6-24: BEM Implementation efficiency: participants vs non-participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEM implementation efficiency measures</th>
<th>Participation in BEM implementation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.8045</td>
<td>.71307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.4954</td>
<td>.11570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.10 Measures of correlation: Pearson’s correlation coefficient

6.10.1 Overall correlation between the actual category for key influential factors and BEM implementation efficiency

The scores in the actual category for each item under each of the 18 key influential factors were averaged and correlated with the overall implementation efficiency (four items). The correlation was calculated using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, which is normally used when the data is considered parametric (Field, 2009). The scores for each factor and their correlation coefficients are reported in Table 6-25.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>EXP</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>384***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>405***</td>
<td>476**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>731**</td>
<td>294*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>873***</td>
<td>384**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>713**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>355**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>268*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>350**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>643**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>673**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>694**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>676**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>679**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>678**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>675**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Pearson</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>676**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘actual’ results for all factors were found to be significantly correlated with the overall implementation efficacy; however, some correlations were found to be stronger than others. A careful examination of Table 6-25 shows that there appears to be high and significant correlation amongst most of the key influential factors. In particular, top management commitment (A) is highly and significantly correlated with most variables: 0.805 with understanding the use and purpose of BEM (C), 0.605 with stimulating a change culture (D), 0.731 with establishing an excellence steering committee (E), 0.873 with implementation plan (F), 0.778 with developing internal capabilities (H), 0.634, 0.680, 0.693 and 0.776 respectively with effective communication (J), developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation (L), providing sufficient training (M) and aligning BEM with information systems (Q). Other key influential factors also tended to produce high and significant correlations with one another. In contrast, two factors, aligning BEM use with organisational processes (K) and developing an action plan (R), had low and in some cases insignificant correlation with most other key influential factors. Moreover, all factors were statistically significantly correlated with BEM implementation efficiency (DPNT), to varying degrees. The factors with the highest degrees of association with DPNT were A (0.720), C (0.713), Q (0.693), F (0.668), H (0.659) and M (0.650). On the whole, as demonstrated in this table, the findings are indicative of the fact that the independent factors were highly determinative for the variation in the dependent variable, DPNT.

6.10.2 Overall actual correlation: Participants

The findings in Table 6-26 are quite similar to those in Table 6-25. With the exception of one factor, supportive organisational structure (G), all key influential factors produced statistically significant correlation measures with BEM implementation efficiency. The highest degree of such association was between DPNT and top management commitment (A) (0.674), followed by understanding the purpose and use of BEM (C) (0.667), providing sufficient training (M) and aligning BEM with information systems (Q) (0.666). Apart from factor G, supportive organisational structure, which had very little significant association with any of the other key influential factors, all factors appeared to be highly collinear with one another. In particular, high degrees of association were found between each of A, B and C and each
of the others. On the whole, the findings suggest that the actual correlation, vis-à-vis the participants, was high and significant in most cases.

Table 6-26: Overall actual correlation: Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Pearson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pearson</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Pearson</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Pearson</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Pearson</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Pearson</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Pearson</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Pearson</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Pearson</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Pearson</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Pearson</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Pearson</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Pearson</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Pearson</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Pearson</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Pearson</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Pearson</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Pearson</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Pearson</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 6.10.3 Overall actual correlation: Non-participants

#### Table 6-27: Overall actual correlation: Non-participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similarly, for non-participants, examination of Table 6-27 indicates that on the whole there were a large number of statistically significant correlation measures amongst key influential factors. DPNT tended to be strongly associated with all of the key influential factors.
factors, having statistically significant measures of correlation with them, with the exception of four of these: supportive organisational structure (G), aligning BEM with the strategic planning process (I), aligning BEM with organisational processes (K) and developing an action plan (R). Factor R, developing an action plan, was once again relatively weakly and insignificantly correlated with most other factors. On the whole, factors A, B, C and E—top management commitment, setting a shared long-term vision, understanding the use and purpose of BEM and establishing an excellence steering committee—were the most strongly correlated with the other factors.

**6.11 Chapter summary**

This chapter has presented and analysed the quantitative data derived from the questionnaire responses. The perceptions of importance and of the actual situation regarding each key influential factor were discussed via descriptive analysis, and inferential statistics were used to investigate and identify relationships between the key influential factors and BEM implementation efficiency. These findings will be further analysed and discussed in relation to the literature review and the qualitative findings in chapter eight. The next chapter presents and analyses the qualitative data gathered in interviews with ADP personnel.
Chapter Seven: Qualitative Analysis

7.1 Introduction

As discussed in the methodology chapter, this study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods: semi-structured interviews and questionnaires. This chapter presents a summary of the findings of interviews conducted with 25 ADP employees, the intention being to gather information arising from key employees’ knowledge and experience of the implementation of the ADP’s BEM and particularly to investigate how the key influential factors were deployed and their impact on the implementation of the BEM. The data presented here can be seen to supplement the quantitative data discussed in the previous chapter, broadening our perspective on the successful implementation of a BEM in the public sector.

This chapter is structured into three main sections, covering the key characteristics of the interviewees, their general perceptions of the implementation of the ADP’s BEM and their views regarding the key influential factors for successful BEM implementation.

7.2 Key characteristics of the interviewees

This first section presents the interviewees’ profiles and backgrounds. The researcher interviewed 25 key employees across the ADP General Directorate. These interviewees played management roles in the ADP and were responsible for managing the implementation of its BEM. Thus, they were able to supply detailed information regarding this implementation. The importance of key employees is highlighted by Holloway (1997), who states that critical information is always available from powerful employees in an organisation and that this gives the researcher insight into the phenomenon being investigated and an improved understanding of it.

Table 7-1 provides a summary of the interviewees’ characteristics, showing that 92% of them were male and only 8% female. The observer of management practice in Arab countries will see that the majority of the workforce is usually male (Iles et al, 2006). This is particularly true in the UAE, where Gallant and Pounder (2008) note that the employment level of female UAE nationals is below predicted gender levels, because of the strong influence of the national culture. However, a recent UAE government
initiative has aimed to increase female employment in order to minimise unemployment among female UAE nationals, according to Richardson (2004).

Table 7-1: Key characteristics of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager of General Directorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Managers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts &amp; consultants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Qualifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UAE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for nationality, 21 interviewees (84%) were UAE nationals and four were not, reflecting the diversity of the general workforce within the ADP (experts, consultants and permanent staff). Positions at different levels of the organisation were targeted in order to gain broad information and a comprehensive view of the phenomenon; thus, one of the interviewees was a general manager in the ADP General Directorate, six were departmental managers and eleven (44%) section heads, while seven (28%) were consultants and experts in the implementation of BEM. Table 7-1 shows that 40% of the key interviewees held bachelor degrees, 48% masters and just 12% (three persons) PhDs. As for length of service, 36% of the interviewees had worked in the ADP for between ten and 15 years, 28% more than 15 years, 24% between 5 and 10 years, and 12% less than 5 years.
7.3 General perceptions of the ADP’s BEM implementation

This section reports and analyses interviewees’ responses regarding their experience and views of the efficiency of the implementation of the ADP’s BEM. This topic was explored by asking each interviewee the following questions:

- What were the main reasons for implementing the BEM?
- How would you assess the level of BEM implementation in the ADP?
- What were the outcomes of the BEM implementation?
- How easy was the implementation of the BEM in your organisation?
- What were the challenges faced during the implementation of the BEM?

7.3.1 Reasons for BEM implementation

The BEM process was initiated when the Abu Dhabi Executive Council made it compulsory for all local government organisations to implement a BEM; in response, the ADP started to implement the EFQM model. At first, there were many complaints and resistance to participating in the implementation of a BEM, because employees were fearful about the change and worried that they might not be able to comply with the requirements of the BEM.

One interviewee said:

*When the BEM was introduced in the ADP, we did not know what it was about, but then we noticed that it was initiated by ADEC to improve local government performance, and it was supervised by the General Secretary of ADEC .... Therefore, the Commander of the ADP asked us to participate in the BEM to get the excellence prizes, which consequently would impact on the ADP’s performance.*

Other interviewees expressed similar opinions:

*... ADEC put pressure on the ADP to implement the BEM. It was government strategy to improve the local government departments by implementing BEMs; therefore it was compulsory to participate in this award programme.*
The above statements reflect the political pressure on the ADP to participate in the BEM project. On the other hand, some interviewees had positive perceptions of BEM implementation:

... Employees recognise the benefits of the BEM as a good performance management model which can improve our performance, services and process management.

We identified the best practice police services, such as in Singapore, Belgium, and some in the UK, and we recognised that implementing a BEM would help to have data that we could use to benchmark our performance with such best practice police services around the world.

Another perspective on the rationale for the BEM implementation was identified by one interviewee:

The award is sponsored and the ceremony is patronised by Sheikh Mohammed Bin Zayed Al-Nahyan [Ruler of Abu Dhabi], therefore the BEM is highly prestigious for any government organisation in Abu Dhabi.

In addition to the above reasons for adopting the BEM, other interviewees added these:

The ADP started using strategic planning from 2002 and ISO, therefore, among Abu Dhabi local government organisations we are pioneering continuous improvement, increasing our confidence that we are ready to participate and win the BEM prize.

The BEM helped to resolve some problems that existed in the ADP, such as process overlapping, waste and lack of customer orientation.

The BEM introduced a culture of process management, cost effectiveness, productivity and a systematic approach.

Thus, it can be seen that the main reason for the ADP adopting a BEM was political pressure from ADEC; however, other reasons developed to support the rationale after the BEM was introduced to the ADP. The key reason why this initiative was important is that the BEM could be used to compare the ADP’s situation against worldwide best
practice, to undertake benchmarking and thus to improve the ADP’s performance and its employees’ skills and productivity.

7.3.2 The extent of BEM implementation

This subsection examines interviewees’ responses regarding the level of BEM implementation in the ADP; each interviewee expressed his or her subjective knowledge and experience of the level of implementation. A majority indicated that the level of implementation of BEM could be ranked as good, but that it was still in its infancy:

*Since we are still in the early stages of the excellence journey, I’d say that the ADP has implemented the BEM at 60%.*

*We got a good score against BEM criteria, but I believe the assessors were soft with us because it was the first year of introducing a BEM in Abu Dhabi. Therefore it can be seen that our implementation level is good but we have not reached the excellent level. I mean I can say that the implementation level is 70%.*

According to these interviewees, the BEM implementation level was related to the ADP’s readiness and the level of excellence maturity. Thus another interviewee said:

*The BEM was approved in 2007 and we were asked to submit our award application by December of the same year. Therefore we did not have enough time to prepare ourselves for such change, although there were huge efforts and resources were spent, but still we have not implemented the BEM comprehensively.*

On the other hand, some interviewees identified the size of the ADP and its geographical coverage as the causes of a low level of BEM implementation:

*We are one of the biggest organisations in the UAE, with more than 35,000 employees; therefore, it is not an easy task to implement a BEM comprehensively across all directorates.*

*The ADP is a geographically dispersed organisation with three regional directorates, Abu Dhabi Island, Al-Ain and the Western Region, which might be
one of the difficulties that we face in implementing BEM efficiently across all three regions, so we still need time and resources to reach a mature level of the implementation... I see the BEM implementation level in the ADP as 55%.

Another interviewee observed that the BEM implementation level was good in the Abu Dhabi Police Directorate (Abu Dhabi Island), but still in its early stages in other regional directorates:

The BEM implementation level in the ADP and its agencies in Abu Dhabi Island region is high, but on the other hand, the Western region and Al-Ain are lagging behind. In my opinion, we need a few years to ensure the comprehensive implementation of the BEM in the ADP because excellence is a long-term journey that can’t be achieved in one or two years.

There was consensus amongst the above interviewees that the size and geographical area covered by the ADP affected the extent of its implementation of the BEM. To summarize, the BEM was seen as a strategic improvement initiative which therefore needed time and patience to be implemented comprehensively, particularly in a large organisation like the ADP.

7.3.3 Outcomes of BEM implementation

This subsection discusses the benefits and difficulties that interviewees’ perceived as arising from BEM implementation. First, some interviewees felt that it had brought some benefits to the ADP:

The implementation of the BEM has promoted an excellence and continuous improvement culture in the ADP. What’s more, the commitment of our leaders towards improvement actions is obvious to see.

The ADP has increased training courses in new improvement initiatives, workshops... and adopted a systematic approach to work.

We’ve noticed changes and improvements in our work through the spread of the teamwork concept, a systematic approach, learning skills and problem solving techniques. True, it was felt that the BEM caused some extra workload, but it would be a temporary side effect.
The above responses indicate that the interviewees recognised the benefits of the BEM. On the other hand, a number of interviewees also highlighted some negative effects on the ADP:

*Implementation of the BEM caused some problems such as increased workload, constant changes to the structure and changing the employees’ focus from their core work.*

Another interviewee put these negative effects into context:

*The BEM, as with any other improvement project, is linked with some changes and this in turn causes some temporary negative effects, which can be overcome in time.*

Conversely, a number of other interviewees did not accept that the benefits of the BEM which had been achieved had yet matched the resources and time that were given to this project:

*There have only been moderate benefits from adopting the BEM compared with what we have put in, in terms of time and resources – training, consultation, working after hours and so on.*

Another commented that the benefits of adopting the BEM would come gradually:

*In my view, the only impacts of the BEM in the first two years were culture changes and systematic approaches, and other benefits might be gained over time.*

Thus, while interviewees recognised the organisational benefits of the adoption and implementation of the BEM by the ADP, there was consensus that these benefits would continue to come slowly and gradually.

### 7.3.4 Ease of BEM implementation

This subsection explores the perceptions of the interviewees regarding the ease of implementation of the ADP’s BEM. Some typical responses are these:

*It is not an easy task, where you need to allocate huge resources and time.*
Since it is a new concept we struggled to convince the employees to accept it, therefore there was some resistance towards the BEM.

Another interviewee suggested that the difficulties of implementing the BEM could be overcome quickly:

In the beginning it was very difficult, particularly as we are a very large organisation and we have not introduced such a model before, but after we did some self-assessment against BEM criteria, we discussed the difficulties with the Excellence Committee and drew up an improvement action plan. This made implementation easier in the following years.

Although the interviewees felt that the BEM project was not easy to implement in the ADP, it was believed that with top management support and the allocation of resources and time, any teething problems could be overcome.

7.3.5 Challenges during BEM implementation

Related to the comments above are interviewees’ opinions regarding the main challenges that they faced during BEM implementation.

The main challenge we faced was the cultural change from the traditional way of doing daily work to continuous improvement, which took time and patience on our part, therefore there was some resistance to adopting the BEM.

Resistance was a result of fear of the proposed radical changes and of how the burden of blame and any failures would impact on the individual. A number of interviewees noted that the Excellence Committee was aware of this resistance and initially took a bureaucratic approach, pushing the change through with urgency. To reduce resistance, interviewees noted that management provided a high volume of training courses, workshops and consultations. Some of the additional challenges that contributed to the implementation difficulties included the consolidation of existing ADP processes within the BEM implementation process, the short project timescale and milestones, the lack of awareness of the BEM within the organisation and the shortage of expertise on excellence within the organisation. In addition to the process issues, there were some organisational environmental features within the ADP which interviewees identified, including the military structure, the size of the organisation, the traditional, hierarchal
and centralised approach to decision-making and the geographical difficulties between regional directorates.

7.4 Interviewees’ opinions of the key factors influencing BEM implementation

This section presents the interviewees’ views concerning the key influential factors identified earlier, in order to assess their criticality and impact on the BEM implementation process in the ADP.

7.4.1 Top management commitment

Considering top management commitment as a key influential factor allows this study to examine how strongly the ADP’s top managers were committed to its BEM project. Most interviewees expressed the belief that top management commitment was crucial to implementing the BEM:

The BEM is a new concept here, and for implementing such initiatives in the ADP we need top management commitment, support and patience, because as far as I know, adopting BEM is a long-term initiative. Therefore without top management commitment it will be difficult to achieve a successful result.

This contribution demonstrates the importance of top management commitment within the ADP. Interviewees believed that top management played a significant role in the project, with a high level of serious commitment to the implementation of the BEM. Examples of this given by interviewees were statements made by the General Commander of the ADP, the bringing in of external expertise and the participation of top managers in implementation activities such as training. These interviewees stated that this early involvement demonstrated to the organisation the importance of the BEM to the ADP.

The General Commander of the ADP [also Minister of the Interior], the General Secretary of the Minister of the Interior’s Office and the General Director of the HR department in the ADP attended several workshops related to the implementation of the BEM and they discussed some issues or obstacles with the implementation team.
Although the above declarations indicate the involvement of top management, a number of interviewees indicated efficiency issues regarding this involvement, such as the number of projects undertaken within the organisation at the same time and inconsistent support for various projects, dependant on the line manager’s personal preferences. One interviewee provided an example:

*In the beginning all managers were busy developing and implementing strategic planning and there was a lack of participation by managers in the first year of introducing the BEM, except for the General Commander and two other general managers, but once they [management] recognised the rewards ceremony for employees who participated in the BEM, they turned their compass to the BEM project.*

Within the lower management levels there was some scepticism about the commitment levels of particular middle managers. An example supplied by one interviewee was that a manager would appear in a meeting, agreeing with the official policy direction on BEM, but then outside the meeting would fail to follow the stated line in his actions.

It is obvious that top management commitment was crucial during the ADP’s implementation of its BEM. The interviewees’ comments on this issue reflect the nature of the policing environment and the workplace requirements, including the militaristic command structure, which requires compliance.

### 7.4.2 Setting a shared long-term vision

This subsection explores the perceived importance of setting a shared long-term vision of BEM implementation in the ADP, which was believed to be a key influential factor in achieving successful results. A number of interviewees stressed the importance of setting a clear vision of what the ADP wanted to achieve by adopting a BEM:

*I think implementing a BEM in the ADP is a long-term strategic approach and therefore it will be difficult if the ADP does not have a clear vision and picture of where it wants to be in future.*

Some of the positive features that the interviewees identified as a result of a shared long-term vision were the enhancement of employee motivation and involvement in
BEM implementation, along with organisational commitment to the implementation process. This interviewee reported having heard the ADP’s vision explained:

*During the announcement of the decision to implement a BEM in the ADP, the head of the Excellence Committee delivered the vision of the commander that the ADP had to be a ADAEP winner, which relates our performance to such best practice models.*

Other interviewees expressed the view that the BEM would help in developing the organisation for the future by achieving excellence and benchmarking against best practice policing organisations. However, some identified difficulties in communicating the vision across the ADP, particularly in the regional directorates:

*While I was in one of the regional directorates, I thought the purpose of adopting a BEM was just as part of our strategic planning and to get as high a score as we could against the model. But later on, after participating in some workshops related to the message and vision of adopting the BEM, I recognised that it is strategic tool that the ADP has adopted to enable the achievement of continuous improvement.*

Other cultural and contextual issues were raised in relation to the shared long-term vision:

*In the beginning the senior managers in the ADP explained that the ultimate goal of adopting the BEM was to achieve organisational excellence, but at the same time they wanted to achieve it very quickly.*

*True, the ADP has adopted many improvement initiatives, such as strategic planning, ISO, process reengineering, a BEM and changing organisational structure, but senior managers expect a quick return on all these initiatives. In fact, this might affect their commitment, which it’s very important to gain and maintain during the implementation of all these improvement initiatives.*

The above contributions indicate the practice of long-term planning in the ADP, but suggest a need to focus on implementation to achieve good results and to ensure that managers keep in mind the long-term benefits of the BEM project.
7.4.3 Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM

Understanding the BEM and its purpose was assumed to be important to ensure successful results. This subsection examines the level of this understanding in the ADP, exemplified by these three contributions:

*After the consultants and experts explained to the top management individually, they agreed to support the implementation and they recognised its importance in improving the current situation of the ADP.*

*Initially we did not know how to start the implementation, but after attending workshops on the concept of BEM and the purpose of using this model, serious commitment appeared among us – and the top management supported that by allocating all necessary resources during the implementation process.*

*Without an understanding and awareness of the BEM, we would not have been able to identify the resources we needed, or to develop an implementation plan and the associated timescale to ensure that the target would be met.*

It appears that the interviewees believed that the top management and employees of the ADP should have an understanding of the model to enable its effective and successful implementation. They argued that without a coherent understanding of the model, some managers would look for a quick result, which could create stress and organisational pressure on the employees. These interviewees thus saw successful implementation of the BEM as linked to the level of awareness and understanding of it.

A number of interviewees stated their own understanding of the BEM:

*It is a best practice model that is based on well known model, the EFQM, which is used to measure our performance against its criteria.*

*The model criteria are used as a guideline to improve our activities, processes and overall performance results.*

In addition, a number of interviewees clarified how the ADP ensured the understanding of the BEM among employees:

*The ADP provided training courses and workshops to explain the BEM concept and why it had decided to adopt one.*
Another explained how the ADP had conveyed information on BEM implementation:

*Technological approaches such as SMS, E-club, emails and others were used to explain the purpose of adopting the BEM.*

Interviewees reported that the ADP had provided a range of workshops and courses to raise the awareness of employees about the BEM. However, some indicated that the provision of training courses had not covered all levels within the organisation:

*I think workshops regarding the BEM concept and its purpose should be provided equally to all ADP employees.*

*The workshops on the BEM concept were presented to ADP HQ employees, then extended gradually to cover other employees in the regional directorates, but there is still a lack of an efficient approach to reach all employees.*

To sum up, the perception was that understanding the BEM and its use was very important to ensure successful implementation, through providing comprehensive explanations of the concept and purpose of the BEM to all levels in the ADP.

