

:

\*

"86"

"80"

:

:

.1

( / )

(Ernst et al.,

(Grant, Shani and

.1992)

Krishnan, 1994)

(Laszlo, 1997)

(Letza and Gold, 1997)

(Gordon V.R.

Holness, 2002)

(Stake Holders)

:

.2005/11/21

2005/3/9

\*

/

-4

(Backard, 1995)  
(Goetsch and Davis, 1994)

(86)

(80)

-1

-2

-3

:

:

:

:

-1

7-1

:

:

-2

-1

.14-8

-2

:

-3

-3

**.2**

: - :

.20-15  
-4

.

:

.1 :

.24-21  
-5

.2 .31-25 :

-6

.3

.4 :

.36-32  
-7

.5 .41-37 :

-8

.6

.7

.54-42

.8 :

-1

	100	50
		100

:

:

-2

		5
	15	-5
		15

**.3**

(Fine, 1986)

(Hendricks et. al., 1997)

69.-55

(Lawler et al., 1996)

(Forza and Filippin, 1998)

:

-

-

-

"

"

(Hendricks and Singhal, 1999)

(Grace and Ivan, 1999)

(Agus, 2001)

(Agus, 2004)

%85 (Fynes and Burca, 2005)

(Liao et al., 1995)

ISO 9000

(Jabnoun, 2002)

"

"

(Tari and Sabater, 2004)

(Shea and Howell, 1998)

Dean, ) (Chen and Hambrick, 1995) (Prybutok and Ramasesh, 2005)

(Robbert and Bamford, 1998)

(Daft, 1995) (Stuart et al., 1996)

(Kelly, 1992) (Miller and Chen, 1994)

(Linderman et al., 2005)

(Struebing and Klaus, 1997)

(Easton, 1998) (Prajogo and Sohal, 2004)

(Arditi and Gunaydin, 1997)

(1)

**(1)**

8.7		91.3			
<b>3.8</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>77.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.8</b>	
<b>46</b>		<b>45-36</b>		<b>35-25</b>	
30		35		35	
10		10 - 5		5	
<b>63.8</b>		<b>15</b>		<b>21.3</b>	
100		100 50		50	
<b>63.8</b>		<b>17.5</b>		<b>18.8</b>	

(19 17)

%70

(1)

45-25

(%63.8)

100

10

(2)

0.6320	4.5750	1
09338.	4.0375	2
0.8418	3.3625	3
1.1052	3.7875	4
0.9372	3.8000	5
0.9987	3.3625	6
1.0702	3.7000	7
1.1418	4.0250	8
0.9731	3.3500	9
0.9274	3.7375	10
1.1703	3.7250	11
1.0994	3.07375	12
1.2115	3.7250	13
1.0671	3.9750	14
1.0820	3.6375	15
1.0890	3.5625	16
1.1485	2.8500	17
1.0626	3.4000	18
1.2033	2.2875	19
1.0035	3.8250	20
1.0670	3.9625	21
1.0051	3.9500	22
1.2094	3.8250	23
1.1137	3.5125	24
1.1278	3.7625	25
1.1317	3.6875	26
1.0238	3.3000	27
1.0671	3.4750	28
1.0696	3.9125	29
1.0361	3.800	30
0.9626	3.9000	31
0.9338	3.9625	32
1.0702	3.6375	33

1.0671	3.7250	34
1.1933	3.2375	35
1.0785	3.4625	36
0.8596	4.2875	37
0.9332	4.2000	38
1.1205	3.6875	39
1.1668	3.4250	40
1.1248	3.7250	41
0.9311	3.7625	42
0.8707	4.3375	43
0.9109	4.1750	44
0.8264	4.2250	45
0.7769	4.4375	46
0.9109	4.3250	47
0.8385	4.3250	48
0.9236	4.2125	49
1.0625	3.6875	50
0.9459	3.9375	51
1.3350	3.3000	52
1.0551	3.7250	53
1.0031	3.8625	54
0.8922	3.9625	55
1.1021	3.5250	56
1.0527	3.6750	57
1.0024	3.5875	58
1.0024	3.4125	59
1.0185	3.7250	60
1.0952	3.6250	61
0.9359	3.9000	62
1.0031	3.8625	63
1.0062	3.8875	64
0.8908	4.0625	65
1.0366	3.8375	66
1.0361	3.8000	67
1.1245	3.5375	68
1.0176	3.5500	69
		<b>Valid N(Listwise)</b>

