

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN TQM: THE ROLE OF EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT AND CUSTOMER FOCUS

Mary Lois White, Louisiana State University Shreveport (email: mwhite@lsus.edu)

Felice A. Williams, Louisiana State University Shreveport (email: felice.williams@lsus.edu)

Tami L. Knotts, Louisiana State University Shreveport (email: tknotts@lsus.edu)

Abstract—Changes in the educational landscape require higher learning institutions to remain competitive and focus on continuous improvement. Total quality management (TQM) is one way that higher education organizations can achieve these goals (Michael, Sower, & Motwani, 1997). Universities tend to encourage campus involvement and student-centered attitudes among their faculty, both of which are factors associated with TQM. Therefore, this paper investigates whether participation in a specific TQM program, Service Excellence Training, is influenced by a faculty member's level of employee involvement, level of student focus, or a combination of both. Our results provide some evidence that involved or student-focused faculty were more likely to participate in the program, and their primary reasons for doing so were to develop a sense of community and to answer the call of administration. Non-participants, on the other hand, did not feel like the information in the program was relevant to them. Our final set of findings addressed the question of whether faculty believed that constituents across campus should be required to participate in the program. Interestingly, the results indicated a strong belief that administrators and staff should be required to complete the program but not faculty. Even faculty who participated in the training program did not believe, in general, that other faculty should be required to participate.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE current educational climate reflects an ever-growing need for institutions of higher learning to stay competitive, as the institutional costs of funding a public college education has progressively shifted from state funding to higher student tuition (Breneman, 2002). Due to increasing budget cuts and attrition, current faculty are given fewer resources and tasked with more responsibilities. Limited technology funds, larger classes, and heavier teaching loads are common in today's academic environment in an effort to improve productivity and efficiency. Student expectations have also changed over time. With rising tuition costs and the growth of online degree-granting institutions, student demands for flexibility, accessibility, and customer service have increased (Breneman, 2002).

Building on the seminal ideas of Crosby (1979) and Deming (1986), some scholars believe that total quality management (TQM) represents a viable response through which

universities can successfully navigate the changing landscape of higher education. While discussion of an educational evolution is not new (Jacobson, 1991), this "era" embraces the need for quality enhancement and leaner university operations. Though TQM was initially developed in a manufacturing context, its principles are particularly relevant to higher education today through its focus on continuous improvement. Institutions of higher education can be thought of as a dynamic environment characterized by new knowledge creation (Koch & Fisher, 1998), and the implementation of TQM principles can be quite beneficial.

Today's educational environment calls for an increase in how faculty approach their service requirements in order to satisfy organizational and student needs. Universities tend to desire faculty who willingly increase their level of involvement and are student-focused in order to meet the demands of a customer-centric learning environment. In the management literature, employee involvement and customer focus are recognized as two important aspects of total quality management (Mark, 2013; Tang, Chen, & Wu, 2010). This paper examines how employee involvement and customer focus affect participation in a quality improvement program. Specifically, we investigate whether faculty participation in a Service Excellence Training program is due to their commitment to university involvement, their view of students as customers, or a combination of both. The remainder of this paper provides an overview of the TQM literature and its relevance to higher education, followed by our methodology and results.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Total Quality Management

W. Edwards Deming's total quality management (TQM) is said to be a cultural change or a management philosophy that allows individuals to engage in behaviors and values that are personally beneficial and helpful to the organization by keeping it competitive and focused on long-term survival (Shea & Howell, 1998). Similarly, Asif, Awan, Khan, and Ahmad (2013) asserted that though the application of TQM in different contexts is relatively new, its potential benefit for improving organizational performance and customer satisfaction remain the same. In other words, TQM is not a set of specific procedures for an organization to follow for

guaranteed success, but rather its primary focus is on the involvement of everyone in the organization for the purpose of continuous improvement of quality. Further, TQM has the potential to produce a wide variety of benefits including customer satisfaction, improved business results, and employee fulfillment (Anderson, Rungtusanatham, & Schroeder, 1994).

Shea and Howell (1998) identified three overarching themes which represent the definition and components of TQM: leadership, cooperative climate, and quality tools. The leadership theme consists of visionary leadership, top management support, a quality culture, and strategic quality management. The climate characteristics necessary for TQM consists of positive employee relations, supplier and customer involvement, training and learning at all levels, teamwork structures, and internal and external cooperation. The final element of TQM encompasses the use of quality tools in product or service design, quality data and reporting, process control, feedback, operational quality planning, communication of improvement information, benchmarking, and internal quality information usage. The presence of all three components suggests a well-designed TQM system that will ultimately set an organization up for success.