### 7.4.4 Stimulating a change culture

*From my point of view, changing culture here will enhance the ADP’s receptiveness to the change during the implementation of the BEM ... This could be through training, workshops, using technology to promote new and best cultural aspects.*

The above interviewee and others emphasised the need to modify the organisational culture to ensure the readiness of the ADP to implement its BEM. Therefore, a number of interviewees mentioned some aspects of the existing culture within the ADP and suggested ways to address them:

*When the BEM was first introduced there was a fear among some people in the ADP that implementing any changes might damage their interests or position in the organisation, which caused some resistance to appear among some people here. ... Thus, the ADP should start by changing the managers’ perceptions of the BEM to ensure their enthusiasm and involvement and to overcome resistance.*
Another interviewee described a situation where employees were afraid to participate in any project or change initiative, in order to avoid making mistakes or having their positions threatened:

*I see ADP employees always sticking with the status quo, fearing any accountability related to their involvement in the implementation of the BEM, because they realise that internal assessors come to assess their work and the activity of their departments against the BEM model... In this culture, measurement means spotting the weaknesses of a person, therefore, more effort will be needed to change these aspects of the ADP’s culture.*

The above statements reflect the cultural difficulties encountered among employees when introducing change into the ADP, which are related to some general cultural aspects of Abu Dhabi society. The strong military structure of the ADP meant that the change was imposed, giving members of the force no choice about participating. Despite this strong command hierarchy, however, implementation could still be affected by employee resistance, as indicated by the following example given by an employee:

*There is an authoritarian style here in the ADP, where managers like to control the situation all the time, therefore, as members of the implementation team we do what we are told, because if we didn’t we might get punished or blamed for any mistakes during the implementation of the BEM... This in turn causes a lack of trust and open communication and minimises delegation during implementation.*

These views indicate the existence of bureaucracy in the ADP, which was seen sometimes to affect employee motivation negatively, reducing involvement and delaying the making of decisions. Conversely, another interviewee suggested that the bureaucracy might be used to enhance BEM implementation:

*The bureaucratic style works in the ADP when you want to introduce any change, because we are a very large organisation with a low change orientation, therefore in the early stages of change you need to push the people to become involved in it by using some of your authority... This can be seen in most police organisations.*
Other cultural issues mentioned were deference to experts and the culture of blame:

> We always depend on what experts and consultants say and do, therefore, top management usually listens to them rather than us.

> Since we have a blaming culture here, we would rather explain our opinion about the implementation to the consultant rather than top management, because if some mistakes happen we might be blamed.

These statements indicate that one problem was that employees felt that they could not express themselves freely. This sense of restricted freedom of expression could then be used to avoid either taking the blame for a mistake or contradicting the opinion of an expert or consultant who had access to the ADP’s top management.

Some interviewees stated that the ADP had tried to change some aspects of its organisational culture by various means:

> A few months ago, a workshop was held for the BEM implementation team. I personally attended this workshop and I think it is strong evidence that the ADP intends to create an excellence culture.

> The ADP takes the approach of creating excellence and quality culture through training, workshops and other communication systems in order to enhance the culture, but in my view, unfortunately it has still not been cascaded to the other levels because most of it is only introduced to certain groups and teams.

> The ADP set up an excellence branch in each general directorate in order to deliver the message of adopting the BEM and to enhance the culture in these directorates towards BEM adoption... These branches have started conducting workshops about excellence culture and the best practice approach to the top level in each directorate, which helps to convince the managers about what we are doing regarding the BEM.

Further details of the efforts of the ADP to improve the culture were given by this interviewee:

> All of us recognise that the General Secretary of the Minister of the Interior’s Office and the general directorates collectively have approved many training
courses and workshops, and provided consultations by excellence experts... I feel that we are in a golden era when you see the most powerful people in the ADP supporting these changes.

To sum up, interviewees reported that the ADP had taken some action to change its traditional culture in order to facilitate the successful implementation of its BEM.

7.4.5 Establishing an excellence steering committee

Interviewees offered many opinions of the role of the Excellence Steering Committee and its influence on BEM implementation by the ADP, including these contributions:

In essence, the ADP appointed an award steering group. This committee is responsible for developing the implementation plan side by side with the other layer of improvement teams.

The award committee is appointed by the General Commander and headed by the general director of the HR department. This means that it is well supported and all of its requirements are met... In fact, the chair of the committee has direct links to the ADP commander and his secretary, who have shown their serious commitment to adopting the BEM and winning the award.

When other members see that the committee is headed by the HR manager and sponsored by the Secretary of the Minister’s Office they show their commitment and demonstrate it during implementation... This in fact makes implementation easier.

The above responses indicate that the interviewees were aware that an excellence steering committee had been appointed. Other contributions highlighted the importance of the committee’s existence during the BEM implementation process:

Without the award committee we would not be where we are now.

The implementation and improvement team reports to the award committee, who support us and allocate all the resources that are needed during the implementation.
The committee was seen as having a highly supportive influence that energised the participation of the ADP in implementing the BEM, through its commitment to the allocation of the resources needed to enable the ADP to implement the BEM. Interviewees felt that the Excellence Committee had played an important role in facilitating the implementation process:

*The chair and members of the award committee are responsible for the implementation of the BEM by the ADP; therefore they appointed the second layer of implementation team members, allocating resources and reporting the progress of implementation to the development steering committee.*

*The Excellence Committee is responsible for conducting two self-assessments a year... It supervises the implementation of action plans to minimise the gap between the ADP’s BEM and the EFQM model.*

Another interviewee explained how the Excellence Committee reported on the progress of BEM implementation to the ADP’s Development Committee:

*The Excellence Committee conducts two monthly review meetings with the implementation team in order to review the progress of BEM implementation, then they report this progress during meetings with the ADP commander and the development team to ensure that communication regarding the implementation is kept up to date and that any necessary decisions are taken.*

Other interviewees explained how the Excellence Committee developed the implementation team and how this made implementation of BEM easier and improved geographical coverage:

*The Award Committee played a role in developing the implementation team, which represents different levels and regional directorates in the ADP.*

*Selecting the team members from different ADP regional directorates has made the implementation easier and more comprehensive, by covering all regional directorates...*

There was consensus amongst interviewees on the role of the Excellence Committee during the implementation of the BEM, yet a few argued that the lack of communication
between the implementation team, employees and the Excellence Committee limited the level and effectiveness of implementation:

*In my opinion, there is no problem between the higher levels of committee communication, but a problem still exists between us as an implementation team and the committee.*

*When feedback and progress reports on implementation reach the committee, I’m sure they deal with them quickly, but they are sometimes not so easy to reach or communicate with.*

These responses indicate the existence of some communication difficulties between the higher and lower ranks in the organisation.

*But they sometimes lack communication with the lower layer of the implementation team, therefore they need some skills to enable them to communicate with us.*

Interviewees felt that the Excellence Committee members required greater training and development of soft skills such as communication and patience, along with a greater appreciation of the fact that change takes time to be embedded within an organisation.

*Unfortunately, a few members of the committee believe that successful implementation of BEM means being a winner and that anything different means failure... However, some other members recognise that implementing a BEM leads to the improvement of the BEM, regardless of winning the prize.*

*Some members of the committee and the implementation team expect a quick return, which again can cause some frustration and pressure among the other teams.*

To sum up, the importance of developing an excellence committee to steer the implementation of BEM was clearly recognised by the interviewees. This committee should be knowledgeable about BEM implementation as well as powerful enough to allocate resources to support the process. Communication issues between the implementation team and the main Excellence Committee should be considered with care, particularly in a large geographically spread organisation.
7.4.6 Implementation plan

The ADP’s preparation and planning of its BEM implementation is examined in this subsection. A number of interviewees broadly shared a view of the importance of planning prior to the implementation:

*Without a good, clear implementation plan, the implementation of a BEM would be difficult in a large organisation like the ADP.*

*Since 2003, many change initiatives have been introduced in the ADP, therefore, accurate planning has been needed in order to prioritise our efforts and resources.*

*Achieving a good result in the award was significantly related to the preparation and good planning for the implementation of the BEM, so that it was easy for both sides—the top management and the implementation team—to manage and review progress.*

*In the early stage of developing the BEM, an implementation plan across regional directorates and levels should be considered, as this will help to minimise the gap between the ADP headquarters and its regional directorates.*

Thus, it was seen as important to develop an accurate plan for BEM implementation in the ADP, to ensure that all the required resources could be allocated effectively and efficiently.

The following are some other views of planning for the BEM implementation revealed by the interviews:

*The BEM implementation team did internal self-assessments, then based on the results the plan was made in order to bridge the gaps. Later on the external party came and assessed the situation of the ADP to ensure that all the actions were taken to match the BEM requirements.*

*The Excellence Committee started by appointing the BEM implementation team, determining its roles and responsibilities. Then they appointed some consultancies to do some self-assessment and gap analysis, to identify the current situation of the ADP. Later on, the plan was introduced to the ADP top*
management to approve it in order to get full support from them. This was a good idea to introduce the BEM to ADP employees, but it was still not enough because the ADP is very spread out geographically. Therefore, more involvement from different departments is important to set up the implementation plan and ensure that it will cover all departments and police stations in the Abu Dhabi region.

These interviewees thus expressed a belief that the self-assessment results were essential as input to the process of developing the BEM implementation plan for the ADP.

Another issue regarding the implementation plan was its flexibility, highlighted by this interviewee:

*The implementation plan became more flexible since we imported some consultants in order to participate with us to develop it; therefore, the implementation became easier.*

However, other interviewees felt that although there was planning, it followed an ad hoc approach rather than a strongly formalised one:

*In my opinion, there was no formalised plan for implementation, but I think there were some guidelines based on the results of self-assessment—then they started to create action plans for the improvement areas identified by these results.*

In summary, interviewees agreed on the importance of implementation planning as a factor affecting the implementation of BEM within the ADP, but a more formalised plan for the whole of the organisation across all regions was felt to be needed, with some flexibility during the implementation and the early involvement of employees across the organisation.

### 7.4.7 Supportive organisational structure

The interviewees were asked to give their perceptions and opinions of the ADP’s structure and its influence on the successful implementation of its BEM. They were asked about the structural changes which occurred at the beginning of this decade:
When the development programme and the ADP’s strategy were introduced, the leaders of this organisation recognised that the old organisational structure was not compatible with the current strategy, so in 2003 they initiated an organisational structure change, which was completed in 2004.

On the other hand, a number of interviewees highlighted the characteristics of the old structure as forming one of the barriers to the adoption of any improvement initiatives:

If we kept the old organisational structure I think it would present some difficulties to implementing any improvement change initiatives because of the existence of the centralised decision making and rigid communication processes, the lack of responsibility and some contradictions in authority.

Lack of an appropriate job integration approach was one of the main features of the old organisational structure of the ADP. You see that some groups of employees have extra work and other less because of the contradictions.

The old ADP structure was more function based rather than process based, therefore it was a barrier to teamwork across functions. To be frank, this makes an isolation of the practice of regional directorates in the ADP.

The leadership of the ADP started the structural changes in 2003 based on best practices from other policing and public sector organisations. The interviewees mentioned several examples of best practice organisations that were visited to help benchmark and develop an overview of structural organisational enhancement. It seems that the ADP used many best practice approaches in order to develop a supportive organisational structure that matched its future vision. A number of interviewees offered their opinions regarding the impact of the ADP’s organisational structure on its BEM implementation:

It has become clearer in responsibilities, authority and communication channels and there are more cross-functional teams.

The current structure includes the Excellence Section, which is attached to the Office of the General Director. This section supervises the implementation of the BEM in each department based on the criterion that it is responsible for. It also coordinates between the department and the main Excellence Section in the
Strategic Department, which is responsible for implementing the improvement initiatives for the whole of the ADP.

Thus, the above interviewees indicated that the current structure had a vital role in the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM. On the other hand, some interviewees stated that although the change of organisational structure had enhanced the progression of improvement and contemporary administrative practice, there were still some negative issues which might be related to the nature of the ADP and its culture:

As you know, the ADP as a police organisation is influenced by its military background and thought, so you will find to some extent that there is hierarchical decision making, rigid communication and authoritarian control.

The ADP is a large organisation and consists of three regional directorates, therefore most of the decisions are taken at ADP headquarters, where the authority lies and resources are kept.

In the ADP, we sometimes suffer from an unstable organisational structure. I mean the structure is sometimes changed for internal or external political reasons; therefore, I feel it has influenced BEM implementation.

A similar view was expressed by another interviewee:

In 2007 we were working on preparing the Quality Department for ISO certification and we spent a few months on it, but suddenly we were informed that the Quality Department was to be merged with the Strategic and Performance Improvement Department and we were told not to proceed with its ISO certification.

From these various comments it appears that the organisational structure of the ADP in its current format is supportive of the implementation of the new BEM. However, the interviewees identified a number of issues within the organisation which challenge any further development. These obstacles include the hierarchical nature of a military organisation, its rigid command and control system, its spread across a large geographical area and the power dynamics within the organisation.
7.4.8 Developing internal capabilities

To explore the ADP’s internal capability status, the interviewees were asked their opinions about the readiness of the ADP to implement the BEM and whether it was able to adopt it. The following are some general perceptions of the ADP’s capabilities:

*The ADP is capable of implementing any changes, because its leaders adopted the improvement and development programme in 2002.*

*Developing training programmes, strategic planning, ISO, recruiting well educated staff and consultants all increase the ADP’s capabilities to embark on any improvement programme.*

*There is no problem with funding or providing resources here in the ADP, since the leaders provide it in a timely manner.*

Through the leadership, organisational programmes and resource provision since 2002, the ADP had been working to implement changes such as BEM adoption. In reference to adopting the BEM, the following observations were made:

*If the BEM had been introduced ten years ago, we would not have achieved any significant results, but after the adoption of the development programme in 2002, such as improving the ADP’s structure and strategy, increasing the operational budgets, process mapping and management, advanced training courses and adopting best practice tools, the implementation is easier and better.*

*From 2003 to 2004 the ADP brought in many consultants from different countries in order to develop the organisational structure, strategy and our capabilities to face future challenges. In this way, the culture and employees’ perceptions were changed about the importance of being ready for any change in future.*

As the ADP developed its available skills, knowledge and organisational resources, interviewees perceived an improvement within the organisation which had enabled greater development of the organisational capability and readiness to implement the
BEM. Another interviewee expressed the view that the first ADP Strategy (2003-2007) had played a significant role in improving these capabilities:

When we adopted the new strategy in 2003, we considered the current situation and where we wanted to be within four years, then many changes were made during those four years to bring us to where we are now... In terms of implementing a BEM, I don’t think we have a problem regarding that, but one thing we do need is top management agreement. This is because whatever top management agrees upon will happen, because all the requirements will be provided in order to achieve successful results.

In the opinion of another interviewee, the top management had participated in the implementation of the BEM under pressure from ADEC. A number of interviewees felt that the readiness of the ADP to implement the BEM was related to its pioneering organisational self-development among other organisations in Abu Dhabi; for example:

I think that what we see in the ADP now is because of the development programmes introduced since 2002, therefore we are one of the first organisations in Abu Dhabi to have developed its strategy, ISO and training needs analysis, which in turn increases our capabilities to meet any future challenges.

While many interviewees thus highlighted the ADP’s readiness and ability to adopt the BEM, some expressed reservations:

The lack of a systematic approach is one of the main gaps in ADP capabilities.

Sometimes you recognise that there are ready capabilities within the ADP headquarters. However, there are some doubts about other regional directorates because some development programmes do not effectively reach all of them.

On the whole, the respondents indicated that there was operational readiness within the ADP to implement and adopt new programmes like the BEM, although on the other hand, some interviewees emphasised the need for a systematic approach to ensure that the improvement programme reached all the other regional directorates.
7.4.9 Aligning the BEM with the strategic planning process

This part of the interview explored how the BEM implementation strategy was aligned with the ADP’s corporate strategy. This alignment was seen as a key influential factor in the successful implementation of the BEM. There was a clear perception of its importance and its impact on BEM implementation, on the part of a number of interviewees:

*The ADP corporate strategy determines the strategic goals and how the ADP can achieve them, therefore the BEM as a strategic goal and an ADEC initiative means that the BEM implementation strategy needs to be aligned with the ADP strategy to ensure that the ADP is capable of implementing it effectively.*

*Implementing BEM needs effective allocation of employees, information, material and other resources, therefore, aligning the BEM implementation strategy with the ADP strategy will make for a better utilisation of the available resources in order to achieve successful implementation.*

Through the alignment of the use of the BEM with the strategy planning process, the interviewees felt that the performance of the implementation would be enhanced, since there was a strong commitment on the part of management and this impacted on the delivery of organisational resources. One example of the collaborative support within the organisation was reported thus:

*In the ADP, employees appreciate and respect the corporate strategy because they believe that most of the reward initiatives are linked to their efforts and participation in helping the ADP to achieve its strategy. Thus, aligning the implementation strategy with the corporate strategy will create a sense of importance and motivation for the employees to participate in the implementation process.*

Employees suggested that there could beneficial outcomes, both personally and professionally, of the alignment of the use of BEM with the new organisational strategy implementation. However, some interviewees recalled that the organisation was currently undergoing a period of transition.
Frankly speaking, I obviously don’t know how much alignment there is between the corporate strategy and the implementation strategy, but I can see that the ADP is somehow dealing with the BEM as a separate project. They are committed to achieving better results with the award, but it is still not fully integrated with the strategic planning process in the ADP.

Since the 2008-2012 strategy already exists, we haven’t had the chance to use the BEM to develop our strategy, but I’m sure in future that this element might be seriously considered in our strategic planning process.

The implementation strategy is discussed in the strategic and development committee meetings, but we don’t have a systematic alignment between it and the corporate strategy.

These comments reflect the history of the development of strategy within the ADP. At the time of the study, a number of existing strategies were in operation, but were not fully linked to the new approach towards the BEM. Another interviewee argued that there was some contradiction in the lack of alignment between the use of BEM and the existing strategic planning process:

We are not fully aligning the corporate strategy with the implementation strategy, but all resources are allocated and the commitment of top management is explicit to everybody here. But at the same time I understand this has happened because the commander and top management wanted to win the award, so they are fully focused on it.

There are some initiatives for aligning some departmental business plans with the implementation strategy, but as for the corporate strategy, this is not fully integrated... However, in the ADP there are no financial problems weakening support for BEM implementation.

The last interviewee cited here felt that there were some individual managers who had implemented the new strategies as part of the departmental business planning. These managers had been proactive in implementing the BEM, while others had not done so at this stage. It should be noted that at the time of the study there was no formalised
alignment to improve the association between use of the BEM and the strategic planning process within the ADP.

7.4.10 Effective communication

The interviewees agreed that communicating the progress of implementation and information related to the BEM in the ADP had helped to engage the employees’ interest in and attention to the implementation process. They perceived communication as playing an essential part in BEM implementation, ensuring its effectiveness and success:

*Communicating the message, objectives and concept of using BEM across all levels in the ADP helps to stimulate the current culture in the ADP and build the employees’ buy-in, which in turn enhances the implementation process.*

*Proper communication systems keep employees updated about the progress of implementation.*

It should be noted that some interviewees identified regional issues as affecting the communication channels and having a negative impact on the implementation process.

*A lack of robust communication channels during BEM implementation has caused inconsistency in the flow of information and feedback between employees and the implementation team in the ADP.*

*When they started introducing improvement programmes in the ADP, the first step was an organisational structure change and one of the main reasons for that change was to ensure effective communication channels across all levels in the ADP.*

The above respondents highlighted the importance of effective communication before and during BEM implementation. Another interviewee referred to the contents of the ADP’s communication plan:

*The ADP needs to communicate the purpose of using the BEM, how to communicate the model, the benefits expected from the implementation and which tools and approaches they are going to use... Also, here in the ADP, whatever is approved by top management teams goes smoothly, so the*
communication plan should be approved by them in order to be adopted by all departments.

Within this overview of what should occur as part of the communication plan, several interviewees identified what was in place within the ADP:

Two official meetings were conducted every month between the implementation team and the Excellence Committee in order to review progress, deliver feedback and make suggestions.

Technology was used to make communication more effective during the implementation process: SMS, email, intranet, E-club, newsletters and official reports of implementation progress.

Regular meetings were held between sub-teams and their members in order to discuss any information before the official meeting between the implementation team and the Excellence Committee.

However, some interviewees identified a range of challenges facing the communication plan:

Although the ADP has attempted to ensure communication before and during BEM implementation by changing the organisational structure, using technology and providing training courses, the military mindset and cultural issues have influenced the communication methods in the ADP—for example, the rigid communication that comes down from the top, caused by the hierarchal position of some senior managers.

Sometimes employees have used a personal approach in order to deliver their messages and feedback to the implementation team. This depends on their networking and how powerful it is to deliver this feedback and suggestions.