Reliability Coefficient  $\alpha = 0.9786$

Multicollinearity  
 Multicollinearity 5

$$9786 = \alpha$$

$$. \%60 \quad (2)$$

Kolmogorow-Smirnov (K-S)

$$0.955 \quad \text{SIG} \quad ) \quad 0.05 \quad (3)$$

$$(0.839 \quad (0.769)$$

(3)

**0.551	**0.650	**0.495	0.666**	740.	1.000	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
**0.598	**0.750	**0.680	**0.707	1.000	**0.740	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
**0.557	**0.796	**0.621	1.000	**0.707	**0.666	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0	0.000	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
**0.525	**0.679	1.000	**0.621	**0.680	**0.495	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
**0.642	1.000	**0.679	**0.769	**0.750	**0.650	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
1.000	**0.642	**0.525	**0.557	**0.598	**0.551	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
**0.682	**0.729	**0.549	**0.644	**0.712	**0.676	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N
**0.589	**0.769	**0.727	**0.674	**0.692	**0.616	Pearson Correlation
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
80	80	80	80	80	80	N



(3)

.616**	.676**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
.692**	.712**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
.647**	.644**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
.627**	.549**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
.697**	.729**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
.589**	.682**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
.700**	1.000	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N
1.000	.700**	Pearson Correlation
.000	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)
.80	.80	N

.01 \*\*

$$VIF = \frac{1}{1 - r^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 - (-.769)^2}$$

VIF = 2.056

(4)

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGF	F	F
	0.80	0.894	0.000	2.1	35.513

(4)

Y = -0.142 + 0.238X<sub>1</sub> - 0.02109X<sub>2</sub> + 0.118X<sub>3</sub> - 0.006814X<sub>4</sub> - 0.05354X<sub>5</sub> + 0.132X<sub>6</sub> - 0.07993X<sub>7</sub> + 0.574

(1997)

(5)

(5)

R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGF	F		
0.712	0.844	0.000	192.56		1
0.771	0.878	0.000	129.415		2
0.778	0.887	0.000	93.957		3

%51

Y = 0.210 + 0.875X (1)

Y = 0.212 + 678X<sub>1</sub> + 0.315X<sub>2</sub> (2)

Y = 0.200 + 0.608X<sub>1</sub> + (3)

0.262X<sub>2</sub> + 0.131X<sub>3</sub>

(1998)

Y = 0.929 + 0.725X<sub>1</sub>

1.1

2.1

(6)

1.1

2.1

(7)

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.492	0.701	0.000	1.9905	8.685

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.506	0.711	0.000	1.9905	8.933

T (6)

(7)

T

(9)

4.1

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.361	0.601	0.000	1.9905	6.634

T (9) ) (2005  
) (2005

0.492

$$Y=1.447+0.609X_2$$

0.361

3.1

) (1998 ) (1997  
) (1999 )

$$Y=1.718+0.528X_4$$

(8)

3.1

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.499	0.706	0.000	1.9905	8.811

T (8)

5.1

(10)

5.1

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.577	0.759	0.000	1.9905	10.309

0.499

) (1995 ) (1986 )  
(2005 ) (2002  
) (1998 )

0.577

$$Y= 1.671+0.632X_3$$

4.1

0.456

)

.(1996

) (2004

:

$$Y = 1.455 + 0.616X_5$$

) (2002

)

.(2005

)

(2004

:

6.1

$$Y = 1.581 + 0.556X_7$$

(11)

8.1

6.1

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.429	0.655	0.000	1.9905	7.657

(13)

8.1

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.712	0.844	0.555	1.9905	13.877

T

(11)

T

(13)

0.429

)

(1999

)