In addition to the three components mentioned above, there are certain preconditions that must be present in an organization for the proficient implementation of TQM. Absent these preconditions, the implementation of any TQM program should be reconsidered given the increased probability for failure (Packard, 1995). Chief among these preconditions is a focus on communication across the organization. Specifically, successful TQM implementation within an organization must involve employees in the process (Tang et al., 2010). TQM outcomes are tied to how well employees are included in production and service decisions. Communication across departments and between management and employees is essential to building trust during TQM implementation (Temponi, 2005). An additional precondition is customer satisfaction, as greater recognition of customer needs is viewed as a critical success factor for quality improvement. Mark (2013) suggested that student satisfaction achieved by “embedding quality in the learning process” is necessary for higher education institutions to remain competitive. Both of these preconditions—organization-wide employee involvement and customer focus—serve to create an environment that is conducive for TQM (Sila & Ebrahimpour, 2003).

Though TQM research over time has outlined a number of success factors, consensus concerning which success factors are critical as reported in different studies does not exist (Asif et al., 2013). Sila and Ebrahimpour (2003) in their meta-

analysis on TQM critical factors found at least eighteen different factors that were common across the studies they examined. Essentially, the various components of TQM do not often comprise a cohesive whole (Ackoff, 1999), and the determination of critical factors might mean isolating some factors contextually from the myriad of others in the literature (Asif et al., 2013). TQM models identify a variety of critical factors, but employee involvement and customer focus are two factors which continually emerge across many of the existing TQM studies.

B. TQM in Higher Education

Although TQM was initially developed and applied to business restructuring for the purpose of quality improvement, institutions of higher learning have also recognized the need for quality enhancement. Several scholars and educational entrepreneurs have applied TQM principles to higher education settings to meet the need of the evolving university environment. Michael, Sower, and Motwani (1997) asserted that the effective adoption of TQM concepts in academic settings leads to an advanced educational organization that attracts quality students and professors, retains current students, and functions efficiently. Higher education by nature is characteristically different from other organizations and faces different challenges (Koch & Fisher, 1998). As such, adaptation becomes a necessity and puts greater emphasis on quality assurance, which is an important component of TQM (Asif & Raouf, 2013).

Bonstingl (1992) summarized in detail how TQM applies to higher educational reform. He suggested that the basic tenets in TQM’s application to higher education involve synergistic relationships between faculty and students, continuous improvement through faculty involvement, evaluation of the learning institution’s processes, and effective leadership by administration and senior faculty. The synergistic relationship between faculty and students is especially important given that this synergy often translates into teamwork and collaboration across the institution. Bonstingl (1992) further noted that in a TQM organization everyone is considered to be a supplier and a customer. The university and faculty are suppliers of knowledge, learning environments, and learning tools to students. While universities and professors work together to develop the students’ capabilities, the students work toward their own personal development and are the primary customers of faculty expertise and the university as a whole. Therefore, customer focus is considered to be a crucial aspect of TQM in higher education.

Another important aspect of TQM as it applies to higher education is continuous improvement (Bonstingl, 1992). Continuous improvement in the academic context entails a combined effort across the educational institution from top to

bottom to perform self-evaluations and engage in constant enhancement. Continuous improvement should be the goal of every individual across the institution and specifically part of the mission of faculty to better themselves and their students through learning. This concept of continuous learning likens an institution to a system in which all work that is done is essentially part of an ongoing process (Bonstingl, 1992). This means that TQM involves analyzing the system in its entirety and determining problematic processes that affect quality output. Specifically, institutions of higher learning must evaluate the pedagogical processes that affect the quality of their graduates. Inherent in this is the need for faculty involvement at multiple levels within the institution.

A final tenet of TQM as it relates to higher education is the role of leadership from top management within the institution. The university administration must select representatives in the form of senior and/or lead faculty members who are willing and able to represent the TQM program. The belief in TQM principles accompanied by institutional involvement and good interpersonal skills can help leaders define the institution's role and guide the future of their university (Michael et al., 1997). In order to create a quality service culture and a commitment to long-term quality, top management and lead faculty need to completely support the TQM program not only in word but also through action (Temponi, 2005).

III. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This study examines faculty participation in a Service Excellence Training program at a small, liberal arts college in the mid-Atlantic region. The program was part of a large-scale TQM effort, which focused on improving the university experience for all stakeholders. The Service Excellence Training program outlined standards and procedures for welcoming constituents to campus and creating a friendly atmosphere that exceeded customer expectations. A sixteen question survey, shown in the Appendix, was distributed to forty-five full-time faculty to determine their level of involvement in the training program. Reasons for faculty participation were classified along two dimensions—employee involvement and customer focus—which are defined below.

A. Employee Involvement.

Based on the faculty evaluation system at this college, faculty participation in and attendance at campus events was encouraged but not required. Thus, faculty members who indicated attending both athletic events and cultural events on campus were designated as high in employee involvement (HI—HIGH INV). These individuals tended to show their commitment to the university by voluntarily answering the administration's call to be involved in campus life. The remaining faculty members were designated as LI—LOW

INV.

B. Customer Focus.

Faculty members were identified as student-focused based on whether they viewed students as customers (HF—HIGH FOCUS). In this study, customers are defined as active partners in the production and delivery of products/services by providing information and effort prior to an actual transaction (Hill, 1995; Lengnick-Hall, 1996). This means that students share responsibility for their educational success and expect quality in return. The remaining faculty members were designated as LF—LOW FOCUS.

Based on the dimensions of employee involvement and customer focus, four different categorizations exist for faculty participation (see Table 1). HIHF (HIGH INV, HIGH FOCUS) faculty members are both highly involved in the community and the university, and they view students as customers who deserve quality improvements. Faculty who are HILF (HIGH INV, LOW FOCUS) are involved in the campus community, but they do not view students as customers. The LIHF (LOW INV, HIGH FOCUS) faculty are not involved in campus activities, but they do view students as customers, who deserve a continuously improving educational experience. Finally, faculty who represent the LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) do not believe that students are customers, and they are not as involved in the campus community relative to other commitments.

Table 1
Faculty Participation Categories

Customer Focus	Employee Involvement	
	High	Low
High	Faculty members who reported attending cultural and athletic events on campus and reported believing students are customers. HIHF (HIGH INV, HIGH FOCUS)	Faculty members who reported they did not attend athletic and cultural events on campus but who reported believing students are customers. LIHF (LOW INV, HIGH FOCUS)
Low	Faculty members who reported attending cultural and athletic events on campus but who reported believing students are not customers. HILF (HIGH INV, LOW FOCUS)	Faculty members who reported they did not attend athletic and cultural events on campus and who reported believing students are not customers. LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS)

Both employee involvement and customer focus have been repeatedly identified as critical success factors for TQM in non-academic environments (Sila & Ebrahimpour, 2003). However, as Asif et al. (2013) suggested, no consensus exists regarding critical TQM components in higher education. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: Faculty who are involved on campus or believe students are customers are more likely to participate in the Service Excellence Training program.

H2: Faculty who participate in the Service Excellence Training program are likely to do so for a few targeted reasons.

H3: Faculty who do not participate will have numerous and more varied reasons for not participating.

H4: Faculty members who participate in the Service Excellence Training program will also believe that other constituents on campus should attend the training.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

Only full-time faculty members were included in the sample; forty-five surveys were returned. All ranks of full-time faculty were represented by the respondents. Table 2 shows descriptive statistics for the key variables used in this study. Slightly more than half of the respondents, 51 percent, indicated they believe students are customers. While 87 percent of respondents reported attending at least one cultural event on the campus, only 38 percent indicated attending an athletic event. Over half of respondents indicated administrative personnel and staff should be required to participate in the Service Excellence Training, while less than one-third indicated faculty should be required to participate.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Sample Data from Survey

Variable/Question	Mean	n
Instructor	0.13	45
Assistant Professor	0.33	45
Associate Professor	0.24	45
Professor	0.29	45
Attended a cultural event	0.87	45
Attended an athletic event	0.38	45
Students are customers	0.51	43
Administration should be required to take SET	0.58	45
Staff should be required to take SET	0.56	45
Faculty should be required to take SET	0.31	45

B. Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that faculty who are involved in the campus community or believe students are customers are more likely to participate in the Service Excellence Training program. Based on the preceding designations, we would expect all of the faculty that are categorized as either highly involved in the campus community or who believe students are customers to participate in the training program. Thus, the faculty members who would be least likely to participate would be found in the LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) group. Table 3 shows the number of faculty members in each category based on whether they indicated an intention to participate in the training program.