The ADP has undergone structural and systematic changes during the last decade but it still faces challenges related to its organisational and societal culture, its geographical spread and certain historical factors, all of which affect its communication efficiency.
7.4.11 Aligning BEM with organisational processes

This subsection presents respondents’ views on the alignment of BEM use with the ADP’s existing organisational processes. They appeared to agree that the idea of aligning these factors was desirable and that failure to do so might cause increased workload and overlapping:

*To be frank, I think implementing the BEM in the ADP caused some overlapping with some existing processes, and employees believe it is a separate project, therefore aligning it with the processes might help us to avoid extra work and save time.*

*Although we have ISO certification in some departments, since the BEM was introduced in 2007, the workload has increased dramatically, which in turn has impacted on our daily work and main activities.*

There was some duplication in organisational processes reported by interviewees, who explained that this was a feature of the poor alignment between the use of BEM and the existing organisational processes. Those interviewees who identified that there was duplication in processes perceived that it created extra work and thus cost time and energy resources. For example, one respondent stated that staff already had a high workload and that any additional work would push them past their endurance and ability to cope. It was suggested that with better alignment between the use of the model and the current processes, this issue would be resolved and not make such a great impact on workflows.

In addition, some interviewees suggested potential forms of alignment between the model and the existing ADP processes:

*We have eight main processes in the ADP; therefore, if we align each criterion of the BEM with the relevant process it might help us to focus on doing one thing rather than doing something twice, avoiding overlapping and increased workload.*

*We have an owner for each main process, so the implementation team might coordinate with the owner of the process to align the criterion of the excellence model with his process. This would be helpful to ensure collecting the right data*
about the criterion, avoiding increased workload and the wasting of time and effort.

In summary, the interviewees felt that alignment with existing processes was a necessary factor to embed the BEM within the organisation. Interviewees recognised that this alignment would not be an easy task, as the organisation had to ensure that its employees had the necessary skills and capabilities to overcome the challenges they faced, in order to achieve robust alignment.

7.4.12 Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation

Motivating employees to engage in the BEM implementation process was one of the key influential factors for successful implementation of the BEM, according to the interviewees. Therefore, they highlighted the need to recognise employees’ efforts towards BEM implementation and to reward them for their contributions:

Rewards are important to encourage employees to participate in the implementation of the BEM.

Everyone is looking for rewards, promotion, bonuses, so developing reward guidelines for the BEM implementation process will create the opportunity and environment for employees’ engagement and commitment.

It is difficult to make ADP employees agree to participate in BEM implementation unless they are confident that the ADP will reward them for their contributions.

It seems from the above that there was agreement amongst interviewees that rewarding employees for their contributions was essential to ensure the successful implementation of the BEM. The following statements depict the current situation of the ADP regarding rewards and recognition of employees’ involvement in BEM implementation:

The ADP has developed reward guidelines for the BEM implementation process. The rewards are salary bonuses, promotion and medals from the General Commander.

BEM implementation team members were enthusiastic and satisfied with the reward scheme that was approved by the General Commander.
Interviewees explained that the reward scheme was developed for the BEM implementation team and the Excellence Committee. There was a strong link, according to the study participants, between the reward guidelines and the implementation of the BEM. For example, one interviewee stated:

_The reward guidelines for BEM implementation are aligned with the employees’ contributions to the implementation process._

While there were positive statements demonstrating that the ADP did develop a reward scheme for employees who had contributed to the implementation of the BEM, a number of interviewees raised concerns regarding its application:

_The ADP has reward guidelines for employees who are part of the BEM implementation team, and the rewards and incentives guidelines are linked with the result of the BEM implementation. However, from my point of view, the other people who are not included in the official list of the implementation team are excluded from the rewards ceremony which is conducted every year. This has affected the motivation level among those employees who give their time and effort but are not clearly rewarded._

_The ADP has approved the reward system, which is linked to the implementation results, but frankly speaking, the rewards are not cascaded to the lower levels in the ADP but just apply to the official implementation team. We recently discussed this issue with the steering committee, in our last meeting._

It seems from the above statements that the reward system was seen as attractive to all but still not comprehensive, failing to cover all employees who contributed to the BEM implementation. This shortcoming in the application of the reward guidelines was identified within the upper management level of the organisation and it appeared that there were likely to be further policy developments within the organisation to address this issue. A number of interviewees explained the reasons for not including all employees involved in BEM implementation, typified by the following interview extract:
Everything is controlled by ADP headquarters: resources, rewards, promotions and others, which means that employees who are involved and are based in the regional directorates are not rewarded effectively for their efforts.

As this interviewee explained, an employee might not be on the official list, although he might have helped the official team through its organisational support and networks. Unfortunately, such people were not likely to be acknowledged in the awards ceremony. Another reason why the guidelines did not apply to all was identified as a logistical issue:

A reward system linked to BEM implementation is attractive for everybody, but it is still difficult to include everyone involved, because it is impossible to count all of them. What we actually do is to offer rewards for those who are responsible for clear tasks approved by the implementation team and the Excellence Committee, who are usually senior people in the ADP.

To sum up, the ADP had developed a set of reward guidelines and aligned this system with the BEM implementation process, which was approved by the General Commander. The guidelines seemed to be attractive and satisfactory for the employees, but a group of interviewees raised the issue that the distribution of rewards was affected by cultural and environmental issues such as personal relationships and geographical considerations, which made employees outside the headquarters less likely to be chosen for the rewards.

7.4.13 Providing sufficient training

This section presents the interviewees’ opinions concerning the BEM-related training that was provided to the ADP’s employees. Many stressed the importance of providing sufficient training in order to ensure that the employees had sufficient understanding of the implementation of the ADP’s BEM:

As you know, the BEM is a new idea in the UAE and especially in the ADP; therefore employees need to improve their skills in how to implement it successfully.

When any new improvement initiatives are introduced, continuous training needs to be provided alongside the implementation in order to ensure the
employees’ understanding, which in turn minimises their resistance and increases their efficiency at the participation level.

You can’t blame the employees for their resistance or lack of involvement in any project if you don’t improve their knowledge and experience in the project.

These and other interviewees highlighted the need for training in order to improve employees’ skills, awareness and knowledge of the implementation of the BEM, because they were still unfamiliar with the initiative. In the following excerpts, interviewees discuss the training course provision that the ADP made in order to enhance the success of BEM implementation:

The ADP developed and introduced a massive training programme when they first decided to implement the BEM.

As part of the BEM implementation team, we attended many training courses, both formal and informal, and sometimes we took training courses in different countries, like Belgium and the UK.

The ADP contacted some of the well-known training institutes to deliver in-house training about the implementation of the BEM for its employees; for example, the EFQM centre in Brussels, the HRM institute in Dubai, and some others in the UK and Singapore.

Some respondents indicated that the ADP’s budget allocation for the training courses was significant and that these were delivered by internationally acknowledged training organisations that had a high level of experience in BEM training provision. The use of foreign organisations enabled the ADP to import valuable knowledge and skills.

A similar view was expressed by another interviewee:

In 2007, at the beginning of BEM introduction, the training course focused on the general perception of the model and its criteria. After a time, the training became more professional and specialist in some areas, such as accredited assessors of the model, process management, managing change, project management and cultural change.
While the initial training programmes were concerned with BEMs in general, further training courses were developed and presented in specialist areas to support BEM implementation. Another interviewee indicated that the training courses which were provided led to major changes in the ADP and its employees’ behaviour and skills:

*What you see here now—awareness, involvement, commitment, enthusiasm towards the BEM—all this is thanks to the fact that the appropriate training programmes were introduced during BEM implementation.*

It seems from the above statements that the ADP supported BEM implementation by providing relevant training courses. However, other interviewees stated that the training courses had not reached everybody in the ADP:

*The training in the ADP has been limited to certain groups of employees such as the implementation team and people at headquarters, while the remainder haven’t received sufficient training in the BEM.*

*I think employees in regional directorates have not had sufficient training courses about the BEM, because we don’t have a clear and comprehensive approach to cover them there.*

These comments indicate the existence of a division between regional centres and ADP headquarters in relation to the quality and amount of training provided. In addition, a number of interviewees argued that training should be aligned with the training department plan:

*The lower-level employees in the ADP have not received enough training about the BEM implementation process, as a result of not having a top-down and systematic approach here.*

*Training about the implementation process of BEM needs to be aligned with the training department plan to be more systematic and cover all departments in the ADP.*

While it is apparent from the interviews that the ADP provided many training programmes for those employees who were involved in the implementation of its BEM, there were particular issues in regional areas and amongst the lower ranked members of
the organisation. The key suggestion from interviewees was that there should have been a systematic approach and better administration by the training department to ensure that an organisation-wide training needs assessment was undertaken to develop a detailed training plan that was regularly communicated to the organisation.

7.4.14 Employee involvement

Participation in the BEM implementation process was one of the key influential factors discussed in the literature review. Therefore, the interviewees were asked about the level of employees’ involvement in implementation. A number of them referred to the importance of building employee buy-in:

The implementation of a BEM is not an easy task and it would be even more difficult without the effective involvement of employees from all levels and functional areas within the ADP.

Lack of staff involvement makes the BEM implementation process difficult, because they might resist it.

Consulting the employees at an operational and functional level is very important to ensure the successful implementation of the BEM in the ADP.

The above interviewees indicated the importance of and the need for employees’ involvement in the BEM implementation process. A number of others highlighted the level of staff involvement in the process:

I should say that the ADP has taken many steps to improve the employees’ ability and encourage them to participate in the implementation of the BEM; for example, training courses, workshops, brochures, SMS and others. These actions facilitated their involvement and updated employees about the implementation.

The ADP selected its BEM implementation team from across the departments in the ADP, which ensured the involvement of many employees from different functional areas.
The Excellence Committee and executive management of the ADP deployed a multi-functional team which utilised a range of communication and training approaches to implement the BEM.

*The ADP has a hierarchical structure; therefore it needs to create a supportive environment to ensure effective involvement in the BEM implementation.*

The following interviewees explained how the ADP attempted to create the supportive environment within the organisation which was necessary to enable effective BEM implementation. One expressed the view that the reward scheme was attractive and designed to encourage employees to become involved in the implementation of the BEM:

*The ADP developed a very attractive reward scheme and aligned it with people’s participation in BEM implementation, so we noticed a strong involvement of employees in this project... Employees believe that participating in this implementation process will enhance their relationships with upper level managers.*

Others made similar points:

*When the low-level employees see their top managers, like the General Commander and the General Secretary of the Minister of the Interior’s Office, committed to the implementation of the BEM, they want to prove themselves and to be in the area that the top managers are concerned about.*

*ADP employees are now aware of the importance of adopting the best practice model in order to improve their individual and department situations; therefore they try to do something for themselves and their departments by being involved in the implementation of the BEM.*

It seems from the above statements that the ADP believed in the importance of employee involvement; therefore, it encouraged them to participate in this project and to deliver their views to the people responsible for the implementation of the BEM. On the other hand, a number of interviewees stated that despite the efforts of the ADP to create an environment conducive to involvement, its social and bureaucratic culture and military background influenced the level of employee involvement in implementation:
Seniority of rank affects communication between managers and lower levels in the ADP, which in turn influences their involvement; however, some managers have open meetings with their staff to discuss improvements, but the social protocol still influences the situation.

Usually, middle managers in the ADP control the information and who is involved in the decision making process during the implementation of the BEM, because they don’t want to lose their power and position of influence.

As a military structure and system, once you see the leaders in the organisation are committed to the BEM you have no choice but to follow them and be committed, otherwise it suggest that you are resisting the development initiatives.

A large amount of evidence emerged from the interviews that the ADP supported attempts to encourage employees’ participation in BEM implementation, but despite the considerable endeavours to encourage employee buy-in and participation, interviewees identified some organisational barriers which still needed to be addressed, such as those arising from cultural, military and bureaucratic factors.

7.4.15 Employee empowerment

This subsection discusses interviewees’ perceptions of the level of employee empowerment within the ADP. First, they agreed on the need for the delegation of authority to lower-level employees in order to achieve effective involvement and the acceleration of BEM implementation:

*It is useless to ask employees to participate and be involved in the BEM implementation process without delegating to them the authority to take any necessary action.*

*Delegating authority during the implementation process increased their ownership.*

It is notable that the interviewees quoted above recognised the importance of delegation in order to execute work effectively. Another group of interviewees reported favourably on the mechanisms of employee empowerment during the BEM implementation:
The top management, for example the General Commander of the ADP and his General Secretary, have always emphasised the facilitation of employee involvement at operational and functional levels in this project. This was done through giving them the resources and authority needed during the BEM implementation.

Training, seminars and workshops about how to delegate authority in the ADP were delivered to the senior managers to enhance the delegation culture, because we believed that centralisation might make the BEM implementation slow and affect the results.

The ADP developed an empowerment approach and one of the general directors is responsible for ensuring that it is implemented and adopted across the ADP’s departments.

These actions indicate the commitment of the ADP to encourage the delegation of authority and so to facilitate the successful implementation of the BEM. A number of interviewees illustrated the level of empowerment during the BEM implementation project:

Yes, as a sub-team manager, I have the authority to take a decision within my scope ... and this delegation is given to me by the Excellence Committee and the General Commander of the ADP, although I am still required to report my actions to them after that.

All resources and support are provided to us by the top management and the Excellence Committee in order to take any decisions that might be needed during the implementation of the BEM.

There was consensus that the ADP had attempted to improve the level of delegation within the organisation and to devolve away from a centralised decision-making model. From some of the comments, it appears that there were some issues related to the organisational culture and geographical spread of the organisation:

Unfortunately, empowerment is not executed systematically. I mean it is different from manager to manager and it is not cascaded to the lower levels in the ADP.
Some of the employees at the operational level have been indoctrinated to only do what they are told; therefore, they find it difficult to take decisions independently.

The geographical spread of the ADP regional directorates makes the delegation of authority difficult, because most of the important decisions are centralised and must be approved at ADP headquarters.

The executive and upper management teams within the ADP appear to have supported the implementation of employee empowerment and increased levels of delegation, because the organisation wished to move away from the old authoritarian approach. Nevertheless, while there had been an organisational directive to make changes, it appears that some social and cultural barriers persisted and needed to be overcome.

7.4.16 Aligning the BEM with the performance measurement system

Aligning the use of the BEM with the performance measurement system was another of the potential key influential factors examined in this study. There was agreement amongst the interviewees on the importance of this alignment, which would facilitate the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM, exemplified by these remarks:

- Evaluating the BEM implementation process helps us to take appropriate decisions and manage resources and time effectively.

- I think if we identify the measures derived from the implementation process, that will help to monitor its progress.

- Aligning the implementation process with the performance measurement system might save us time and effort, which in turn would make the implementation fully integrated in the ADP.

The above contributions emphasize the importance of the alignment between the BEM implementation and the performance measurement system, to facilitate the successful implementation of BEM within the ADP and make it easier for all employees. Another interviewee explained the current situation of the performance measurement system and the BEM implementation:
First of all, we don’t have a complete and comprehensive PMS, although we have some initiatives like Actuate [a software application], which provides some information about the KPIs that have been identified for the ADP’s strategy.

Other interviewees indicated that the Actuate software could help in the implementation if it was aligned with BEM implementation measures. They referred to such measures which might be utilised, including self-assessment scores and reports by external consultants and the ADEC assessors. It should be noted that there were BEM implementation measures which were not aligned with the performance measurement system currently used within the ADP.

Developing a PMS for the ADP and aligning it with the BEM implementation process facilitated the successful implementation and made it easier for the top management and Excellence Committee to take decisions related to the implementation.

Aligning the use of the BEM with the performance measurement system seems to have been seen as essential for the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM. Interviewees believed that the existing performance measurement system should be aligned with the BEM implementation indicators, which could be used to manage and measure the implementation process.

7.4.17 Aligning the BEM with information systems

The availability of information at the right time and place is considered critical to the successful implementation of a BEM. Therefore, this subsection discusses the extent of the alignment between the ADP’s information systems and its use of the BEM. A number of respondents expressed views regarding the importance of this alignment:

One of the most difficult issues we faced during the implementation of the BEM was to gather related information within the ADP against BEM criteria.

We are a large organisation with many policing functions including crime investigation, traffic, community policing, and other administrative tasks. Therefore, ensuring identification of the sources and methods of gathering information is very important for any improvement initiatives in the ADP.
In addition, a number of interviewees criticised the current situation regarding the availability of information and the role of the ADP’s information systems in facilitating the successful implementation of the BEM:

*When you talk about gathering information and evidence related to the BEM it is mostly done manually in the ADP, not because we don’t have the information systems but because of a lack of an information strategy for the BEM and a lack of understanding of the information sources.*

A similar view was expressed by an interviewee regarding the time wasted by the lack of an information strategy:

*To be frank, what we do to collect information during the implementation of BEM is wasting time and resources. Also, I don’t know why the ADP does not set up a team to study the current situation and try to develop a solution for information problems.*

Other interviewees argued that the information problems in the ADP were related to its geographical spread and that changes to the administrative system were at an early stage:

*A large organisation which is spread over three regional directorates might affect the availability of information.*

*Information could be more available at headquarters than in the regional directorates.*

Others expressed the view that the solution to poor information availability was to provide an integrated system and align it with the use of the BEM:

*Although we are advanced in technology use in many areas, like crime investigation, quick intervention, crime scene and patrolling, there is still a lack of integrated information systems, which makes the collection of this information difficult.*

*Integration between the databases provides accurate information for the implementation of the BEM in the ADP.*
Thus, interviewees suggested that proper alignment of the use of the BEM with organisational information systems would provide greater employee involvement, improve data collection, make the implementation easier and thus enhance decision making during BEM implementation. They believed that information was important to the implementation of BEM but that there were some difficulties arising from a lack of alignment.

7.4.18 Developing an action plan

This subsection considers the last of the supposed key influential factors in the successful implementation of the ADP’s BEM: the development of an action plan. One interviewee expressed a clear opinion of its importance:

*You cannot wait until the end of implementation of BEM to take any necessary corrective actions, because sometimes you have to take important decisions in order to achieve better results.*

Other interviewees explained how the ADP had developed an action plan for BEM implementation:

*We conducted self-assessment against BEM twice a year, then we reported to the Excellence Committee and top management in order to take any necessary action or decisions during the implementation of the BEM.*

*In the first year, we had shortages in many resources and a lack of a systematic approach. As soon as we reported that to the ADP’s development committee and discussed our requirements, they approved them and asked the head of the Excellence Committee to take any decisions regarding them.*

*We use the feedback on the award application, which comes from the general secretary of ADAEP, and from hired consultants. Then we incorporate remediation steps within the action plan to address this feedback, which is also aligned with the department’s annual plan.*

*We allocate an owner for each action plan initiative, who reports to the relevant BEM implementation team manager.*
The above statements show that the ADP had developed action plans for BEM implementation and reviewed them every month during the official meetings of the BEM implementation team and the Excellence Committee. However, some interviewees indicated that the action plan needed to be cascaded and aligned effectively at the corporate level:

As you know, we are new to the excellence journey, so many actions and changes need to be considered. Therefore, the action plan initiatives should be aligned with the ADP’s strategy in order to allocate sufficient resources for these initiatives.

Another interviewee added that there were difficulties in reviewing and measuring the action plan initiatives:

Unfortunately, we don’t have a systematic approach to measuring the action plan initiatives that have been approved by the top management. Therefore, if the action plan was aligned with the strategy of the departmental plan, it would be easier to measure it.

In addition, there appeared to be an issue of overlapping, affecting the implementation of the action plan:

There is some overlapping in the responsibilities of the action plan, because sometimes the owner of the action plan initiatives might not be part of the department that the initiatives relate to.

These contributions by interviewees make it apparent that the ADP’s top management and the Excellence Committee considered self-assessment reports and the feedback on award applications to provide a basis for developing organisational action plans. Support and resources were allocated to implement the action plan, which was developed to address the weaknesses and areas for improvement. However, interviewees identified certain issues, such as a lack of alignment of the action plans with current ADP strategy and the assessment of the action plan, as having the potential to affect the efficiency with which the ADP implemented its BEM.
7.5 Chapter summary

The demographic and contextual analysis of the interview participants’ responses has identified several themes which will be discussed in the following chapter. The purpose of the interviews was to investigate participants’ perceptions of how key influential factors were deployed and their impact on the implementation by the ADP of its BEM. The discussion chapter which follows will cover the themes developed in this chapter, along with those arising from the literature review and the quantitative findings.
Chapter Eight: Discussion

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings based on the questionnaire and interview data reported in Chapters Six and Seven. The thesis as a whole reports an investigation into the efficiency of the ADP’s implementation of a BEM through the use of ADAEP. This investigation was based on eighteen key influential factors which were identified from the literature review as necessary to ensure the successful implementation of a BEM. The present chapter begins with a general discussion of the ADP’s BEM project, then each of the key influential factors is discussed in detail to develop an understanding of how the ADP might improve its the implementation of its BEM and achieve potential benefits which will help the organisation to meet its long-term goals.

8.2 General perceptions of the ADP’s BEM implementation

Perceptions of the implementation of the BEM within the ADP were found to be generally positive; however, interviewees identified challenges to the ease and effectiveness of the initial implementation. Despite these challenges, the organisation has benefited from the promotion of an excellence culture and from taking a systematic approach, along with a recognition that the development of quality improvement in the ADP is an iterative, long-term process.