.(2005

0.712

:

$$Y = 1.895 + 0.509X_6$$

7.1

(12)

7.1

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGT	T	T
	0.456	0.675	0.000	1.9905	8.08

) (2004

)

) (2005

)

(2005

.(1996

(12)

:

$$Y = .210 + .875 x_8$$

(1998 )

(14)

(16)

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGF	F	F
	0.963	0.98	0.528	2.9	.942

69

0.739

F (14)

.66 57

)

(1997

(1997 )

.4

: :

.1 :

.2

(15)

.3

	R <sup>2</sup>	R	SIGF	F	F
	.943	.97	.875	3.2	.229

.4

(15)

.5

69

.3

.58

.4

: :

.1

.5

.2

(16)

1.000	Pearson Correlation	<b>54</b>
0	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
0.479	Pearson Correlation	<b>55</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.569**	Pearson Correlation	<b>56</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.681**	Pearson Correlation	<b>57</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.702**	Pearson Correlation	<b>58</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.652**	Pearson Correlation	<b>59</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.659**	Pearson Correlation	<b>60</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.578**	Pearson Correlation	<b>61</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
.599**	Pearson Correlation	<b>62</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	
0.522**	Pearson Correlation	<b>63</b>
0.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
80	N	

.386** 0.000 80	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed) N	<b>64</b>
0.599** 0.000 80	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed) N	<b>65</b>
.693** 0.000 80	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed) N	<b>66</b>
.652** 0.000 80	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed) N	<b>67</b>
.536** 0.000 80	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed) N	<b>68</b>
.739** 0.000 80	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed) N	<b>69</b>

International Quality Study: The Definitive Study of The Best International Quality Management Practices; Top – line findings, Earnst and Young Cleveland, OH.

Easton, G.S. and Jarrell, S.L. 1998. The effects of TQM on Corporate performance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business*, 71 (2): 253 – 307.

Fine, C.H. 1986. Quality Improvements and learning in Productive Systems. *Management Science*, 32 (10): 1301 – 1315.

Fines, Brain and Burca, Sean De. 2005. The Effects of Design Qualities on Quality Performance. *Int. J. Production Economics*, 96: 1-14.

Forza, Cipriano and Filippini, Roberto. 1998. TQM Impact on Quality Performance and Customer Satisfaction: A Caused Model. *Int. J. Production Economics*, 55: 1-20.

Goetsch, David L. and Davis, Stanley. 1994. Intoduction T Total quality: Quality, Productively and Competitiveness. *Macmillan College Publishing Company*.

Gordon, V.R. Holness. 2002. Achieving Quality Using TQM and ISO, *A Shrae Journal*. www.ashrae.org.

Grace, An. and Ivan, Choi. 1999. Facilitating Implementation

Agus, Arawati. 2001. A Lineer Structural Modeling of TQM Practices in Mangacturing Companies in Malaysia, *Total Quality Management*. 12 (5): 561 – 573.

Agus, Arawati. 2004. The Structural Linkages between TQM, Product Quality Performance, and Business Performance: Prelim:- Mary Empirical Study in Electronics Companies. *Singapore Management Review*, 27 (1): 87 – 105.

Arditi, David and Gunaydin, H. Murat. 1997. Total Quality Management in the Constriction Process. *International Journal of Project Management*, 15m (4): 235 – 243.

Daft, R.L. 1995. *Organization theory and Design*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, West Publishing Company, Minneapolis / st. Paul.

Dean, T.J. Robert, L.B. and Bamford, C.E. 1998. Differences in Lrage and Small Firms Responses to Environmental Context: Straegic Implications from a Comparative Analysis of Business Formations, *Strategic management Journal*, 19: 709 – 728.

Earnst and Young and American Quality Foundation. 1992.