Table 3
Intention to Participate

Faculty Type	Number and Percentage Overall (n=45)	Number and Percentage of Non-participants (n=20)	Number and Percentage of Participants (n=25)
HIHF	7 (16.28%)	3 (15.79%)	4 (16.67%)
HILF	9 (20.93%)	2 (10.53%)	7 (29.17%)
LIHF	15 (34.88%)	6 (31.58%)	9 (37.50%)
LILF	12 (27.91%)	8 (42.11%)	4 (16.67%)
Missing	2	1	1

Using a contingency table analysis, shown in Table 4, there is some minimal evidence to support Hypothesis 1, which indicates faculty classified as either involved or student-focused were more likely to participate in the training program ($p < .10$).

Table 4
Percent of Faculty Intending to Participate

Faculty Type	Non-participants (n=19)	Participants (n=24)
LILF	66.7% (8)	33.3% (4)
HILF, HIHF, LIHF	35.5% (11)	64.5% (20)
Chi-sq=3.411, N=43, p=.065		

Although it is hypothesized that being either involved in the campus or student-focused would result in a faculty member being more willing to participate in the training program, it would not be expected that they necessarily participate for the same reasons.

If the first hypothesis is correct, then faculty who have a high level of participation in the campus community are likely to participate in the training program. In other words, because they are highly involved in the campus community, they will participate when asked. They do not need an additional individual incentive to participate. The faculty members who believe students are customers are expected to participate because the training program has been described by the

administration as designed to improve the customer experience at the university.

C. Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 states that faculty members that participate will do so for a few targeted reasons. As shown in Hypothesis 1, faculty members who are highly involved in the campus community or view students as customers are more likely to participate in the Service Excellence Training program. Therefore, it would be expected they would focus on these two areas when asked to indicate their reasons for participating in the program and to rank each reason selected. The following table indicates the frequency that each reason was ranked as the most important. The survey respondents were given a list of reasons from which they could select, but they were also given an opportunity for free response. Table 5 shows the highest ranked reasons for faculty participation in the training program.

Table 5
Highest Ranked Reasons for Participation

	HIHF	HILF	LIHF	LILF	Total
Administrati on Requested	1	4	3	1	9
Develop Community	2	2	5	2	11
Chair Requested	0	0	1	0	1
Good Training	1	0	0	1	2
Note: One participant did not indicate a highest ranked reason for participating.					

Overwhelmingly, faculty members most often reported that their highest ranked reasons for participating were to develop a sense of community and because the administration had requested that faculty members participate. These two responses accounted for 48 percent and 39 percent of the responses, respectively. Considering three of the four faculty categories represent high involvement in the campus and a belief that students are customers, the overwhelming selection of these responses is not surprising. Faculty members who are involved in the campus community would be expected to engage in activities they believe will develop a sense of community and may want to show their commitment to the organization by honoring the administration's request that they voluntarily participate in the program.

Two of the four LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) faculty who participated in the training program also indicated a desire to develop community as their highest ranked reason for participating. Although this particular group of faculty were categorized as having a lower involvement in the campus community, this should not be taken to mean they are not at all involved. All four of the LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) faculty attended cultural events on campus, but because they did not attend athletic events they were designated as having a

lower level of involvement in the campus community. In other words, these faculty members did participate in the campus community, just at a lower level than some of their colleagues. In comparison, almost half of the LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) faculty who did not indicate a willingness to participate in the training program did not attend either a cultural event or an athletic event on campus.

Table 6 shows the total number of times faculty participants selected each response. This aggregated table also reflects that faculty most often selected two reasons for participating: to develop community and because the administration requested faculty participation. Of the 47 total reasons marked, 32 percent of the responses were due to the administration requesting faculty participation, and 36 percent of the responses were due to a desire to develop community. Only one other reason, curiosity, even reached above 10 percent.