8.2.1 Reasons for BEM implementation

During the last two decades many national governments around the world have used quality awards to encourage and develop both their public and private sectors (Evans and Lindsay, 2001; Arjomandi et al, 2009; Nazemi, 2010). This trend is also apparent within the Arabian Gulf Region as governments implement NPM approaches to improve performance (Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall, 2001). Recently, Salem and Jarrar (2009) have noted that the UAE government was using its Government Excellence Programme, based upon BEM practices, to develop global capabilities in the country. The initial rationale for the BEM implementation, according to the majority of interviewees, was that ADEC had mandated the implementation of BEM processes within all local government agencies as part of the ongoing development of the public
service sector, through the use of NPM strategies. However, it was noted that some members of the ADP were aware that participation in the BEM process would help the organisation to improve its process management and cost effectiveness, while providing it with an opportunity to undertake benchmarking activities that would respond to stakeholder requirements. ADEC has set a goal for Abu Dhabi City to become one of the top five cities in the world by 2030 (UAE Yearbook, 2009). With ADEC as one of the internal stakeholders and a focus on improved performance, there will be additional demands as external stakeholders’ expectations of the ADP rise through improved interactions between the agency and the general public. ADAEP has the patronage of the current Ruler of Abu Dhabi, Sheikh Mohammed Bin Zayed Al-Nahyan, so there is a compliance culture, according to Mead (2005). Indeed, some interviewees reported that there was a high level of prestige in being involved in the awards programme. Other interviewees perceived the participation of the organisation in the BEM as just an extension of the continuous improvement approach that the ADP had undertaken since the early 2000s, providing another systematic approach which would enable process management to develop organisational performance and quality. ADEC has made participation in the BEM compulsory for all government agencies and departments since 2007, to encourage the establishment of an excellence culture in the public sector. The ADP has developed a rationale to implement a BEM and its employees appeared to be aware of the initial reason and the long-term rationale for supporting continuing participation in the BEM process, including participation in ADAEP.

8.2.2 The extent and ease of BEM implementation

The initial implementation of the BEM in 2007, according to the interview participants, was rushed. One commented, “We did not have enough time to prepare ourselves for such change” and explained that even with a large investment of effort and resources the BEM was not implemented comprehensively throughout the ADP. Other interviewees noted that the ADP should have been expected to have teething problems due to time constraints, the organisation’s size and large geographical spread and the knowledge and skills required for BEM implementation. This supports the view of Carpinetti et al (2010) that large organisations often find it difficult to establish improvement programmes due to their structures. Having identified certain teething problems, the interviewees assessed the level of implementation of the BEM within the
ADP to be between 55% to 70%. It should be noted that estimations towards the lower end of this range were made by members of regional directorates, who reported issues of access to training and resources, which were centralised at ADP headquarters. It appears that the level of BEM implementation that had been achieved was the result of a highly committed minister and ADP executive management team. The ease of implementation, according to interviewees, was hindered by two factors: organisational structure (Bauer et al, 2005) and cultural resistance to change (Jones and Seraphim, 2008). To address these issues, the ADP appears to have undertaken a large amount of training and education, along with resource provision, to encourage participation through the use of rewards. Although some barriers were overcome by the top management’s commitment of resources, interviewees reported that there were still some issues within the agency that they expected to be addressed as the organisation develops in its use of the BEM. Bauer et al (2005) state that there is a correlation between organisational structure and ease of implementation and that larger organisations are likely to face initial difficulties due to their size and the formality of their structure. To address such structural issues, the ADP should consider using a systematic approach to the implementation of the BEM, including the alignment of strategy and operational processes (Jabnoun, 2005; Tarí, 2006b; Tarí 2008).

8.2.3 Benefits of BEM implementation

In response to the questionnaire, 57.9% of respondents expressed the belief that the ADP had positively gained from its participation in the BEM project, with a mean score of 3.95. It was expected from the literature that the ADP would see benefits such as improved team working (Tarí, 2006b), greater awareness of quality among employees, continuous professional and organisational improvement (George et al, 2003), development of a proactive flexible workplace (Farrar, 2000) through empowerment (Tarí, 2006b), cost effectiveness and use of a systematic approach (Tarí, 2006b), leading to an improvement in services and a greater level of customer focus (Miguel, 2006). Interviewees stated that the organisational culture of the ADP had changed and developed to include greater teamwork and a focus on performance quality as the agency provided training and the development of skills. Some interviewees mentioned that the culture in the organisation had changed, as they were now expected to be more proactive and use problem solving; thus employee empowerment (Zairi and Alsughayir,
2011) could be identified, as employees were willing to make decisions which previously they would have deferred to management. This finding is supported by the very high satisfaction rates in a recent customer satisfaction survey (87%) and an employee satisfaction survey (77.4%) (Secretary of Excellence Award, 2009). Additionally, 86.6% of questionnaire respondents identified some personal gain from the ADP’s BEM implementation, which interviewees specified as better training, advancement and job satisfaction. While there were seen to have been improvements in the culture and organisational benefits for the ADP, there were also some criticisms of greater workload, initiative overload or fatigue as well as a lack of outcomes. This last problem may have arisen because individuals failed to understand that BEM implementation would not provide a quick fix but rather would be part of a long-term development process for the ADP. Generally, the interviewees found that the first two years resulted in cultural change and some development of systematic approaches, but felt that the other benefits might be gained over time. Zairi and Alsughayir (2011) argue that BEM adoption is a long-term strategy and that benefits to the organisation take time.

8.2.4 Challenges during BEM implementation

From the interviews and the observation of the activities undertaken in the ADP, it is apparent that there were a few challenges during the implementation of its BEM. The Excellence Steering Committee identified resistance to change as a project risk, responding with the command and control approach that is familiar to observers of paramilitary organisations (King, 2003), in order to increase participation in training and the initial implementation process. Evidence of top management action comes from an interviewee who stated:

*Top management created a sense of urgency for adopting the BEM and it was not optional not to participate in it, but it must be accepted by all employees and showing any non-acceptance could cause problems for the employees, which I think from my point of view is healthy, because sometimes you need to push the change.*

As the ADP became more familiar with the concepts and ideas of BEM, the executive management approach changed. Interviewees reported that there were challenges in
relation to time, regional organisation and integration within the existing operational systems. There had been some cultural clashes in the ADP in changing from the paramilitary command and control culture (King, 2003) to one which encouraged empowerment, but there appeared to be a trend within the organisation towards greater involvement and development, in line with NPM practices.

8.3 Discussion of the key influential factors for BEM implementation

8.3.1 Top management commitment

Ninety percent of the respondents to the quantitative questionnaire stated that top management commitment was a necessary requirement for the implementation of the BEM. There were strong overall responses regarding both perceived ($\bar{x}=4.2$) and actual ($\bar{x}=3.6$) levels of top management commitment. This finding is consistent with the argument in the literature about the importance of top management commitment to the implementation of a BEM (Melan, 1998; Rivers and Bae, 1999; Sakthivel, 2005; Yousaf, 2006; Yaacob, 2009; Carpinetti et al, 2010; Psychogios, 2010; Kumar et al, 2011). Salaheldin (2009) advises that without the support of top management, BEM implementation is likely to fail. The General Director of the Strategic and Performance Improvement Department argued during his interview that without the support and understanding of the executive managers, the implementation of the BEM and the allocation of the necessary resources would not have occurred, because of their authority, their power and their control of the agency’s resources, including its financial assets.

The Pearson correlation analysis showed top management commitment to be strongly correlated with the majority of the other factors. There was a significant association with implementation efficiency (dependent variable) ($r_{(164)}=0.720, p<0.01$). This confirms the findings of a study by Mosadegh-Rad (2005) that there was a positive correlation between top management commitment and successful implementation of TQM. The positive correlation between top management commitment and the other factors—such as understanding the use of the BEM, implementation plan development and aligning the information system with the use of BEM—reflects the importance of illustrating top management commitment to achieve successful BEM implementation in the ADP. These findings are consistent with other studies which have found that the
level of top management commitment is observed in the provision of resources and training and in the approval of improvement activities and policies (Chow and Ha, 2009; Yaacob, 2009; Wahid and Corner, 2009; Psychogios, 2010; Kumar et al, 2011). The study’s findings corroborate statements in the literature that gaining top management commitment during the implementation of BEM in the military and police context (Elshennawy et al, 1992; Moser and Bailey, 1997; Tarí, 2006b) is necessary for successful BEM implementation.

Some interviewees stated that the General Command had demonstrated its commitment in the early stages of BEM implementation. This corroborates a study of the Spanish Police Service by Tarí (2006b), who emphasised that gaining top management commitment in the early stages of BEM implementation was vital for achieving successful results. This was obvious in the ADP, as interviewees stated:

*The commitment shown by top management in the early stages, in a speech by the General Commander and then the announcement of the participation of the ADP in the BEM gives us an indication of the seriousness of implementing the BEM and of the need to be prepared for the implementation battle.*

This in turn facilitated an increase in employees’ willingness to participate effectively in the implementation programme (Kumar et al, 2011).

However, the following interview excerpt presents the reality of police institutions, the organisational nature and work systems, showing how commitment is sometimes compulsory rather than optional.

*Senior managers became involved in the implementation of the BEM because the General Commander told them to do so, therefore some of them can be seen in BEM implementation team meetings, but after the meeting you can’t see their commitment.*

The above quotation provides an indication that commitment to the BEM might vary from manager to manager and that this was related to the interest and motivation which drove each manager or employee to participate. Thus it can be said that there were various types of management commitment: the first was where managers believed in the importance of adopting the BEM and were strongly committed to its success in the
ADP, while the second type was manifested by those managers who participated in the activity to gain from the rewards and benefits that might follow the prize ceremony, in the form of bonuses or extra resources for active participants. The third group of managers comprised those who just wanted to be seen to follow the current trend and practices by attending BEM sessions and pretending to be committed, while not actually taking the trouble to take the action required for their parts of the organisation to implement the BEM. Al Nuaimi (2010:77) identifies this group as those who “don’t do what they say”. Such managers, according to Baxter and Hirschhauser (2004), are merely keeping their image up while waiting for the status quo to return to normal. This attitude is associated with the survival mentality and with a desire to retain organisational position or control of a section. While it can be seen from the findings that there was strong commitment within the ADP at the highest level of management, there were also opportunities within the organisation for weak commitment or ineffective involvement. However, these could be minimised, as one interviewee declared:

Here in the ADP, as it has a military structure and system, once you see the leaders of the organisation are committed to the BEM you have no choice but to follow them and be committed, otherwise it will show that you are resisting the development initiatives of the senior leaders of the ADP.

This assertion reflects the bureaucratic nature of police agencies, their paramilitary structure and employees’ fear of disobeying orders. Tarí (2006b) argues that management commitment has a positive effect on employees’ involvement in police forces, especially among the lower ranks, due to the hierarchical command structure (King, 2003). Since the participation of the ADP in the award was not voluntary, Al Nuaimi (2010) explains that a new ADP reward and punishment system was developed in order to address the existence of non-performers and encourage employee involvement. The new reward and punishment system helped to reduce the number of officers who resisted the change and to increase the efficiency of employees’ participation in the implementation of any improvement initiatives (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

A number of interviewees questioned the level of middle and senior management involvement related to managers’ personal preferences. According to Dedoussis (1993), in Arab organisations, managers’ preferences play a role in their involvement in any
organisational activities. Ali (2008) suggests that the internal interests and preferences of the manager may reflect the organisation’s internal politics and networking associations. The findings of both Al Nuaimi (2010) and the present study concerning the commitment of top management supports Rees and Althakhri (2008), who state that within Arab organisations strong leadership is required to direct employees to follow organisational goals. The manager of the Arab organisation is seen as holding legitimate power, according to Rees and Althakhri (2008), thus activating and encouraging the change. Without this leadership support, change is unlikely to be implemented successfully.

It was noted that two factors—aligning the use of the BEM with strategic planning and aligning the use of the BEM with the organisation’s processes—had no statistically significant correlation with top management commitment, yet a different picture emerged from the interview responses: participants argued strongly that without top management commitment, the alignment with strategic planning and organisational processes would not have occurred. The questionnaire findings were not expected, as the literature (Ahmed et al, 2003; Wahid and Corner, 2009) asserts the necessity for top management commitment and alignment to BEM within the organisation, through its embedding in strategic planning and operational activities. A reason for this discrepancy between the questionnaire and the interview process could be that the questionnaire participants were not as aware as the interviewees of the role of top management in supporting the alignment with organisational processes and strategy. Alternatively, there may have been some confusion over various ADP projects. To address this discrepancy, the ADP may need to consider a better communication strategy for change and increased employee involvement in BEM implementation within the organisation.

8.3.2 Setting a shared long-term vision

Setting out a shared long-term vision for adopting a BEM is vital for the organisation in order to engage employees in its implementation (Kaluarachchi, 2010). Therefore, the literature emphasizes that the vision should be apparent and well communicated throughout the organisation (Das et al, 2011; Smith, 2011). The questionnaire findings indicate the importance of establishing this vision during BEM implementation and this is demonstrated by the fact that nearly 95% of respondents perceived the importance of a vision which is clear and communicated throughout the ADP ($\bar{x}$=4.3). The interviews
supported the questionnaire findings, where interviewees emphasised that without a clear vision of why the BEM was adopted in the ADP they would have had difficulties in implementing the model. Interviewees reported that the head of the Excellence Committee (General Director of HR) delivered the vision of the Commander of the ADP to achieve performance excellence and be an ADAEP prize winner. However, the actual mean score for setting a shared vision ($\bar{x}=3.2$) was lower and more neutral than the perception ($\bar{x}=4.3$). The interview findings suggest that this could be the result of the failure of an inefficient system to communicate the vision to two other regional directorates within the ADP. Employees in the ADP headquarters region were more familiar with the vision, since they had received extensive information and attended workshops on the adoption of the BEM. Carpinetti et al (2010) assert that in a large organisation that has regional offices there are always problems in communicating and distributing the relevant information in a timely and appropriate manner. This communication issue within the ADP could be a result of geographical distance or traditional management control, according to Al Nuaimi (2010).

In general, establishing a shared long-term vision was significantly correlated with the BEM implementation efficiency of the ADP. This is in line with literature review findings (Mosadegh-Rad, 2005; Kaluarachchi, 2010; Das et al, 2011) that a clear vision helps to achieve better results in the implementation of a BEM. Only one factor, organisational structure, was found not to have a positive relationship with setting a shared long-term vision. The literature suggests that the organisational structure, particularly in large organisations, plays a role in the transformation of the vision into understanding and then action (Yousef and Aspinwall, 2000b; Carpinetti et al, 2010). An interview respondent provided evidence of the existence of issues in communication of the vision arising from the organisational structure:

> Although in regional directorates the vision is not clear for everyone, this is related to the lack of communicating the vision to some regional directorates in order to reach everyone there.

Undoubtedly, everyone in the ADP should have a clear vision of BEM adoption. Although this vision was communicated to the implementation team at ADP headquarters, it seems that it was not as clear to the regional directorate employees and this may have affected their involvement in and commitment to the success of BEM.
implementation. To address this lack of clarity within the regional structure, the ADP should investigate the communication process and address regional communication issues.

8.3.3 Understanding the use and purpose of the BEM

This factor had a high mean score ($\bar{x}=4.4$) in the quantitative survey, which indicates that more than 90% of respondents agreed on the importance of understanding the use of the BEM and its purpose in order to implement it successfully within the ADP. Mosadegh-Rad (2006) and Yaacob (2009) support this finding by advising that employees’ understanding of the concepts and use of TQM and BEMs has a positive impact on the success of BEM implementation. Triangulation between the literature, the quantitative study and the qualitative study was achieved with the interview findings, where support for the importance of this factor was mentioned:

*The most important thing is that the top managers should understand and be aware of BEM and its purpose in order to gain their commitment and support.*

This respondent’s comment corroborates the finding of Meers and Samson (2003) that the awareness of TQM and BEMs among top managers increases their involvement and support for the implementation of BEM. The level of awareness of BEM use varied and some managers expected a quick fix, with rapid and tangible results. This expectation of instantaneous results amongst some managers contradicts the finding of El-Bakry et al (2010) that TQM implementation is a long-term journey for any organisation. The ADP’s running of training and workshops attempted to address this negative attitude towards TQM in its managers and to prepare them better for the implementation and use of the BEM. Extensive workshops and training were provided for executive managers and this changed the expectation of rapid results to a recognition that they would come gradually over the next few years. However, interviewees felt that although there had been some changes in attitudes there were still managers who expected quick results and the achievement of good scores for their departments’ participation in ADAEP. This might be a case of over-focus or over-targeting the short-term outcomes which Kassem (1989) observed in Arab managers, arguing that Arab countries also tend to be low in future orientation. A strong training plan is needed within the ADP to ensure that all employees have an enhanced level of understanding; whilst managers may have key
performance goals for their sections and individual performance goals related to achieving good scores for participation in ADAEP, upper and middle managers need to remember that the process does not provide a quick fix.

In terms of the actual understanding of the use of BEM and its purpose in the ADP, the questionnaire responses gave a mean of 3.5, which indicates that the level of understanding was considerable in the ADP. However, the interviews raised the issue of the efficiency of the approach that was taken to explaining the concept of the BEM, its usage and its purpose, in the ADP’s regional directorates. As one interviewee stated, “when we started initiating the implementation of BEM in regional directorates, we found difficulties in explaining the model to the employees”, which reflects the difficulty of extending the workshops and training courses to cover all levels in different regional directorates across the ADP. Yaacob (2009) notes that in large organisations many employees are excluded by the approaches taken to implementing TQM and the above interviewee’s response could be an example of this exclusion. When the BEM implementation team is based within the headquarters of a large organisation, even though its members may originally be from regional bases, they are likely not to interact effectively with operational employees in the regional offices, according to Carpinetti et al (2010). There is some evidence of demarcation between the headquarters and the regional locations, but the ADP has recently formed an excellence section in each regional directorate in order to enhance coordination with headquarters during BEM implementation. Carpinetti et al (2010) recommend that to ensure coordination with regional offices the organisation should create joint responsibilities between the implementation teams and the regional office structure. The ADP, with its centralised organisational structure, needs to monitor and address the potential demarcation which has been identified. Failure to control or improve the communication and interaction between the regional offices and headquarters could lead to resistance to change in the organisation (Wu and Wu, 2011). Further research is needed to understand the organisational culture within the ADP and to ensure that future change and development are not undermined by employee resistance.

Mosadegh-Rad (2006) found that there was a strong interaction between understanding the use and purpose of a BEM on one hand and the eventual efficiency of its implementation by the organisation on the other. Similarly, the study found that there
was a highly significant correlation of $r_{(164)}=0.713$, $p<0.01$. The interview findings confirm that a better understanding by top managers who are committed to the use of BEM in the ADP would help to gain and maintain the commitment of employees and managers during implementation. This in line with Meers and Samson (2003) and with Wahid and Corner (2009), who suggest that the lack of awareness of TQM among managers creates resistance to BEM implementation. Other factors that are highly correlated with understanding the use and purpose of the BEM include the implementation plan, with a score of $r_{(164)}=0.755$, $p<0.01$. Without the understanding of the usage of the BEM and the RADAR approach, it would be difficult to develop the implementation plan and associated timescale to ensure that the expected targets will be met, according to the interview participants, which is a similar point to that made by Yaacob (2009). Providing sufficient training and aligning BEM use with the information system are two factors which were positively correlated with understanding the BEM and its purpose, with scores of $r_{(164)}=0.667$, $p<0.01$ and $r_{(164)}=0.804$, $p<0.01$ respectively. Vermeulen (1997) found that poor training and inefficient communication of information caused a lack of awareness amongst the employees of an organisation. The interviews revealed that there were some issues with the training process and BEM awareness amongst ADP employees, particularly those in the regions. It was suggested by some interviewees that more integrated and easily accessible information systems would have helped to provide the information required for BEM implementation in a timely manner, which would in turn increase the awareness of employees in the ADP’s regional directorates.

8.3.4 Stimulating a change culture

Overall, this factor scored a perceived mean of 4.35 and an actual mean of 3.54, which is consistent with the advice in the literature that it is important to stimulate the organisational culture before and during the implementation of a BEM (Mosadegh-Rad, 2006; Davies, 2007; Zu et al, 2010, Smith, 2011). Within the ADP, Al Nuaimi (2010) advises that if the higher and middle ranked officers had not been convinced, they would not have accepted the improvement process and therefore the organisation would not have obtained the desired results when implementing any new initiative. The statistical results for this factor indicate that Q9, on preparing and stimulating the employee culture during the implementation of the BEM, had high means both in the
actual category ($\bar{x}=3.92$) and the perception category ($\bar{x}=4.31$). These means indicate that there was a strong consensus that the ADP had put initiatives in place to develop the employee culture within the organisation to address noncompliance, as described by Al Nuaimi (2010). However, although the perception mean ($\bar{x}=4.10$) for Q10 suggests that clarifying the change process was perceived to be important, the actual mean ($\bar{x}=3.15$) is almost neutral in nature. Although the ADP had undertaken awareness and education programmes about the changes, including the implementation of the BEM, and employees agreed that the ADP had done so, it appears that the message delivered to the employees was not what they needed. Employees agreed that the ADP had advised them about the change process, but felt that it had not been effectively explained how they were supposed to execute the new procedures and implement the processes within their departments. This response indicates that there was some uncertainty about the change process and potential issues with communicating the message from the organisation. Rees and Althakhri (2008) assert that Arab societies have a low tolerance for change and new ideas, due to strong uncertainty avoidance. As one respondent stated:

In 2007, BEM was not well known in the ADP, and most of top management and employees had not heard about the BEM, therefore introducing it here was not an easy job and needed lots of stimulation and change.