- Approach to Process Control and Maintenance, *European J-of Operational Research*, 164: 324-340.
- Miller, D. and Chen, M. 1994. Sources and Consequences of Competitive Inertia: A Study of the US Airline Industry, *Administrative Science quarterly*, 39 (1): 1-30.
- Packard, D.S.W. Thomas. TQM and Organizational Change and Development; from TQM in Social Service: Theory and Practice, Burton Gummer and Philip McCallion, Eds, Albany, N.Y.
- Prajoqo, Daniel I. and Sohal, Amirk S. 2004. The Integration of TQM and Technology/Rand D management in Determining Quality and Innovation Performance, *Omega the International J. of Mangement Scieince*, 1-17.
- Prybutok, Victor R. and Ramasesh Ranga. 2005. An Action-research Quality Improvement, *European J. of Operational Research*, 166: 293-309.
- Schmidt, Stephen, Kiemele, Mark, J. and Cheek, Jr. TQM F., Don't Let TQM Drain you Dry without any ROI. [www.aira Cad.com](http://www.aira Cad.com).
- Shea, Christine M. and Howell, Jane M. 1998. Organizational Antecedents to the Successful Implementation of TQM: A Social Cognitive Perspective, *J. of quality Management*, 3 (1): 3-24.
- Struebing, L., Klans, L.N. 1997. Small Businesses Thinking Big, *Qualities Progress*, 23-27.
- Stuart, Michael., Mullins, Eamonn and Drew, Elieen. 1996. Statistical Quality Control and Improvement, *Eurpean J. of Operational Research*, 88: 203-214.
- Tari, Jnan Jose and Sabater, Vicente. 2004. Quality Tools and Techniqnes: Are they Necessary for Quality Management, *Int. J. Production Econmics*, 92: 267-280.
- of TQM Through Information Technology. *Information and Management*, 36: 287-299.
- Grant, R.M. Shani, R. and Krishnan, R. 1994. TQM's Challenge to Management Theory and Practice. *Sloan Management Review*, Winter, 25-35.
- Hendricks, K.B. and Singhal, V.R. 1997. Does Implementing an Effective TQM Program Actually Improve Operating Performance: Impirical Evidence form Firms that Have Won Quality Awards. *Management Scieince*, 43 (9): 1258-1274.
- Hendricks, K.B. and Singhal, V.R. 1999. The Long run Stock Price Performance of Firms with Effective TQM Programs, *Management Science*, 42 (3): 415-436.
- Kelly, K. 1992. Quality: Small and Midsize Seize the Challenge- not a Moment too Soon, *Business Week*, 30: 66-69.
- Jabnoun, Naceur. 2002. Control Processes for TQM and Quality Assurance, *Work Study*, 51 (4): 182-190.
- Laszlo, George, P. 1997. The Role of Quality Cost in TQM. *The TQM Magazine*, 9 (b): 441-413.
- Lawler, E.E. III. Mohrman, S.A. and Ledford, G.E.Jr. 1992. Employee Involvement and TQM, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Letza, Steve, R. and Gadd Ken. 1994. Should Activity Based Costing be Considered as the Costing Method of Choice to Total Quality Organizations, *The TQM Magazine*, 6 (5): 57-67.
- Liaoz, Cheung, M.T. and Lai, Y.L. 1995. ISO 9000 and its Integration with TQM 195<sup>th</sup> Engineering Management Conference of IEEE, Singapore, 214-217.
- Linderman, Kevin., Mckone-sweet Kathleen E. and Anderson, John, C. 2005. An Integrated Systems



## **The Relationship between the Control System of TQM and its Effectiveness: An Analytical Study on Jordanian Public- shareholdings Industrial Companies.**

*Suleiman Obaidat\**

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aimed at exploring the relationship between the control system of TQM and its effectiveness on Jordanian Public shareholding industrial companies.

In addition to that, the study aimed at knowing if there is any significant differences with regard to this relationship relates to the size or experience- The sample of the study consists of 80 companies out of 86 companies listed in Amman Exchange Market.

The study concludes with many results such as a strong , Positive and significant relationship exists between the elements of the control system and its effectiveness, and the most related one is the quality assurance element. However, no difference in this relationship exist with regard to the size or experience. Based upon these results a set of recommendations were proposed.

**Keywords:** TQM, Effectiveness, Control.

---

\* Faculty of Business Administration, University of Jordan. Received on 9/3/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 21/11/2005.