Table 6
Aggregated Reasons for Participation

Reason	HIHF	HILF	LIHF	LILF	Total
Administration Requested	4	4	4	3	15
Develop Community	3	4	7	3	17
Resume Builder	0	0	0	0	0
Positive Feedback	1	0	1	0	2
Curiosity	1	1	4	1	7
Department Chair Requested	0	0	1	0	1
Good Training	1	1	0	2	4
Other Reason	0	1	0	0	1
Total	10	11	17	9	47

D. Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that faculty who do not participate will have numerous and more varied reasons for not participating. The faculty members categorized as LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) were expected to be the least likely to participate in the training program since they do not view students as customers and are not highly involved in the campus community. As previously shown in Table 3, of the four categorizations, the LILF category accounts for 42 percent of the non-participants. In addition, of the twelve faculty members designated LILF, two-thirds did not intend to participate in the training program. Faculty members who indicated they did not intend to participate in the training program were asked to report their reasons for non-participation. Table 7 shows the highest ranked reasons for non-participation reported by faculty.

Table 7
Highest Ranked Reasons for Non-Participation

	HIHF	HILF	LIHF	LILF	Total
Content not relevant	0	1	2	3	6
Negative feedback	2	0	1	1	4
No incentive	0	0	1	0	1
Too time consuming	1	0	0	2	3
Other reason	0	1	2	2	5

Hypothesis 3 states that faculty members in the LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) group would indicate they did not intend to participate in the training program. The LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) group's most frequently selected choice for non-participation was that the content was not relevant. This choice was also the most commonly ranked highest reason for non-participation; thus, Hypothesis 3 is partially supported.

Faculty who were classified as LIHF (LOW INV, HIGH FOCUS), tended to indicate (in the aggregate) that the negative feedback they heard about the program influenced them to not participate. HI (HIGH INV) faculty gave the fewest reasons for not participating. The most common responses were the program was too time consuming, followed by irrelevant content, then negative feedback from participants. LI (LOW INV) faculty indicated lack of incentive as a reason, which was not selected by HI (HIGH INV) faculty.

The reasons for faculty non-participation are more varied than were the reasons given by faculty for participating. Faculty categorized as having a lower involvement in the campus community accounted for 74 percent of the non-participants and, as shown in Table 8, they indicated more reasons for non-participation than the faculty categorized as having high involvement. The most frequently selected response was related to the content of the program, specifically that the content was not relevant. Non-participants were more likely than participants to choose to write-in their own reasons. Most notably, the LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) category more than doubled the number of reasons selected by any other category of faculty and was the only category to have at least one of each response selected.

In summary, while the participants largely focused their responses into two reasons for participating, those that did not participate were more varied in their responses. In the table of highest ranked reasons for not participating, only one selected response was chosen less than 15 percent of the time. There were four responses that were selected at least 15 percent of the time. In addition, the "other reason" category was the second most selected response, which is a category that allowed respondents to identify a reason that was not already included on the survey. In comparison, no respondent indicated "other reason" as their highest ranked reason for

participating in the training program. This trend continues when the aggregate reasons are tallied; four different responses were selected over 15 percent of the time, with "other reason" accounting for 17 percent of the reasons selected. Again, this free response category indicates there were even more reasons faculty members did not participate; this category was selected only one time by those that participated in the training.

Table 8
Aggregated Reasons for Not Participating

Reason	HIHF	HILF	LIHF	LILF	Total
Content not relevant	2	2	2	7	13
Not required	1	0	0	2	3
No because the administration requested it	0	0	0	2	2
Negative feedback	2	1	4	6	13
No incentive to participate	0	0	3	1	4
Too time consuming	3	2	2	6	13
Other Reason	1	1	3	5	10
Total	9	6	14	29	58

E. Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 states that faculty members who participate in the training will believe that other constituents on campus should participate. The survey asked "Which of the following should be required to complete the SET? (admin, staff, faculty)." Table 9 shows that, in general, faculty respondents did not believe faculty should be required to participate in the training program, regardless of whether they themselves had participated. Faculty members who participated were relatively more likely than non-participants to believe faculty should participate, but only one of the four faculty groups indicated a majority response that faculty should participate in the training program. In comparison, over 50 percent of each category of faculty participants believed the administration and staff should participate.

Is faculty type related to beliefs regarding whether particular constituencies should participate in the training? Not necessarily. Although HIHF (HIGH INV, HIGH FOCUS) faculty were more likely to believe faculty should participate, the HILF (HIGH INV, LOW FOCUS) and LILF (LOW INV, LOW FOCUS) faculty were approximately as likely to believe administration and staff should participate. HIHF (HIGH INV, HIGH FOCUS) faculty tended to believe everyone should participate, while other faculty groups were more likely to believe only some constituents should participate.