Such uncertainty avoidance is likely to cause resistance to change; thus employees need to be vigorously convinced of the purpose of the change, as it can be perceived as a threat, so many will prefer the status quo (Rees and Althakhri, 2008). Al Nuaimi (2010) states that the ADP has implemented the strategic thinking approach in order to address the inadequacy or inaccuracy of information supplied to employees, to convince them of the need for change and to embed the cultural changes needed to improve the BEM.

Support for the existence of this conflict between participants’ responses and the questionnaire seems to be provided by a similar discrepancy amongst the interviewees: one indicated that there had been a strong communication process within the organisation to embed the new BEM and the organisational cultural aspects of this model, while another indicated that the training and awareness sessions about the excellence culture were limited to specific groups and teams. The respondent who identified the limited access to the process also identified issues in cascading ideas
about the excellence culture through the ranks and departmental sections within the organisation, due to the closed implementation network. The respondents who were concerned about the stimulation of the cultural change to support implementation suggested that there was a top-down approach to encourage managers to change their management style and to support the cultural requirements. However, this faced some resistance in the regional locations, as there appeared to be a time lag with respect to the training sessions. To address this issue the ADP had established an excellence branch within each directorate, to coordinate and stimulate the development of the organisational culture for quality within the directorate. Al Nuaimi (2010) states that while there were some initial difficulties in the implementation of education and training about the cultural changes, the ADP has actively worked to overcome these with further improvement processes, which are now providing a valuable return to the organisation as formally resistant officers are participating in the BEM. The ADP has developed a policy to address the resistance to change that is found within Arab organisations, according to Al Nuaimi (2010: 71), which includes “working to ensure all staff are convinced of the need to change, creating a strategic team to lead the change process and follow its implementation, setting precise and substantive goals, maintaining job security, and applying change in a gradual manner.” As the interviews for this study were conducted after the collation of Al Nuaimi’s (2010) study, evidence of these policy changes is confirmed in the interviews, where the respondents identified the presence of a further development in the ADP policies and practices to develop the organisational culture for quality though education and training, the embedding of practices into standard operating processes and an increased role for strategic planning.

The negative response about the closed network of participants came from a regional directorate employee and the new excellence sections may go some way towards addressing his concerns. Further research into the implementation and monitoring of the administration will be needed to confirm that this issue has been effectively resolved in all cases.

There was a significant correlation between stimulating a change culture and BEM implementation efficiency ($r_{164}=0.589$, p<0.01). Mosadegh-Rad (2006) states that cultural change has a significant impact on implementation efficiency and the findings support this. Rees and Althakhri (2008) suggest that the culture within the organisation
and the wider societal culture, such as that found within an Arab organisation, will strongly influence the implementation of change and that whether the change process succeeds or fails will depend on how the organisation has addressed the issue of cultural receptiveness. The highest correlation with this factor was that of top management commitment ($r(164)=0.605$, $p<0.01$), which confirms the findings of previous studies that without strong leadership commitment to impose the change and encourage employee buy-in, change will not happen (Rees and Althakhri, 2008), particularly in the UAE (Makrakis, 2002). The uncertainty avoidance in Arab organisations is often associated with a blame culture (Al-Faleh, 1987) and this was mentioned in an interview:

*In our society, taking risks [making a change] means there is a possibility of mistakes and errors, therefore people do not want to be blamed for making these mistakes.*

Jones and Seraphim (2008) argue that blame is a cultural characteristic which is unfavourable to the implementation of TQM within an organisation. Al-Faleh (1987) highlights the fear within Arab culture of accepting responsibility or blame when actions are not successful. The interview and questionnaire findings indicate that the ADP, through repeated policy changes, education and training programmes, was beginning to succeed in its attempts to overcome a strong cultural influence and thus support the implementation of the BEM.

While the literature suggests that there should be a strong correlation between stimulating a change culture and aligning the use of the BEM with organisation processes, the present study found this not to be significant ($r(164)=0.099$, $p=0.205$). According to Oschman et al (2006), the stimulation of culture is evidence that TQM is being embedded within organisational processes, yet it appears from the Pearson correlation that ADP questionnaire respondents did not believe that it was important to integrate the BEM with the current operational processes. When TQM is not aligned with the organisation’s existing processes, according to Asif et al (2009a), there is no motivation for the change to be implemented and the organisation returns to the status quo. The alignment of TQM with organisational processes makes employees more tolerant of the change and thus stimulates the cultural development that TQM is attempting to bring about (Asif et al, 2009a).
It is apparent that stimulating a change culture was an important factor in supporting the development and implementation of the BEM within the ADP; however, many factors should be considered as necessary to support this factor. Without strong top management commitment, there is no pressure on upper and middle ranked officers to change their existing management processes and activities. It was strong leadership by the executive which pushed this group to participate in the implementation of the BEM. Communication is another factor which underpins the stimulation of culture and leadership. Without the leadership of executives expressing their vision of the change and its purpose, the employees would be unlikely to engage in changing the status quo. The lower ranks were said by some of the interview participants to be resistant to change and Al Nuaimi (2010) also found a high level of resistance within the ADP. With better communication of the organisational message and greater education in the concept and process, the change would not be so frightening and thus the lower ranks would be more likely to receive the message that their support was required in adopting the new organisational culture and its associated BEM into their daily work activities (Tarf, 2006a; Asif et al, 2009a).

8.3.5 Establishing an excellence steering committee

The questionnaire results demonstrate that the Excellence Steering Committee was perceived ($\bar{x}=4.3$) as a major factor in the successful implementation of the BEM within the ADP. This perception was supported by the actual mean of 3.55, confirming the view of Baidoun and Zairi (2003) that in the early stages the excellence steering committee leads and manages the BEM implementation and ensures the provision of resources. The interviews supported the statistical analysis by highlighting the Executive Committee and its organisational power dynamics as a key reason why the implementation was working smoothly and the BEM was becoming embedded within the ADP. Al Nuaimi (2010) reports that the Commander of the ADP directed that key officers headed by a general from the Human Resources Department should form an excellence committee to steer and develop the implementation strategy and practices for the BEM. This high level of organisational commitment is described by Thiagarajan et al (2001) and Chow and Ha (2009) as a critical factor in successful implementation of a BEM, as the committee members or its chairperson must have the power to influence decision making, access resources and set organisational policies and practices. As the
General Director of the Strategy Management and Performance Improvement Directorate stated in his interview, “The members of this committee were selected on the basis of their power, knowledge and ability to communicate the ideas.”

There was a strong correlation, $r_{(164)}=0.592$, $p<0.01$, between BEM implementation efficiency and the setting up of an excellence steering committee. Chow and Ha (2009) and Varkey and Antonio (2010) emphasise the important relationship that having an appropriately focused excellence steering committee has on the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of a BEM. These authors argue that the steering committee is responsible for developing the strategic direction for the adoption and appropriate plans to enable the BEM implementation within the organisation. In line with published research, the highest correlation between the setting up of such a committee and the other factors was found to be with the implementation plan factor, at $r_{(164)}=0.736$, $p<0.01$.

Various interviewees supported this finding by suggesting that without the award steering committee and the BEM implementation team, the organisation would not have achieved its performance goals and long-term strategic development aims. It appears from the interviews that the Excellence Committee undertook a six-monthly approach to self-assessment, to review the BEM and to identify what further actions were required to address and advance its implementation within the ADP. The issues that the implementation team encountered may have arisen from regionalisation and/or the centralisation of key members due the hierarchical organisational structure, which is a common feature of paramilitary organisations such as the ADP.

The BEM implementation team’s difficulties in communicating the new approach to the lower levels of the ADP may indeed have been a result of the strict hierarchical structure within which police officers work as members of a paramilitary organisation (Brunetto and Wharton, 2005). King (2003) suggests that the hierarchical nature of the ranking systems (command and control) found within such organisations can be the primary cause of difficulties in communicating any new organisational values, initiatives or strategic directions.

Although the Excellence Steering Committee utilised staff from all three regional directorates in the implementation team, there was some criticism from the interview
participants, who identified communication difficulties within the lower levels of the BEM implementation team, leading to delays and difficulties in expressing feedback and progress reports. Varkey and Antonio (2010) and Smith (2011) argue that it is essential for a steering committee to communicate well with all levels of the organisation to establish the appropriate mindset for the implementation and use of the BEM. To ensure that the lower-level ADP staff members understand the Excellence Steering Committee’s goals and objectives, their communication should be strengthened (Al Nuaimi, 2010).

8.3.6 Implementation plan

It appears from the questionnaire that there was strong agreement on the importance of the BEM implementation plan (94%). This is consistent with contributors to the literature (Tarí, 2006a; Zhao et al, 2008; Tarí, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010) who assert the need for an accurate, well developed plan prior to BEM implementation. The interview respondents also supported the literature and questionnaire findings, stating that without effective preparation through the use of planning, the implementation of the BEM in a large organisation such as the ADP would not have been successful.

However, although there was some support among interviewees for the ADP’s BEM implementation plan, there were also criticisms, related to employee empowerment, communication and the ability to participate in the development of the plan. It should be noted that the critics were regional staff members rather than those working at the headquarters. This critical view could be the reason why in the questionnaire the actual mean ($\bar{x}=3.64$) was lower than the perceived mean ($\bar{x}=4.416$). Tarí (2010) and Asif et al (2009a) argue that it is important for employees to participate in the development of the implementation plan. The power distance found in Arab countries could have been a reason why managers kept employees out of the development of the plan, according to Mead (2005). Within a large organisation with a ranking structure it can be difficult to enable all employees to participate in implementation planning. Al Nuaimi (2010) reports that some employees in the ADP did not participate in the planning since they did not have enough information about the initiative to support the process and action. Interviewees said that the ADP imported expert knowledge through the use of consultants to lead the development of the implementation plan. It can be seen that although there were initiatives for developing the BEM implementation plan for the
ADP, there should have been more engagement of employees and representatives from regional directorates. Indeed, it has been suggested that there should have been greater consultation within the regional directorates during the development of the BEM implementation plan.

The correlation analysis for this factor reveals a significant relationship between the implementation plan and the efficiency of the BEM implementation in the ADP, at \( r_{164} = 0.668, \ p < 0.01 \). Interviewees supported this analysis in that without good planning they believed the ADP would not have achieved good results in the ADAEP Gold Award in 2009. Abdullah (2010) argues that successful TQM implementation is dependent on effective planning. The correlation analysis also reveals that the implementation plan was highly correlated with top management commitment \( (r_{164} = 0.873, \ p < 0.01) \) and the establishment of the Excellence Steering Committee \( (r_{164} = 0.736, \ p < 0.01) \). This relationship is supported by the interviewees who reported that the development of the implementation plan by the Excellence Committee and implementation team was forwarded to the ADP’s top management in order to gather resources, approval and operational support. This is in line with the contention of Varkey and Antonio (2010) that the development of the plan is usually under the supervision of top management and excellence committees.

In contrast, there was an insignificant correlation between this factor and aligning BEM use with the strategic planning process: \( r_{164} = 0.067, \ p = 0.393 \). This result was not expected, as the literature indicated that these two factors would affect each other and have a strong relationship. Varkey and Antonio (2010) suggest that the plan should be based on a holistic examination of how the workday processes of the organisation would be affected by the intended changes. Asif et al (2009a) argue that to embed quality management within the institution, active and effective planning of change is required. The lack of correlation could be explained by organisational culture, the low level of participation among lower ranks, management actions or a lack of knowledge of the process, but this is not clear. Further research would be needed to identify the cause of this discrepancy in the correlation analysis.

The interviewees mentioned that the implementation plan was developed in the early stages through the use of self-assessment against the BEM criteria. This assessment was conducted by the BEM implementation team with the assistance of imported skill
holders in the form of experts and consulting organisations (Quazi and Padibjo, 1998; Samuelsson and Nilsson, 2002).

From this self-assessment, the BEM implementation team developed a plan incorporating all the timescales, resources, milestones and phases, in line with the literature (Chin and Pun, 2002; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). However, the interviewees identified a need for further communication of the implementation plan across all of the regional directorates, suggesting that there were some weaknesses in the communication process. Varkey and Antonio (2011) and Tarí (2010) strongly advise organisations to have a detailed communication plan which informs and encourages all employees to participate in the implementation process.

There was a suggestion by some interviewees that the planning was done in an ad hoc manner and there was some dissatisfaction with the plan which was communicated by the Excellence Committee and the BEM implementation team. A review of the ADP’s published plans found that its writing style was open ended to allow for flexible adaptation in the various regions. The negative interviewee perceptions of the published plans could be a symptom of the high uncertainty avoidance that Mead (2005) and Rees and Althakhri (2008) describe in Arab cultures. It is emphasised that lower ranking employees within Arab organisations expect managers to provide highly detailed plans for changes to organisational processes and practices, according to Rees and Althakhri (2008). Yet the implementation plan needs to be flexible to enable the organisation to address any future unpredictable challenges (Abdullah, 2010) and this may be why there was some ambiguity in the wording of the published plans. According to some interviewees, the initial plan was very inflexible, leading to difficulties in the implementation, so the plan was rewritten to make it more flexible and to enable the various departments to implement it effectively within their own working environments. The inflexibility of the initial plan could be attributed to the fear of failure, to centralisation or to a lack of trust and confidence within the ADP during the early introduction of the BEM, while the later changes in style could be seen as evidence of advice from excellence consultants in the development of the implementation plan.
8.3.7 Supportive organisational structure

A total of 95% of the questionnaire respondents believed that a supportive organisational structure was necessary for the implementation of the BEM in the ADP. It should be noted that both means, perceived ($\bar{x}$=4.38) and actual ($\bar{x}$=4.05), were high, so it appears that this was a strong factor affecting the ADP’s BEM implementation. There was a statistical correlation between organisational structure and the efficiency of implementation: $r_{(164)}=0.194$, $p<0.05$. Oschman et al (2006), Cagnazzo et al (2010) and Smith (2011) state that a supportive organisational structure impacts positively on the BEM implementation process.

Interviewees identified the old organisational structure as unsupportive of the new direction that the ADP was taking, so during 2003 to 2004 the organisational structure was changed. Within the ADP, according to Al Nuaimi (2010), it was decided that it was necessary to change the structure as part of the development programme started in 2001. The new 2004 organisational structure addressed the weak points identified in the old ADP structure and Al Nuaimi (2010) notes further developments since then, as the organisation has identified better collaborative fits within the agency.

Interviewees said that if the old organisational structure had remained, there would have been issues due to the centralised decision making and the rigid communication process. Comments about the old structure reflect the traditional hierarchal approach to policing, where there is little self-responsibility, some contradiction in authority at times and a strong central bureaucratic approach. Brunetto and Wharton (2005) emphasise that policing organisations traditionally have a strong executive to formulate policies, which are then transmitted as orders to the subordinate ranks. Al Nuaimi (2010) states that the ADP wanted to be a more flexible organisation and thus addressed the lack of homogeneity between functions and processes to enable the implementation of improvement initiatives.

The interviewees indicated that the ADP’s top management had a strong influence on the implementation of the BEM and other improvement initiatives. Structural change within a paramilitary organisation cannot occur without the support of top management, according to Moser and Bailey (1997). Al Nuaimi (2010) states that the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior led the changes to the organisational structure of
the ADP and its development. The correlation analysis supports the literature by identifying a strong relationship between the structure of the organisation and top management commitment in the ADP: \( r_{(164)}=0.213, \ p<0.01 \).

The current ADP structure, according to interviewees, provided clearer levels of communication, responsibilities and greater activities where cross-functional teams were employed. Al Nuaimi (2010) claims that the new ADP structure also provided more responsive and efficient services for the stakeholders. One of the key changes to the organisational structure was a flattening to three levels in the hierarchy (Al Nuaimi, 2010). Yusof and Aspinwall (2000) argue that there should be a flattened hierarchical structure, as this helps to reduce the layers of management while facilitating and increasing the visibility of management to improve the information flow and access by the subordinate levels within the organisation. Interviewees reported that there were fewer levels of management and that decision making was more immediate than previously. These changes are likely to have alleviated the managerial problems identified by Rees and Althakhri (2008) as arising from poor planning, inadequate information systems and centralised authority. With the decentralisation of command and control in the regional areas, the local managers would be able to use the information they have for their areas and address the planning for their needs.

Interviewees found that the current structure was more compatible with the ADP’s BEM implementation, highlighting the establishment in each General Directorate of an Excellence Section, whose function was to supervise the implementation of the BEM within the directorate, based on the model criteria which it was responsible for implementing. These excellence sections also followed the improvement action plan and coordinated with the Strategic and Performance Improvement General Directorate at headquarters, responsible for implementing the BEM across the ADP. The current organisational structure appeared to support the implementation of the BEM, although there were some issues related to the contextual environment of the ADP, as some interviewees noted the impact of the paramilitary organisational culture on the new development. A number of interviewees believed that the hierarchical approach of the chain of command and the culture of responding to orders had created difficulties in the control of decision making and the attitude of the lower ranks towards taking on responsibility, particularly where officers had a number of years experience with the
ADP prior to 2003. This is in line with the finding of Cunningham and Kempling (2009) that paramilitary organisations have strong organisational cultures which can be highly resistant to change, due to the existence of specific fundamental values and norms related to their nature and environment.

Parsons et al (2011) warn that within paramilitary organisations the chain of command creates control issues and in the ADP there could be some conflict between the control requirements and improvement initiatives such as the BEM. Douglas and Judge (2001) state that the impact of the control type of organisational structure facilitates the integration of quality into processes, while an alternative organisational structure such as exploration provides an empowered workplace to adapt processes towards change. The ADP should consider utilising both structural approaches—control and exploration—to provide greater organisational integration of the BEM.

Some interviewees identified a tendency towards hierarchical decision making and the communication of orders to the lower ranks within the ADP, due to the organisation’s nature. This communication structure is related to the paramilitary context (Schafer, 2009), to its historical top-down authoritative approach and to cross-command communication and working. Therefore, the issues identified in the interviews may be the result of the power dynamics within a paramilitary organisation and the fear amongst the lower ranked officers that they would not be treated fairly or that the change could affect their performance evaluation and thus their future promotion opportunities. Giacomazzi and Brody (2004) assert that during change within policing organisations it is important that upper and middle management implement the new values into their day-to-day actions and do not just spout the new organisational values. This means that management should engage in and encourage communication between all, not just on the current initiatives, so that the lower ranks become comfortable in talking to management. It may be that lower ranking officers are not willing to approach higher ranking managers with new initiatives to improve their workflow processes, because they do not feel comfortable in doing so.

Some interviewees identified a time lag between the regional locations and headquarters. Carpinetti et al (2010) argue that large organisations with regional locations may face issues in the dissemination of information to the regional areas. To address this issue, Mead (2005) advises that the organisation needs to make sure that
there is a comprehensive communication action plan, including the use of some decentralisation of management processes. The time lag within the ADP may have arisen from either of two causes: the large regional areas and the strong hierarchy of the paramilitary organisation. To address the barriers that these factors potentially create for the ADP, some decentralisation of control should be undertaken (Jabnoun, 2005; Mead, 2005) however, Parsons et al (2011) argue that control needs to be exercised carefully, because while it may facilitate BEM implementation, it could just as easily be used to undermine the change process.

8.3.8 Developing internal capabilities

The development of internal capabilities was perceived by the questionnaire respondents to be very important, with a mean of 4.34, while the actual mean was 3.38. Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009) emphasise that internal organisational capability is a significant factor during the implementation of BEMs, as they provide the knowledge and drive to overcome contextual problems (Pyo, 2000). By developing the internal capabilities of an organisation as part of BEM implementation, Carpinetti et al (2010) suggest that the organisation can overcome the obstacles that further iterations of the implementation process may encounter in the future.

Some interviewees felt that with the BEM implementation the ADP would always be managing change and that it needed to have operational readiness, i.e. the skills and resources available to enable the change and to meet the challenges of becoming a modern world-class policing organisation. This operational readiness is the internal capability within the organisation that is available to be called upon to overcome challenges, barriers or obstacles. Ford (2007) argues that improving capabilities is related to the readiness for change that allows the organisation to be more successful during the implementation of improvement initiatives.

The correlation results support the interviews and literature (e.g. Ford, 2007; Cagnazzo et al, 2010) with a strong correlation of $r_{164} = 0.659$, $p<0.01$ with the dependant variable of BEM implementation efficiency in the ADP. A key theme from the interviews and the questionnaire was that the ADP had developed its internal capabilities in order to cope with future challenges and this recent development of BEM implementation. Interviewees noted that the ADP had begun its organisational development programme.
in 2002. The interview findings are consistent with the claim of Al Nuaimi (2010:64) that the ADP is a “pioneer organisation in the fields of development and change, strategic planning, comprehensive administrative organisation, and community participation.” Therefore it may be suggested that the ADP is working towards improving its internal capabilities to reach the goal of providing the best possible service to Emirati citizens and its other stakeholders.

The top management commitment factor had a strong correlation with developing internal capabilities, at $r_{(164)}=0.778$, $p<0.01$. An organisation undergoing change, according to Ford (2007), requires top management commitment while building its internal capabilities. There needs to be some patience, as long-term change and development do not occur quickly (Ford, 2007; El Bakry et al, 2010). Some interviewees stated that they had received whatever resources they needed to implement the BEM as a result of top management support and commitment to its implementation and the winning of awards such as ADAEP.

The ADP addressed the development of internal capabilities in the initial stages of developing and implementing the BEM by importing knowledge and skills in the form of experts and consultants, according to interviewees. Cagnazzo et al (2010) and Samuelsson and Nilsson (2002) advise organisations that they may need to bring in outside skill sets, knowledge and experience to enhance their internal capabilities during the initial stages of implementing a BEM. The ADP took the action of hiring consultants to address its limitations (Al Nuaimi, 2010) and to develop a holistic overview of the organisation (Al Mashari et al, 2010).

It appears that the development and implementation of the BEM by the ADP in 2007 was the continuation of earlier development initiatives, according to some interviewees and Al Nuaimi (2010). This ongoing development had been supported by organisational restructuring to reflect new strategic goals, along with the expert advice of consultants to develop knowledge and skills in the organisation. This development would not have been possible without the commitment of top management through funding and organisational support.

However, it appears from the interviews that there were some issues affecting the internal capabilities. One interviewee stated:
Some decisions are taken at ADP headquarters and are implemented effectively, therefore you see the ISO, restructuring, business process re-engineering, training and others are located more in the headquarters than in regional directorates. This reflects the lack of a systematic approach in our development programme.

The disparity between headquarters and the regional directorates could create capability issues for the organisation in the long term. Greater continuity is required throughout the organisation; Tárí (2010) recommends that the entire organisation should participate in the implementation of the BEM. To sum up, the respondents’ views provide an indication of the readiness of the ADP to implement changes and to adopt new programmes like a BEM, although on the other hand, some interviewees emphasised the need for a systematic approach to ensure that the improvement programme reached the other regional directorates. It could be that the ADP’s wide geographic spread caused difficulties in the initial implementation, but in time the regions may be better integrated. It is recommended that the ADP ensure that there is a systematic approach to the development of internal capabilities throughout the entire organisation.

### 8.3.9 Aligning BEM with the strategic planning process

Statistical analysis of the questionnaire data show that the perceived mean for aligning BEM use with the strategic planning process was 3.97. This was a strong response, but responses in the actual category were more neutral, suggesting that the BEM was possibly facing a lack of alignment with the strategic planning process, as one interviewee said:

> However, we are not fully aligning the corporate strategy with the implementation of the BEM, as all resources are still allocated and commitment from top management is explicit to everybody here. But at the same time I understand this happened because the top management wants to win the award and achieve excellent performance; therefore they focus fully on it.

This lack of alignment is contrary to what is recommended by the literature, which emphasises the need to align BEM implementation with the strategic planning process (Breja et al, 2011; Davies, 2008; Conti, 2001). To maintain implementation of the BEM in the practices and actions of the organisation, Oschman et al (2006) advise that TQM
should be integrated and linked to the long-term goals of the organisation through the strategic planning process. Brunetto and Wharton (2005) note that in policing organisations the implementation strategy is formulated at the top level, due the hierarchical nature of such organisations. The importance of senior management making sure that the BEM is aligned with organisational strategies is stressed by Abdullah (2010). Therefore, aligning BEM implementation with strategic planning reflects the top management commitment and the transfer to lower-level staff in a strongly hierarchical organisation. The lower ranks will not buy in without upper management leadership. As evidenced below in the response of an interviewee, the need for clear alignment is particularly strong in geographically large regional organisations.

*In the ADP, as a very large organisation, sometimes you find it difficult to implement something like ADAEP across a wide geographic area and implement it in a consistent way. Aligning the corporate strategy with the BEM implementation strategy might be helpful to overcome these difficulties.*

There was a strong correlation ($r_{(164)}=0.177$, $p<0.05$) between the efficiency of BEM implementation and the aligning of its use with the strategic planning process. However, there was also some contradiction between the literature, interviewee responses and the questionnaire correlation analysis. The analysis found no correlation between the alignment of the BEM with the strategic planning process and top management commitment ($r_{(164)}=0.99$, $p=0.206$) or its alignment with the information systems ($r_{(164)}=0.76$, $p=0.334$). Berman et al (1995), Tarí (2006b) and Breja et al (2011) all identify the necessity for this alignment and argue that having alignment with the organisational goals through the use of strategic planning will increase commitment amongst the management team. Additionally, when there is alignment between BEM implementation and strategic planning, according to Lagrosen (2000), organisational information systems will have accessible data to support the implementation.

Interviewees reported no systematic alignment of the BEM with the organisation’s strategic and operational policies and practices, yet they did affirm that the organisation had taken some initiatives to generate alignment. One interviewee reported that although there was no systematic approach, it was still discussed in the meetings of the Strategic Development Committee, which provided all the resources needed for the implementation. To further embed the use of the BEM within the strategic planning
process, it would benefit the ADP to take a systematic approach. Further research is
needed to investigate how the ADP can align the use of its BEM with its strategic
planning activities.

8.3.10 Effective communication

According to the questionnaire participants, there was a strong perception (\(\bar{x}=4.45\)) that
effective communication was important to the implementation of the BEM. However,
the actual mean of 3.34 appears to be fairly neutral in nature. Tarí (2010), Varkey and
Antonio (2010) and Smith (2011) all highlight the importance of having strong and
effective communication during the implementation of a BEM, as it ensures information
exchange, increases participation and enables the empowerment of employees.

The interviewees, when asked about communication, agreed that it was an important
factor enabling the ADP’s BEM implementation, as it enhanced the implementation
process and increased knowledge within the organisation. It also provided opportunities
for lower ranks to provide feedback to management and the executive. Some of the
interviewees felt that the communication process provided a clear picture of the future
directions of the ADP and how BEM was implemented within the organisation,
identifying a number of communication channels used by the organisation to transmit
this information. These interviewees confirmed the perceptions of the questionnaire
respondents and their evidence provides triangulation with the literature.

The correlation analysis also supports the interview findings, the importance of
communication having a strong correlation of \(r_{(164)}=0.569, p<0.01\) with the efficiency of
BEM implementation. It should be noted that all the factors had a correlation with
effective communication during BEM implementation, the majority of these being
found to have two-tailed significance at \(p<0.01\), signifying a strong correlation. It was
expected from the literature that communication would interact with all factors
(Brunetto and Wharton, 2005; Carrière and Bourque, 2009; Varkey and Antonio, 2010)
as part of the change process.

The structure of the organisation, according to the interviewees, impacted on the
effectiveness of the communication process. They stated that the organisational
restructuring process was undertaken to improve communication in the ADP. King
(2003) and Brunetto and Wharton (2005) emphasise that the nature of the organisational
structure has a strong impact on effective communication, since communication is more likely to be effective when there are fewer layers within an organisation and when managers are encouraged to provide communication which engages with lower level employees, so that they are active participants in BEM implementation. Within a paramilitary organisation, this is how managers can overcome the restrictions that the hierarchical command structure can create and enable lower ranking officers to participate in developments (King, 2003). The correlation between effective communication and supportive organisational structure was $r_{(164)}=0.165$, $p<0.05$.

The drive to change the ADP organisational structure was led by the executive management (Al Nuaimi, 2010). Many interviewees said that without the support of top management the systems and activities to support communication would not have been resourced. There was a correlation between effective communication and top management commitment, $r_{(164)}=0.634$, $p<0.01$. Oschman et al (2006) and Kaluarachchi (2010) state that top management commitment is needed to enable and encourage the entrenchment of quality initiatives through communication at all levels and processes in the organisation. An interviewee from Human Resources identified that the organisational communication plan should be presented to top management for their support, as everything that top management was involved in was implemented smoothly within the ADP.

According to interviewees, it was through the use of the new information technology in which the ADP had invested that communication was undertaken, along with some traditional communication strategies. They said that it was the ease of access to information on the BEM implementation which helped units and individuals to develop skills and knowledge. Al-Nuaimi (2010) reports that there has been a large input of resources to develop the infrastructure within the ADP, including information technology. The use of a multi-channelled approach to communication, according to Varkey and Antonio (2010), will help the development of a regular and accessible communication chain within an organisation. King (2003) suggests using a multi-channel approach that has electronic infrastructure such as websites, as it enables the lower ranks to access the information that they feel they need, not just what their managers believe they need. This is supported by a strong correlation between effective communication and information systems of $r_{(164)}=0.605$, $p<0.01$. 
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However, interviewees identified two issues with the ADP’s communication processes: the specific nature of the paramilitary command structure and the effects of living and working in an Arab culture with its own norms and cultural mores. Firstly, the command structure of a paramilitary organisation means that communication is top down and King (2003) states that the traditional command and control approach to policing is a key barrier to the development of effective communication. This is because when a message is sent down from the top there is often little or no opportunity in a traditional policing organisation to send one back up to management from the lower ranks. For effective communication to occur, there needs to be a two-way process, according to Smith (2011), to enable the challenges and problems within an organisation to be overcome. The second issue is related to the strong tradition within Arab culture of respect for elders or betters and a high power distance (Hofstede, 2001). According to Rice (2003), if the lower ranks in an Arab organisation are not encouraged to communicate and to feel that their contribution is seen by the organisation to be valuable, they will be less likely to participate in communication with management. Rees and Althakhri (2008) warn that if there is ineffective communication between management and employees there is likely to be a high level of resistance to change within Arab organisations. Dale (2003) advises that management must both win the hearts and minds of the employees and listen to employee feedback to ensure engagement in change.

Interviewees complained that senior management in some areas of the ADP only communicated when and with whom it was necessary to maintain their power and position within the organisation, while others identified issues between regional locations when compared to headquarters. It appears that the geographical location of the officers influenced their perceptions and experience of communication within the organisation. The geographical location was not just their actual physical location within the organisation but also their hierarchical access within the ADP. This could be why the actual mean from the questionnaire was neutral ($\bar{x}=3.34$). To address these issues, it is recommended that the organisation develop a holistic organisational communication plan that utilises information technology and enables subordinate members of the organisation to gain access and provide feedback on specific issues. Employees should also be encouraged to participate in providing feedback and this can be linked to other processes in the ADP such as staff performance management.
The ADP is still undertaking strategic development and the BEM is likely to encourage more communication between units and the various levels within the organisation as it becomes embedded. Communication is very important for all of the factors in the study, but it appears that contextual and cultural factors have a particular impact and to address this the ADP needs to ensure that the organisational environment is supportive of two-way communication.

8.3.11 Aligning BEM with organisational processes

The questionnaire results demonstrate that the integration of the use of the BEM with organisational processes was perceived positively ($\bar{x}=3.78$), but the actual mean was only 2.71. Such a difference between perception and reality is likely to have some implications for the ADP. The literature advises that it is important for a BEM to be integrated with organisational processes (Oschman et al, 2006; Asif et al, 2009a; Breja et al, 2011). This discrepancy with the literature was reflected by the interviewees, who felt that the two should be aligned but that they were often not. Several interviewees identified duplication in processes and additional work as a result of the lack of alignment between the ADP’s processes and its use of the BEM. Asif et al (2009a) argue that when an organisation aligns a BEM with its processes there is a reduction of duplication and a better fit of activities as a result of less overlapping of daily tasks. Tarí (2006a) advises that employees should be consulted to help identify where better alignment can be found and thus increase their involvement in BEM implementation.

The correlation analysis found that implementation efficiency was strongly correlated with the BEM’s integration with organisational processes ($r_{(164)}=0.260, p<0.01$). The interviewees also identified a discrepancy between the perception that integration was important and what was actually happening, particularly in the regional divisions. It was also expected from the literature that top management commitment (Nwabueze, 2001; Brunetto and Wharton, 2005), understanding the use and purpose of the BEM (Tarí, 2006a) and organisational structure (Tarí, 2006a) would all have significant relationships with integration of the BEM with organisational processes, although there was no correlation between these factors and integration in the correlation analysis. The interviewees reported that the process management approach in the ADP was in its infancy and as a result there was some confusion and a lack of skills affecting how the organisational sections could integrate the BEM into the workplace activities and
processes. This confusion could be due to a lack of understanding and training to support the process management and a failure to understand how to fully integrate the implementation of the BEM into all activities within the organisation. To address this issue the ADP should consider further training and education, and the establishment of a specific team to provide advice and knowledge on how to align the BEM with the various organisational activities and processes. By the use of a knowledge sharing team, the lessons learnt from one regional location could be shared effectively and efficiently with directorate offices in other locations.

Greasley (2004, citing Mahed and Zairi, 2000) warns that it may take some time to integrate a BEM into an organisation through the use of mixed process design and implementation practices. As respondents indicated in the interviews, the ADP’s BEM was in its infancy. In a case study of the UK police, Greasley (2004) identified up to 30 processes which might have to be mapped onto a single activity or process, due to the duplication of functions at the headquarters and divisional or regional levels. Duplication may also be caused by a large geographical area (Greasley, 2004) and this could be one of the factors impacting on the development of integrated practices within the ADP, as the organisation covers a very large geographical area. The key reasons for undertaking the streamlining of functions are to reduce workloads and to improve the cost efficiency and utilisation of time resources within the organisation. Some of the interviewees reported that the BEM had created additional workload and taken up more time. By streamlining processes and integrating the BEM with them, this wastage of resources could be reduced, thus also reducing employees’ resistance by making their workflow easier.

8.3.12 Developing a recognition scheme for BEM implementation

The questionnaire respondents strongly perceived the need for the ADP to develop recognition guidelines aligned with its existing reward system ($\bar{x}$=4.25). Jiménez-Jiménez and Martínez-Costa (2009) note that individuals are often motivated by external factors such as financial gain or organisational recognition; therefore an organisation will benefit from aligning rewards with strategies. Baidoun and Zairi (2003), Salaheldin (2009) and Das et al (2011) all comment on the importance of having employee motivation and participation through the development of appropriate reward and recognition programmes to support BEM implementation. Al-Zamany et al (2002)
found that in an Arab culture (Yemen) the lack of rewards and appropriate recognition for employees was a barrier to the introduction of quality management and to undertaking the changes required to implement a BEM. In the present study, interviewees were generally agreed on the importance of linking rewards to participation in the BEM implementation.

The correlation analysis established that there was a fairly significant correlation (r(164)=0.589, p<0.01) between this factor and the implementation efficiency of the BEM in the ADP. Interviewees reported that the reward guidelines within the ADP were attractive for all staff members but that they found it difficult to engage in this opportunity, as not everyone who participated in the implementation received recognition. Other interviewees complained that reward and recognition were not cascaded down to the lower ranks and this could potentially explain why this factor was found to have an actual mean of 3.47, which is just above a totally neutral response. It is acknowledged by Allen and Kilmann (2001) that when the reward system is aligned with a change such as the implementation of a BEM, it can make a positive contribution.

There were also close relationships with other factors which had a strong two-tailed correlation with the alignment of the rewards system to the BEM implementation process. The highest correlation was with top management commitment (r(164)=0.680, p<0.01). Interviewees explained this relationship by noting that once any programme gained the support of the ADP’s top management it would be taken seriously at all levels of the organisation. Strong support throughout the organisation following top management involvement is a demonstration of the strong command and control structures which are found within paramilitary organisations (King, 2003) and of the cultural response whereby there is great respect for leadership or seniority (Rice, 2003). Some interviewees mentioned that the recognition and reward guidelines that were developed to support the BEM implementation process were approved by the General-in-Command of the ADP. These guidelines then became attractive to ADP members, enhancing their willingness to be involved in BEM implementation. This willingness is reflected in a strong correlation between developing recognition and employee involvement (r(164)=0.446, p<0.01), which was also supported by interview data. Wahid and Corner (2009) and Das et al (2011) found that an effective rewards system
increased employee involvement and thus the likelihood of a successful implementation process, as resistance to change was reduced (Bhat and Rajashekhar, 2009).

While there was much positive commentary in the interviews in relation to the reward and recognition programme, there were also some critics who said that the rewards did not cascade down the ranks and into the regions. Others complained that the reward scheme did not include all those who participated, omitting those individuals who may have participated in the BEM implementation process, often producing excellent work and performance, but who were not officially recognised as members of the implementation teams. These missing rewardees were often found in regional locations. Moser and Bailey (1997) argue that each individual’s effort needs to be recognised in order to maintain support for a newly implemented BEM. The lack of an effective rewards system can create an organisational impediment (Allen and Kilmann, 2001), as the disenfranchised members of the organisation start to resist the change, and it can have serious consequences including making the change process unsuccessful (Buchanan and Huczynski, 2010). To address employee resistance and to increase participation, it is recommended by Allen and Kilmann (2001) that the reward programme for the implementation process should be aligned with the organisational strategy. To address the issues raised by the interviewees, the ADP should consider developing a tiered reward programme so that the lower ranks receive official recognition. Having different levels of reward would give the sub-teams and team managers the opportunity to offer recognition to those who had supported and worked on the implementation, even if they were not officially part of the BEM implementation team.

8.3.13 Providing sufficient training

It seems that there was consensus among the questionnaire participants as to the perception that sufficient training was provided by the ADP concerning the BEM implementation process (\(\bar{x}=4.45\)). Interviewees also emphasised the importance of the training courses in BEM implementation and some identified this as a new initiative for the UAE public sector and in particular for the ADP. Therefore, a continuous training programme was found to be useful, as interviewees believed that it helped to improve the skills they needed throughout the BEM implementation. This finding is consistent with contributions to the literature to the effect that training should be timely and
appropriate to the activity being undertaken (Oschman et al, 2006; Agus et al, 2010; Koh and Low, 2010). The correlation analysis revealed a strong correlation ($r_{164}=0.650$, $p<0.01$) between training and the efficiency of implementation, supporting interviewees’ comments. There were also strong inter-factor correlations between understanding the use of the BEM and its purpose, employee involvement, top management commitment and simulating the organisational culture for change, thus corroborating the findings of the literature review. Fernandez and Rainey (2006) and Kumar et al (2011) state that top management has a strong influence on the provision of training, because if managers support an initiative they will be more likely to provide the necessary resources, thus motivating employees to participate (Shum et al, 2008; Salaheldin, 2009) by developing their knowledge and skills (Tari, 2008; Baidoun and Zairi, 2003), in turn stimulating the organisational culture to support the change (Psychogios and Wilkinson, 2007). According to some interviewees, the training had had a positive impact on the organisation, increasing people’s awareness, commitment and involvement in the BEM implementation process. Interviewees reported that regular, scheduled training was provided, which enabled them to engage when appropriate with their operational requirements (Tari and Juana-Espinosa, 2007).

However, there were also some issues with the provision of training, as the interviewees in the regional areas reported that the level of training was not sufficient for their needs. One interviewee identified certain groups who received preferential access to training provision, such as ADP headquarters staff and BEM implementation team members, which made it difficult for employees not in these groups to access sufficient training for their needs. Another interviewee complained that the ADP did not have a comprehensive training approach for all employees. Shum et al (2008) assert that employees should attend regularly scheduled training, which Tari (2010) recommends should be extensively detailed. It is suggested by Wahid and Corner (2009) that the human resources department should monitor and develop a comprehensive delivery response to organisational training needs. One interviewee suggested that the training department should undertake a training needs analysis for the whole of the organisation in relation to the BEM implementation and ensure that the training plan for the organisation was aligned with the implementation by providing BEM training as part of the official training schedule and training information, rather than running ad hoc, on-demand courses as different teams and areas requested training sessions. The
discrepancy related to the training processes within the ADP may explain why the questionnaire responses for provision of sufficient training had a fairly neutral actual mean of 3.42.

It seems that the ADP was committed to the provision of training and that this had a beneficial impact on the organisational implementation of its BEM, but there were issues related to the systematic approach towards training. These may have been due to the large geographical area covered by the ADP or the lack of an integrated training approach. To resolve the regional access problem it is recommended that the ADP develop an integrated BEM training plan which schedules regular regional training sessions so that those who believe that they need to update or extend their knowledge of BEM feel able to access suitable and sufficient training provision.

8.3.14 Employee involvement

There was a strong perception (\(\bar{x}=4.40\)) among questionnaire respondents that employee involvement was important for successful BEM implementation. This finding supports the literature review (e.g. Asif et al, 2009a; Cheung and To, 2010; Varkey and Antonio, 2010). Bhat and Rajashekhar (2009) argue that employee involvement is essential for successful BEM implementation; if employees are not involved, resistance is liable to develop, along with a desire to maintain the status quo.

Interviewees recognised that the BEM was a new idea and that it would not be easy to implement it in the ADP. They interviewees said that without the commitment and involvement of the employees, they would not have been able to implement the BEM and it would have been very difficult for the ADP to participate in ADAEP. This recognition of the importance of employee involvement corroborates the correlation analysis, which found a strong correlation \(r_{(164)}=0.457, p<0.01\) with the efficiency of BEM implementation. Tarí (2006b) found that in a policing environment employee involvement was essential for the organisation to achieve effective BEM implementation.

According to the interviewees, the ADP had taken steps to encourage employee involvement, such as selecting the BEM implementation team members from across its organisational departments, ensuring top management commitment and participation, providing attractive motivational rewards and training courses, which increased
employees’ awareness of the appropriateness of the BEM while encouraging them to grasp the attractiveness of participating in the implementation process. These comments support the findings of Jaros (2010), who identifies four key factors which motivate employees to participate: a good organisational rationale for departing from the status quo, organisational leadership which supports the proposed change, attractive benefit opportunities for employees and the ability in the organisation to make the change. There were also strong correlations between employee involvement and the following four factors: empowerment \( (r_{(164)}=0.553, \ p<0.01) \), training \( (r_{(164)}=0.472, \ p<0.01) \), rewards \( (r_{(164)}=0.446, \ p<0.01) \) and communication \( (r_{(164)}=0.443, \ p<0.01) \).

Conversely, the correlation analysis found that two factors were not correlated: aligning BEM use with strategic planning and developing an action plan. The lack of correlation with developing an action plan was unexpected, as the BEM implementation process included undertaking self-assessment and developing an action plan to implement changes in order to improve the performance of the unit or departmental section. Tarí (2006b) advises that the self-assessment process should be undertaken because it engages employees in implementation, while enabling the department or section to align its operational processes with the organisational strategic plan and to develop action plans to follow up on the limitations identified in the self-assessment. The lack of correlation between these two factors could be a result of some issues which the interviewees identified: the hierarchical command structure of the ADP and the way lower ranks perceived seniority.

For example, one interviewee complained:

\textit{The communication style in the ADP is influenced by a hierarchical structure with many layers and ranks, which affects employees’ involvement because they can’t discuss their ideas with the higher level freely.}

It should also be noted that in paramilitary organisations, according to King (2003), Rice (2003) and Clark (2005), the lower ranks expect to follow orders and not to make decisions for themselves, due to the command structure. This could be a reason why employees’ questionnaire responses regarding their actual involvement were found to be neutral (\( \bar{x}=3.06 \)). Yousef (2001) also states that in the Arab world, top managers control and instruct employees with very limited involvement, in order to maintain their power.
and position within the organisation. Interviewees said that middle management controlled the information and who was involved in the BEM implementation process.

While the ADP was found to have adopted approaches to encourage employee involvement, the nature of the organisation and the cultural influence of the society in which it operated was seen to affect employee involvement. The ADP should consider monitoring and investigating how further changes can be made to the organisational culture to enable the BEM to become truly embedded in its practices.

### 8.3.15 Employee empowerment

According to the questionnaire responses, there was a strong perception of the importance of empowerment to support the BEM implementation process in the ADP, with a mean of 4.45. The need for employee empowerment to enable effective implementation is emphasised by Baidoun and Zairi (2003), while Mosadegh-Rad (2005) argues that the failure to empower employees increases the probability of failure when implementing quality changes such as a BEM. The interviewees felt that asking the employees to participate and become involved in BEM implementation was useless without providing them with the necessary authority to make operational and functional decisions to support the BEM implementation process. The correlation analysis found a strong correlation between empowerment and implementation efficiency, $r_{(164)}=0.428$, $p<0.01$. This finding was further supported by the interviewees when they discussed the associated factors affecting employee empowerment, such as top management commitment, training, stimulation of the organisational culture for change and the facilitation of employee involvement. These comments are supported by the questionnaire cross-factor analysis, which found a significant correlation between the empowerment factor and top management commitment ($r_{(164)}=0.331$, $p<0.01$), provision of sufficient training ($r_{(164)}=0.529$, $p<0.01$), stimulation of a change culture ($r_{(164)}=0.291$, $p<0.01$) and employee involvement ($r_{(164)}=0.553$, $p<0.01$). These findings from the questionnaires and interviews corroborate those reported in the literature for top management commitment (Psychogios and Wilkinson, 2007; Zairi and Alsughayir, 2011), provision of sufficient training (Talavera, 2005), stimulating a culture for change (Morgan and Murgatroyd, 1994; Zairi and Alsughayir, 2011) and employee involvement (Yaacob, 2009).
Nevertheless, there was a more neutral response in the questionnaire, with a mean value for actual empowerment of 3.24. Potentially, this neutral response could be the result of a lack of a systematic approach to empowerment, as identified by interviewees who stated that it depended on the manager and often did not reach into the lower levels of the organisation. It should be noted that Psychogios and Wilkinson (2007) argue that an authoritarian leadership style, such as the traditional operational command structure found within paramilitary organisations (King, 2003), is likely to affect the level of employee empowerment. Additionally, Jones and Seraphim (2008) found that in the UAE, employee empowerment was a little understood concept for management and employees, which they believed to cause problems regarding the role of empowerment within organisations undertaking quality improvement strategies. Aycan et al (2007) assert that within Arab society there is a view that employees prefer management to make decisions because this is the natural order of society, so the employees in some units may have been unwilling to engage in empowerment. The ADP needs to ensure that everyone understands the role of empowerment and how it can be applied in the ADP. Yaacob (2009) found that inexperienced employees might not understand the boundaries and might be unwilling to make decisions, feeling that they were overstepping organisational and cultural boundaries in relation to the roles of their managers. He advises organisations to address this issue both by monitoring for employee malfeasance and by encouraging employees to take decisions.

It should be noted that interviewees made comments about large regional coverage and suggested that the existing organisational structure was influencing the levels of empowerment found in the regional directorates because of the centralised decision-making at ADP headquarters. Carpinetti et al (2010) found that large organisations often encountered difficulties in enabling empowerment in subsidiary offices. To address this over-centralisation of the decision-making process, Mead (2005) advises organisations to decentralise decision making where possible and encourage regional empowerment and local control. This issue is reflected in the correlation analysis, as there was no correlation between the current organisational structure and empowerment. This suggests a need for the organisation to address its structure to support BEM implementation.
Aligning BEM with the performance measurement system

The questionnaire participants perceived that the alignment of the BEM with the performance measurement system was an important factor ($\bar{x}=4.25$) in BEM implementation. The literature (Kanji and Sa, 2003; Tarí, 2006b; Fryer et al, 2009) suggests linking the performance measurement system with use of the BEM to ensure that it is embedded within the organisation’s activities, while Yousef (2006) asserts that by such a linkage the organisation can ensure that there is the capability to make the required changes. This is supported by the correlation analysis, which found that implementation efficiency was strongly correlated with the alignment of BEM use with the performance measurement system: $r_{(164)}=0.366, p<0.01$. This factor was correlated with all the other factors, which indicates that it was very important for the entrenchment of the BEM within the ADP.

The actual mean from the questionnaire was neutral, at 3.44, which interviewees justified by noting that the performance measurement system was under revision or further development and that the current system was only one of employee performance appraisal. They said that since there was no comprehensive performance measurement system in the ADP, no key performance indicators had been developed for the BEM implementation measures. Thiagarajan et al (2001), Tarí (2006a) and Cockcroft and Beattie (2009) all agree that organisations should develop key performance measures to facilitate the implementation of a BEM. When the ADP performance measurement system is developed, it is recommended that the ADP establish performance indicators and processes which embed the strategic plan along with the BEM, so that there is a consistent focus on the use of these strategies within the organisation. Cagnazzo et al (2010) advise that if the existing performance measurement system is not fit for purpose it should be replaced.

There were some performance measures in place for the BEM implementation, according to the interviewees, which included a semi-annual self-assessment score, external consultant reports and the ADEC assessor’s jury reports. Kanji and Sa (2003) and Bauer et al (2005) suggest that the self-assessment score could be used as a progress measure for the BEM implementation. Interviewees said that although the self-assessment scores were used, they were not integrated with the current measurement procedures within the ADP. As a result there was some negativity towards the BEM and
the processes associated with the model, because individuals felt that the increased workload created workplace stress amongst employees. Interviewees recommended that the performance measurement system and the BEM should be aligned to help timely decision making while improving the monitoring of the implementation.

Measuring and monitoring of its implementation are very important to the success of the ADP’s BEM. To improve efficiency and effectiveness with the current development of an organisational performance measurement system, it is recommended that KPIs for individuals and units support the embedding and use of the BEM in the organisation.

### 8.3.17 Aligning the BEM with information systems

The alignment of the BEM with the ADP’s information systems was also perceived by questionnaire participants as an important factor to enable successful implementation ($\bar{x}=4.3$). These findings are supported by authors who argue that it is important to align the use of a BEM with organisational information systems (El-Bakry et al, 2010; Koh and Low, 2010) to enable the BEM to become a standard organisational practice. The interviewees provided triangulation by stating that without the use of information systems they would not be able to gather the required information related to the ADP’s BEM implementation. These comments reflect the importance of information systems being accessible, having timely content and being available to all areas of the ADP to support implementation. Martinez-Lorente et al (2004) and Bush et al (2009) highlight the importance of aligning the use of information systems to support the implementation and use of a BEM. In the correlation analysis it was found that implementation efficiency had a strong correlation with the alignment of BEM use with information systems, at $r_{(164)}=0.693$, $p<0.01$, and this result reflects the influence of this factor on the efficiency of BEM implementation in the ADP.

When information systems are linked to or aligned with the BEM, according to Martinez-Lorente et al (2004), this helps to embed quality management within the organisation. If the information systems support the BEM it will help top management and employees to participate while supporting the decision-making processes within the organisation. The correlation analysis found that the strongest correlation for information systems was with understanding the model and its purposes, at $r_{(164)}=0.804$, $p<0.01$, while that with top management was $r_{(164)}=0.776$, $p<0.01$. Interviewees
supported this correlation, as they said that the ADP management had implemented and developed the information systems to enable empowerment, involvement, communication and effective decision making. Bush et al (2009) emphasise that top management should support the development of information systems which facilitate the implementation of BEMs within the organisation.

An information system can be used to support organisational communication (Bush, 2009; Koh and Low, 2010). From the correlation analysis there is evidence of a positive relationship between the two factors: $r_{(164)}=0.605$, $p<0.01$. Interviewees also emphasised that communication was supported by the use of information technology systems and that the organisation would benefit by aligning its BEM with the its information systems. Wahid and Corner (2009) acknowledge that in a large organisation such as the ADP it is necessary to align the BEM with the information systems, as it helps to cascade information through the dispersed organisation, while Mead (2005) argues that such a system can diminish uncertainty avoidance while providing consistency and continuity throughout the whole organisation. If the ADP were to align the use of its BEM with its information systems and its strategic planning process, the power dynamics and cultural influence of hierarchy could be reduced, as lower ranking members would not be dominated by their managers and all would feel that they had the information they required to understand their roles within the organisation.

In the correlation analysis there were two factors which were not found to have a correlation with aligning the use of the BEM with information systems: supportive organisational structure and aligning BEM use with the strategic planning process. Interviewees stated that there was currently no strong alignment strategy between the information systems and the use of the BEM, a shortcoming which should be addressed. Additionally, interviewees were critical of the lack of alignment between the BEM and the strategic planning process, complaining that in some cases the workload had increased, as the information system was not capturing the data required to enable easy reporting. With alignment of the BEM to the strategic planning process, Lagrosen (2000) argues that information systems are developed which support access to the required information so that the BEM becomes embedded in all daily practices and activities undertaken within the organisation. Shouroki (2009) states that the organisational structure influences or enhances the information flow as well as the
context, when employees communicate and network with each other. The actual mean from the questionnaire was neutral ($\bar{x}=3.00$) for aligning the use of BEM with the information systems and this could be related to the influence of organisational structure or possibly the strategic planning process. Another potential reason is the large and diverse geographical region in which the organisation operates, as interviewees reported differences between regional locations and ADP headquarters in access to and availability of information. This lack of alignment could have a long-term impact on morale, causing resistance to changes that the ADP may seek to implement in the future. One way to address this would be to ensure improved communication and regional participation in developments through information systems integrated with BEM use.

8.3.18 Developing an action plan

According to the literature (Samuelsson and Nilsson, 2002; Tarí, 2008; Carpinetti et al, 2010; López-Fresno, 2010), developing an action plan is a key factor influencing BEM implementation and this was borne out by the strong responses to the questionnaire items regarding perceptions of this factor ($\bar{x}=4.35$). Similarly, this was a strong theme in the interviews, where participants described the development of an action plan as a key influential factor in the BEM implementation process. Tarí (2008) warns that without action planning, improvements are unlikely to occur, thus undermining the improvement process and creating an opportunity for the change to fail to achieve the organisational goals. There was a correlation between the development of action plans and the efficiency of BEM implementation at $r_{164}=0.192$, p<0.01. As one interviewee said, “action plans kept the managers and Excellence Steering Committee updated about the BEM implementation process, which in turn accelerated the making of decisions and corrections during the implementation”. This statement supports the argument of López-Fresno (2010) that it is essential for organisations to use an action plan to address specific issues, to ensure the successful implementation of a BEM.

Tarí and Madeleine (2010) state that top management commitment is required to support the development and implementation of organisational action plans, so that the necessary resources are supplied to support the implementation process. An interviewee said that the presence of the ADP’s top executives who were involved in the Excellence Steering Committee ensured that there was top management support through allocation
of the necessary resources to enable the BEM implementation process. Additionally, it appears from the questionnaire that there was triangulation support for this, as the actual mean ($\bar{x}=3.74$) for developing action plans was one of the strongest responses to the actual category in the questionnaire. Interviewees reported that there was a feedback processes from the external consultants, who undertook site reviews to ensure that the BEM criteria were met. The self-assessment results, the consultant feedback and the BEM Excellence steering committee feedback were all incorporated into the organisational action plan. The identification of areas for improvement is recommended by Ford and Even (2006) and Tarí (2008) as the basis for developing the action plan. Although these processes were identified within the ADP to help the development of the action plan, the interviewees reported some teething problems, which they said had been resolved by improved access to resources through top management commitment to the Excellence Steering Committee. In the future, to overcome problems with the action plan, the interviewees recommended that it should be cascaded through the organisation by aligning it with the ADP’s strategic planning process. Van der Wiele and Brown (1999) and Tarí (2006b) argue that when the action plan is aligned with the organisational strategic planning process there is better facilitation and management of resources to support the execution of the action plan.

Another difficulty with the action plan identified in the interviews concerned the measurement of its implementation. Interviewees recognized that there was an unsystematic approach and a failure to provide appropriate measures for them to monitor the implementation and execution of the action plan. While the correlation analysis indicated a strong correlation ($r_{164}=0.351$, $p<0.01$) between the action plan and the performance measurement system, it must be remembered that the existing system in the ADP focused on the individual, not on the unit or department. The interviewees, by referring to the need for a systematic approach, were echoing Tarí (2006b), who advises that the action planning process should be aligned to performance measurement. The ADP is currently developing a new performance measurement system and it is recommended that among its components should be indicators covering the action plan for individuals, units and departments, providing a systematic approach to performance measurement. The absence of a systematic approach across the ADP may explain why there was also a poor correlation response between developing an action plan and developing internal capabilities. Some interviewees commented that in the regional
locations they had felt isolated or had not observed a consistent approach to BEM implementation. The questionnaire correlation of $r_{(164)}=0.149$, $p=0.57$ between developing internal capabilities and developing an action plan may have arisen because the negative responses of regional personnel cancelled out the positive responses of headquarters staff, thus producing a neutral correlation. It seems that the ADP had developed and followed an action plan based on self-assessment and feedback but that there were still some factors having a negative impact on the effectiveness of the execution of the action plan. These appear to have been related to its alignment with the strategic planning process and to the need for a systematic approach to ensure consistency throughout the ADP.

8.4 Conceptual roadmap for the implementation of BEM

From the research process and the discussion of the findings in comparison with the literature, 18 key factors influencing the implementation of BEM have been identified, tested and examined in the context of a UAE public sector organisation. The study has identified a strong correlation between each of the factors and the efficiency of BEM implementation by such an organisation. Through triangulation it was found that these key influential factors could be grouped into three stages: commitment, implementation, and measurement and sustainability. During the first stage, that of the organisation’s commitment to adopting a BEM, there was found to be a need to gain top management commitment and support in order to strengthen awareness of the need for a BEM and to clarify the purpose of its use by the organisation. Additionally, a consistent vision for the organisation needs to be developed, along with a well resourced excellence steering committee that is able to communicate the necessity for the change to the organisation. The committee needs top management support and participation to enable the development of an implementation plan which is adequately resourced and to invest it with the necessary authority to undertake changes to the organisation’s structure, processes and activities.

The factors affecting the implementation phase fall into two subgroups, integration (hard factors) and adaptation characteristics (soft factors), which the organisation needs to consider as part of the BEM implementation process. According to Zairi and Alsughayir (2011), the soft factors are related to people and their behaviour, exerting socio-cultural influences on the organisation, while the hard factors cover the tools,
process and systems within the organisation. Bauer et al (2005) and Davies (2008) assert that integration is very important to achieve successful BEM implementation and that this integration can be supported by aligning the use of the BEM with the organisation systems, structure, strategy and processes, which are considered to be hard factors.

To ensure that consistency is maintained vis-à-vis organisational requirements at the measurement and sustainability stage, the implementation needs to be monitored and where necessary addressed through action planning. The grouping of the factors means that they have an accumulative impact on each other and the communication factor has a strong interaction at all stages of the implementation process. BEM implementation follows a continuous iterative process to develop the excellence of organisational performance. All phases are dependent on communication across and throughout the hierarchical levels of the organisation. Figure 8-1 is a conceptual roadmap for implementation of BEM developed for the present study, which illustrates the phases of the implementation strategy and the interrelationships between the 18 key influential factors.
Figure 8.1: Conceptual roadmap for the implementation of a BEM
8.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of the research and demonstrated the triangulation between the literature, questionnaire and interview results. The ADP was found to have undergone changes during the implementation of its BEM and to have encountered challenges as well benefits from this implementation. This chapter has discussed how these challenges affected the ADP as well as providing an understanding of BEM implementation within an Arab public service organisation. The experience of the ADP can be used by other UAE agencies and by other interested parties in the Gulf region, in their own implementation best practice management models. The eighteen key influential factors investigated in this study were all correlated with the efficiency of BEM implementation, so failure to address any one of them may impact on the success of any strategy for the implementation of improvement initiatives. A conceptual framework has been developed to describe the phases of BEM implementation and the interrelationships among the eighteen key influential factors; therefore, all these factors should be addressed together in a systematic manner when implementing a BEM, this being dependent on the culture, nature and environmental context of the organisation concerned.

The final chapter, which follows, summarises the thesis and draws conclusions.
Chapter Nine: Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the research study. The key findings are summarised, along with contributions to the theory and practice of business management that have been made and developed from the research process. The limitations of the research are discussed and suggestions are made regarding potential areas for further research.

9.2 General overview of the research study

Business excellence models provide an attractive improvement strategy for many governments around the world, which have found that these models have enabled their agencies to develop operational performance excellence. The use of BEMs is seen as a best practice option for government agencies to meet the service provision expectations of key stakeholders, especially among the general public. In addition to customer satisfaction and service quality, there are other benefits for the public sector, including improved productivity, reduced cost and greater operational effectiveness.

Over the last two decades, national governments have established their own quality awards, which are mostly based upon the well known BEMs, such as EFQM or MBNQA, in order to promote best practice while developing an excellence culture within the public service sector. The use of BEMs is a long-term strategy, as it is not an easy task and is a rather complex process to undertake. It appears from the literature (Chapter 4) that there is high rate of failure in BEM implementation. Zairi and Alsughayir (2011) assert that these failures are hindered by a lack of clearly defined key influential factors that provide guidance regarding the implementation strategy to enable successful BEM implementation. The present study found that successful BEM implementation was linked to the extent to which the case study organisation adopted and addressed the 18 key influential factors which were identified in Chapter 4.

While there is much literature on BEMs, there is relatively little on their implementation, especially in public sector organisations (Tarí, 2006b). This deficiency is exacerbated by a lack of similar cultural and environmental contexts to that of the case study organisation, the Abu Dhabi Police. The study attempted to contribute to
knowledge and understanding in this area of BEM studies and the key influential factors associated with the implementation process, by undertaking a holistic and extensive review of the existing BEM literature. From this review process, 18 factors were identified as having an influence on the implementation of a BEM within a public sector organisation. Apart from the systematic literature review, the research methodology incorporated a mixed-methods data collection process within the ADP. It examined the operation within the ADP of the key influential factors identified from the literature using interviews with executive managers, BEM implementation team managers and members of the Excellence Steering Committee, along with a questionnaire survey of 300 ADP employees. The purpose of this data collection process was to gather information to address the following research objectives:

- To identify the key influential factors in the successful implementation of a BEM in the public sector.

- To investigate how the key influential factors were deployed during the BEM implementation in a public sector organisation.

- To investigate how these factors affect the implementation of the BEM.

- To assess the degree of criticality of the presence of the key influential factors in enabling successful BEM implementation.

- To identify the difference between the perceived and actual implementation of the key influential factors related to BEM implementation.

The interview findings were developed from a thematic analysis of the interview data, which facilitated the exploration of the respondents’ perceptions of the BEM implementation process in the ADP. In conjunction with this qualitative investigation, a statistical analysis of the quantitative data was undertaken. A paired-samples t-test was utilised to determine differences between questionnaire respondents’ perceptions and the actual situation of the key influential factors within the ADP’s BEM implementation process. The correlation between the presence of the factors and the efficiency of BEM implementation in the ADP was investigated using a Pearson’s correlation coefficient analysis. The findings of the data analysis were presented in Chapters 6 and 7, while Chapter 8 provided an integrated discussion of these findings and of the relevant
literature, leading to the development of a conceptual roadmap of the key influential factors for the successful implementation of a BEM by a public sector organisation. The remainder of the present chapter provides an overview of the key findings, discusses the contribution of the study to the theory and practice of public sector management, examines the limitations of the study and suggests opportunities for further research.

9.3 Key findings

This study has identified a paucity of literature on the BEM implementation process in public sector organisations. Its attempt to bridge this gap has led to the conclusions presented below.

1. Eighteen key influential factors were identified which impact on BEM implementation and its efficiency within a public sector organisation.

   These key influential factors were identified from a comprehensive review of the literature on BEM implementation, then investigated in the context of a single case study. The analysis found that within the ADP all 18 key factors influenced the efficiency of BEM implementation.

2. All the factors were found to be perceived as important in the ADP’s BEM implementation, but respondents reported that they were actually present to a lesser degree than their perceived importance would indicate.

3. There was variance in the levels of the actual presence of the key influential factors in the ADP’s BEM implementation.

   The ADP was found to have implemented all of the factors to some extent, but there was still variance in the level of BEM implementation, which was found to be due to the Arab culture, the organisational structure and the environment of a police organisation. There needs to be further investigation in the ADP into why the regional directorates had different levels of BEM implementation to those found at ADP headquarters.

4. Although their level of importance varies, the key influential factors can be grouped in terms of commitment, implementation and measurement, where each factor plays a significant role in the phases of BEM implementation.
To ensure successful BEM implementation, the first stage, commitment, needs top management support to clarify the purpose of the BEM, whereby a clear vision of the model is communicated throughout the organisation by a well resourced excellence steering committee to create a sense of urgency that the change is necessary for the organisation. At the next stage, that of implementation, the organisation must ensure that the adaptability characteristics and integration activities are addressed to support the change process which occurs during BEM implementation. At the measurement and sustainability stage, to ensure that consistency is maintained regarding the organisational requirements, the BEM implementation needs to be monitored and where necessary addressed through action planning. BEM implementation is a continuously iterative process to develop organisational performance excellence. The stages of the BEM implementation roadmap are all dependent on communication across and throughout the hierarchical levels of the organisation. All 18 key influential factors have interrelationships that affect the BEM implementation process; therefore they must all be considered together during implementation.

The ADP was found to have undertaken the initial stages of BEM implementation, but the study has identified some practical issues that need to be addressed and some opportunities for further research which could be usefully pursued to develop a greater understanding of the complex issues emerging from this study.

9.4 Limitations

This study has contributed to the knowledge of BEM implementation in a public service organisation; however, some limitations will apply to any research activity, due to the limitations of time, access and resources. While there are some limitations, the research has attempted to reduce the effect they would have on the process, so that the data was not significantly affected.

It was noted that some of the survey responses were incomplete and there were pattern trends in some responses. Incomplete surveys were removed, along with those where it appeared that the pattern trend arose from a reluctance to participate. It should be noted that survey forms were distributed by the ADP Research Centre and there was a
potential for some participants to feel that they had to complete the survey, due to the nature of the organisation. A self-completion survey can have inaccuracies, so the researcher is never completely confident in the responses (Bryman and Bell, 2007; Saunders et al, 2009). The nature of the workplace environment also affected the interview process, as none of the participants agreed to have their interviews recorded. While every effort was made to note all comments, the researcher may have missed some data from the interview proceedings during transcription.

The study setting and the fact that it was a single case study has the potential to affect the validity of generalisation to the wider public service sector and to other organisational sectors (Yin, 2009). A multiple-case approach might have led to more powerful conclusions about the impact of the key influential factors identified in the literature review on BEM implementation in public sector organisations. Additionally, the timeframe in which the study was undertaken may have limited the investigation of the phenomena under consideration, since BEM implementation is a long-term iterative process. If possible, future researchers should consider undertaking a longitudinal study, as implementation of a BEM is part of a long-term approach to performance excellence and organisational improvement.

9.5 Contribution of the study to theory

This study has contributed to the body of literature on BEM implementation in public sector organisations, which remains an under-researched area (Motwani and Kumar, 1997; Tarí, 2006a; Davies, 2008). By investigating BEM implementation, the researcher has identified 18 key influential factors needed for it to be successful in a public sector organisation. The case study provides a contextual discussion for the Middle Eastern development environment, where the BEM is a relatively new phenomenon.

The contextual environment of the study has extended the knowledge of NPM in rapidly developing nations and provides a beneficial benchmark source of a non-western BEM implementation in the public sector that reflects Arab cultural influences and the existence of a bureaucratic level of uncertainty avoidance (Rees and Althakhri, 2008). This study of a public sector organisation provides a source of strategy and considerations which other Middle Eastern or GCC countries may wish to use when considering the implementation of their own BEMs, along with a conceptual roadmap
that incorporates the 18 key influential factors and the various phases of BEM implementation.

Sousa and Voss (2002) identify confusion in the implementation of quality management about what practices to follow and how to undertake the implementation process. This study has focused on BEM as a quality practice in use and on the process of implementation. Its focus on the how makes a contribution in that most of the existing literature focuses on what might be adopted as a quality practice (Sousa and Voss, 2002). This study extends the previous theoretical understanding of the implementation of a BEM within a public sector organisation and presents one of the first non-western developing country public sector comparisons.

The study supports the findings of other authors (King, 2003; Ford, 2006; Varkey and Antonio, 2010) and provides another contextual environment for the necessity of supportive communication as a requirement to enable the implementation of change. Without consistently supportive communication systems and approaches, it has been found that some of the key influential factors for successful BEM implementation can be undermined in a public sector organisation.

A mixed-methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative data collection was used in the study, which helped to enrich the understanding of the ADP’s BEM implementation. Using mixed methods enabled the evaluation of different sample group sources across the organisation and throughout the hierarchy, to provide a range of viewpoints which helped to triangulate the findings and generated discussion.

Since this study is one of first to discuss how to implement a BEM within a public sector organisation, the research instrument and process adopted here could be used to gather data related to the 18 identified key influential factors for a comparative study in another organisational setting.

9.6 Contribution to practice within the ADP

The study identified a number of structural issues within the ADP affecting BEM implementation. Jabnoun (2005), Tarí (2006b) and Tarí (2008) all advise that there should be a systematic approach which aligns BEM with the organisational strategy, structure and operational processes. There appears to be some regionality within the
ADP and this can be overcome by improving the structural demarcation between the headquarters and the regional directorates through decentralisation, according to Mead (2005), aiming to increase regional empowerment and employee involvement through greater decision-making opportunities.

The ADP information systems need to be reviewed to ensure that they are fit for the purpose of providing practical ways of recording BEM measures as part of the workflow, to enhance communication and help to support the organisational processes. The structural organisation of the existing information systems is undermining workflow productivity and overburdening employees in regional locations.

Given the variance in implementation levels across the organisation, the ADP needs to review the existing communication strategy for its lower ranks so that there is a plan to improve communication across all levels of the organisation and throughout the hierarchy. The ADP would benefit from a multi-channelled communication plan that utilizes information technology (Jaros, 2010) to encourage bottom-up communication, which is not often supported by the current organisational culture and environment. Additionally, the BEM support teams need to have greater communication links across the regional directorates so that the sharing and transmission of knowledge are more effective.

The use of a systematic approach will enable the development of internal capabilities across the whole organisation (Ford, 2007). Training delivery, content and accessibility must be developed to ensure that there is a holistic and systematic approach to training throughout the organisation and that it is accessible in a timely manner. To support the development of systematic approach, a training needs analysis should be undertaken by the Human Resources Training Department, to supplement what has been done by the BEM implementation team.

It is recommended that the BEM be systematically applied to the key performance indicators in the proposed performance measurement system, to ensure that this practice and other new strategies are embedded into the organisation, rather than being seen as quick fixes. Additionally, the links between the performance measurement systems could be used to control and expand employee attitudes towards the positive iteration of the BEM, especially if there is a link with the reward system to encourage action.
As part of performance measurement and management, the ADP needs to develop a tiered recognition and reward system that allows team and sub-team managers to recognise those who have participated, supported and performed to a high level, even though they are not on the official BEM implementation team lists.

Further monitoring and understanding of the ADP organisational culture is needed. The regional Arab culture may be impacting at various levels and this needs to be monitored as well as being researched. It is acknowledged that there is a greater level of change resistance in Arab cultures and this has the potential to affect the ADP negatively. The ADP needs to have a better understanding of the cultural influences which present challenges to the future development and ongoing application of NPM processes such as BEM implementation. One tool that the ADP may wish to consider in future investigations of organisational culture is the Competing Values Framework (Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall, 2001), which provides a cultural assessment.

9.7 Further research

There is little existing research assessing the readiness of the organisational culture in Arab societies, particularly within public sector organisations which are intending to implement a BEM. For other organisations considering this, it is recommended that existing organisational culture is assessed using the Competing Values Framework in order to observe the readiness and compatibility of the organisation and the requirements of the BEM. There are also opportunities for further research into public safety or policing organisations, as this study of the ADP is one of the first into BEM use by an Arab public safety organisation. Generally, there is very little management literature on the management of public safety organisations in developing countries and this is an area where further research is required, especially when funding restraints and development needs are pushing governments to adopt organisational and management best practice models such as NPM, constructed in a western and developed context, in response to increasing stakeholder expectations and the globalisation of trade.

A greater understanding of organisational culture and structure is needed within the ADP. An understanding of the apparent regionality within the organisation would benefit it, as resistance due to regional issues or structural barriers could potentially be an organisational risk for the ADP in the future. To understand what is happening in the
regions, the ADP needs to investigate why there is some resistance and if possible identify further ways in which it can support its regional office locations, to ensure that they participate equally in organisational developments, while embedding NPM into the ADP.

The communication process and what is effective for organisational needs requires further investigation within the ADP, especially to find out what is happening in the communication of organisational messages to the lower regional positions, as it appears that there is a blockage in the system, distorting the messages that the lower ranked employees are receiving and weakening the implementation of change and new operational practices such as the BEM. In organisations in developing countries, in both public and private sectors, which are traditionally bureaucratic in nature and marked by a strong cultural practice of respect for elders, further research is needed into how to address communication issues and uncertainty avoidance during BEM implementation.

Further understanding of the ADP’s training requirements for BEM implementation needs to be developed and this could be undertaken by means of a holistic training needs analysis across the organisation.

9.8 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented a summary of the whole study through a synopsis of the research undertaken, along with sections covering the key findings, contributions to knowledge and practice, potential areas for further research and research limitations.

This study has identified eighteen key influential factors which need to be considered when implementing a BEM, as well as developing a conceptual roadmap of how the factors interrelate and influence each other. As all 18 key influential factors identified had a significant impact on the success of BEM implementation in the ADP, organisations need to consider all of these factors if they wish to safeguard the success of their own BEM implementation.
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Dear Respondent

My name is Ali Al-Ghufli, a PhD student at the University of Manchester. I am carrying out this research as one of the requirements for my Doctorate degree at the University of Manchester. The major part of this study aims to identify and examine the Key Influential Factors that facilitate successful implementation of a Business Excellence Model [BEM] in the Abu Dhabi Police. Attached to this letter is a short questionnaire that presents statements related to the aspects of BEM implementation process. Therefore, I am inviting you to kindly participate in the questionnaire in relation to experience of your own organisation’s BEM implementation. This questionnaire has Likert-like scales to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each BEM factor in your own organisation.

If you choose to do so, I would very much appreciate your participation and time. Also I assure you and guarantee that your responses will be used for academic purposes, and participants’ information will remain confidential. I will be pleased to send you an executive summary of the results of this research upon your request.

I am looking forward to receiving your completed questionnaire and if you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire, you may contact me by email at: ali.ghufli@gmail.com

Yours sincerely,

Ali Abdulla Al-Ghufli

PhD student at the University of Manchester
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Information for the respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job Categories : (please tick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Police □ Civilian work in Police department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seniority Rank (please tick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Under lieutenant □ Lieutenant and above □ None of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic Qualifications (please tick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Read □ Higher Secondary □ Bachelor □ Master □ PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; write □ Secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job Position (please tick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Manager of general directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Manager of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Manager of section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Manager of branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ None of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work Experience (please tick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Less than 5 years □ 5-10 years □ 10-15 years □ More than 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Have you participated in the implementation of the Abu Dhabi Excellence Award?

Yes...... No.......  

If yes, what was your responsibility during the BEM implementation?

.................................................................
The following statements and headings relate to your opinion of the importance and the actual level of implementation of each key influential factor during BEM implementation by the Abu Dhabi Police. Please show the extent to which you think each factor is important and implemented in your organisation by ticking one box for each statement, indicating a very low, low, medium, high or very high level of agreement.

**Top Management Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management participation is important for successful implementation of the Business Excellence Model [BEM] by the Abu Dhabi Police [ADP].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management actively participate in BEM implementation in the Abu Dhabi Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocating adequate resources and time by top management is important for successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management allocates adequate resources and time for BEM implementation in the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for top management to lead BEM implementation in order to achieve excellent results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management leads the implementation of BEM in The ADP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setting a shared long-term vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting a clear and adequate vision of the BEM is important for successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vision of the BEM implementation in the ADP is clear and adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the vision of the BEM is important to achieve successful BEM implementation in the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vision of this BEM implementation is communicated throughout the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding the use and purpose of BEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the purpose of the use of BEM to the employees is important to achieve successful BEM implementation in the ADP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the ADP understand the purpose of the BEM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating awareness of the urgent need for a BEM among managers and employees is important for successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADP creates awareness of the need for the BEM among managers and employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of sufficient information and opportunity for employees to become familiar with the BEM is important to achieve successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADP provides sufficient information and opportunity for employees to become familiar with BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stimulating a change culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Preparing and stimulating the culture before and during BEM implementation is important to ensure its success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ADP has taken action to prepare and stimulate the culture during BEM implementation (for example, avoiding a blame and gambling culture, creating a sense of urgency).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Clarifying how the organisation deals with change during BEM implementation is important to ensure its success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ADP clarifies how the organisation deals with change during the BEM implementation process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Establishing an Excellence Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Establishing an excellence steering committee to administer BEM implementation is important for its success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ADP set up an excellence steering committee which is responsible for administering BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Providing the Excellence Steering Committee with the skills and knowledge needed for BEM implementation is important to achieve an excellent BEM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ADP Excellence Steering Committee has the skills and knowledge needed during BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>The visibility and access of the Excellence Steering Committee to top management and related information are important for successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ADP Excellence Steering Committee is visible and has access to top management and related information during the BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Developing an implementation plan is important for successful BEM implementation in the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ADP has developed a plan for BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Communicating the implementation plan throughout the ADP is important to ensure effective BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The implementation plan was communicated throughout the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Basing the implementation plan on pre-assessment of the situation of the ADP is important to ensure a successful BEM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The implementation plan was based on a pre-assessment of the current situation of the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Supportive Organisational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Clear definition of the ownership and responsibilities of the implementation team is important in order to achieve excellent results in the BEM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ownership and responsibilities for BEM implementation were well defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A supportive structure for visibility and information availability is important to ensure effective BEM implementation in the ADP.

Structures in the ADP facilitate the visibility of the top management and information availability.

## Developing Internal Capabilities

### (1)
Adequate preparation of the organisation to handle the change is important to ensure effective BEM implementation.

The ADP was prepared adequately to handle the change related to BEM implementation.

### (2)
Hiring BEM experts and external consultants is important to enhance implementation.

The ADP hired experts and external consultants to support the BEM implementation.

### (3)
Employees’ education level, experience and background are important to enhance the BEM implementation level in the ADP.

The employees’ education, experience and background were sufficient to deal with BEM implementation.

## Aligning the BEM with the Strategic Planning Process

### (1)
Aligning the use of the BEM with the strategic planning process is important for successful BEM implementation in the ADP.

The use of the BEM is aligned with the strategic planning process in the ADP.
Linking the BEM implementation plan to the departmental business plan is important to ensure successful BEM implementation.

The BEM implementation plan is related to the departmental business plan in the ADP.

### Effective communication

**Communication**

**1.** Communicating information related to the BEM throughout the ADP prior the BEM implementation is important to ensure its effectiveness.

Information related to the BEM was communicated throughout the ADP.

**2.** Communicating the implementation progress is important to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of BEM implementation.

There is adequate communication about BEM implementation and progress in the ADP.

### Aligning BEM with Organisational Processes

**1.** The alignment of the use of the BEM with organisational processes is important to ensure successful BEM implementation.

The ADP has aligned the use of the BEM with its existing organisational process.
Aligning the use of the BEM with organisational processes is important to avoid overlaps with existing processes.

There is no overlap between BEM implementation and the processes that exist in the ADP.

Aligning the use of the BEM with organisational processes is important to avoid adding to employees’ workload.

BEM implementation in the ADP has made no addition to the workload of employees.

## Developing a Recognition Guideline for BEM implementation

Developing a recognition guideline for BEM implementation and aligning it with the ADP rewards system is important for successful implementation.

The ADP has an active policy to recognise and reward employees for their effort and contribution to BEM implementation.

Motivating employees towards the BEM is important to ensure their involvement in its implementation.

The ADP motivates its employees to be involved in and committed to BEM implementation.

## Providing Sufficient Training

Adequate BEM training for employees is important to ensure their readiness for its implementation.

The ADP provides adequate training about the BEM and its concept.
Providing adequate training for employees across the organisation is important to avoid any resistance and to ensure involvement in the implementation process.

Training about the BEM was provided to employees across the ADP.

Employees’ Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ involvement is important to achieve successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are effectively involved in the BEM implementation process within the ADP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ involvement in the early stage of developing the implementation plan is important to achieve successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the ADP were part of the BEM implementation plan at an early stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment is important to achieve successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have been empowered in the ADP during BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering employees’ suggestions about BEM implementation is important for its success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADP considers and encourages employees’ suggestions about BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aligning BEM with the Performance Measurement System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining good measures of BEM implementation is important to achieve a successful BEM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADP identified good measures of BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning the use of the BEM with the performance measurement system is important to achieve successful BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADP aligns the use of its BEM with its performance measurement system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making employees aware of the progress of BEM implementation is important for its success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the ADP are aware of the progress of BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Aligning the BEM with Information Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning the use of the BEM with the information systems is important to achieve a successful BEM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADP aligns the use of its BEM with its information systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning BEM use with the information systems is important to communicate the information needed during BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information system that exists in the ADP actively communicates the information that is needed during BEM implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The availability of sufficient information and the opportunity for employees to become familiar with the BEM is important for its success in the ADP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| The ADP provides sufficient information and opportunity for employees to become familiar with BEM implementation. |

### Developing an action Plan

#### Incorporating the results of measuring BEM implementation within the action plan is important to achieve a successful BEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| The ADP incorporates the results of measuring BEM implementation progress within its action plan. |

#### Following up the implementation of the action plan is important to achieve successful BEM implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| ADP top management and the Excellence Steering Committee support and follow up the action plan. |

### Implementation Efficiency

#### The implementation of the BEM within the ADP has been successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### The implementation of the BEM in the ADP was easy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### The ADP gained the expected return from the implementation of its BEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### The implementation of the BEM has allowed some individuals within the ADP to advance themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Finally, from your point of view, are there any further key influential factors that might enhance BEM implementation in the Abu Dhabi Police?

If you would like to receive a copy of the survey findings, please provide contact details:

Title/Name ..................................................................................................................
Organisation ...............................................................................................................
Address .......................................................................................................................
E-mail ....................................................................................................................... 

Thank you very much for your time and effort.
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

Introduction

My name is Ali Al-Ghufli. I’m carrying out this interview as one of the requirements for my Doctorate at the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom. The aims of this research are to explore the key influential factors that facilitate BEM implementation in public sector organisations and to examine how these factors are deployed during the BEM implementation process.

Today I would like to interview you in order to discuss BEM implementation in your organisation. This interview is completely voluntary and confidential. Moreover, I assure you that your response will be used purely for academic purposes and that your name will not be mentioned to anybody under any circumstances. The results of the interview will be sent to you upon your request only.

The interview will last between 40 and 60 minutes and will be taped with your consent. Do you have any questions?

With your agreement, I will begin the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="right">Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="right">Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="right">Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="right">Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="right">Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part Two: Investigating Key Influential Factors

- What is your responsibility in the BEM implementation process?
- What were the reasons for BEM implementation?
- In the BEM implementation process, what are the roles of the top management? And what was their attitude to the BEM?
- Who led BEM implementation?
- How do you define the ownership and responsibility for the BEM implementation team?
- How does your organisation create acceptance of change?
- What actions have been directly aimed at changing the culture?
- How do you ensure the readiness and capability of the organisation for BEM implementation?
- What actions were taken to motivate the employees to become involved in the BEM implementation process?
- Please explain how employees provide feedback about the BEM implementation process.
- How clear were the terms of reference during the BEM implementation process in your organisation?
- How do you ensure ongoing communication to support BEM implementation?
- Please explain how you align BEM implementation with the existing organisational process.
- What sort of preparation and training have you had specifically for the BEM implementation team and other employees across the organisation?
- Please explain the BEM implementation plan in your organisation.
- How was the implementation plan developed? And who was involved?
- How was the implementation plan communicated throughout organisation?
- How does the implementation plan relate to the business plan?
- Please describe how you ensure access to all of the information needed during the BEM implementation process.
- How do you measure BEM implementation in your organisation?
- How do you use the results of measuring the BEM implementation process in order to improve the implementation level of ADQA?
### Part Three: Investigation BEM implementation efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How easy was BEM implementation in your organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you assess your level BEM implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the outcome of BEM implementation process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the challenges to BEM implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think could be done to make BEM implementation better?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thanks for your time**