Table 9
Expected Participation

	Faculty	Administration	Staff	Everyone	No one
Participants					
HIHF (n=4)	75%	75%	75%	75%	25%
HILF (n=7)	43%	86%	71%	43%	14%
LILF (n=4)	50%	75%	75%	50%	25%
LIHF (n=9)	44%	56%	67%	44%	33%
Non-Participants					
HIHF (n=3)	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
HILF (n=2)	0%	100%	50%	0%	0%
LILF (n=8)	13%	25%	25%	0%	63%
LIHF (n=6)	17%	50%	50%	17%	50%
Total					
HIHF (n=7)	43%	43%	43%	43%	57%
HILF (n=9)	33%	89%	67%	33%	11%
LILF (n=12)	25%	42%	42%	17%	50%
LIHF (n=15)	33%	53%	60%	33%	40%

Faculty that did not intend to participate in the training program were unlikely to believe other campus constituents should participate in the training program. As expected, faculty that indicated they did not intend to participate did not believe other faculty should participate; only two faculty members indicated faculty should participate. Only one category of faculty, the HILF (HIGH INV, LOW FOCUS) with the fewest non-participants, indicated a majority of administrators should participate. No other category had a majority of respondents indicate that either administrators or staff should participate, and, in fact, two of the four faculty groups had a majority indicate no one should participate.

As shown in Tables 10, 11, and 12, chi-square analyses of whether there is a relationship between faculty intention to participate and whether faculty, administrators, and staff should be required to participate, are all statistically significant ($p < .01$, $p < .05$, and $p < .05$, respectively).

Table 10
Should faculty be required to participate?

	Non-Participant (n=20)	Participant (n=25)
No	90% (18)	52% (13)
Yes	10% (2)	48% (12)
Chi-sq=7.4862, n=45, p=0.0062		

Table 11
Should administrators be required to participate?

	Non-Participant (n=20)	Participant (n=25)
No	60% (12)	28% (7)
Yes	40% (8)	72% (18)
Chi-sq=4.6640, n=45, p=0.0308		

Table 12
Should staff be required to participate?

	Non-Participant (n=20)	Participant (n=25)
No	65% (13)	28% (7)
Yes	35% (7)	72% (18)
Chi-sq=6.1605, n=45, p=0.0131		

V. CONCLUSION

In general, some noteworthy conclusions can be drawn from this study. Across respondents, a slight majority believe that students are customers, while a larger majority reported being involved in the campus community. There was also some disparity in the type of campus involvement as more respondents attended cultural events on campus rather than student-related events. Taken together, this might provide some insight into how the majority of faculty members view their role at the institution. Although their jobs largely involve interacting with students inside the classroom, many might believe that the customer analogy is not applicable in the educational context. While faculty might consider that being involved in the campus community in general is important, it appears that many also believe that their involvement with students should not extend beyond the classroom and should perhaps have relatively narrow parameters, which maintains the historical classroom hierarchy. This view is also supported by their position that staff attendance for the Service Excellence Training program should be mandatory while faculty involvement should be voluntary, inferring that students are seen more as the customers of staff than of faculty.

Though involved and/or student-focused faculty were more likely to participate in the Service Excellence Training program, some of the less involved, less student-focused faculty also participated. This finding was particularly interesting since these groups were just as likely to participate in the training program for similar reasons. All four groups indicated that a sense of community and being asked by

administration were their primary reasons. The prevalence of these reasons suggests the importance of top management involvement in initiating programs, which build community and promote attendance. Further, the variety of reasons offered for non-participation provides guidance for top management in order for them to gauge possible deterrents to the successful implementation of TQM at their institution.

As the educational landscape continues to change, TQM principles will continue to gain relevance for tertiary institutions, with emphasis on the initiation and support coming from top management. Having top management involvement ensures easier implementation especially if the organization has had a successful record of adapting to change and effectively responding to their environment. Further, as part of their TQM initiative, management needs to evaluate their organization's needs, history and employee quality of life. A management audit may be necessary to determine varying levels of organizational functions with an eye toward focusing on areas of the institution that need improvement. Prior to the management audit, consideration must also be given to the course of events that preceded the decision to implement a TQM program.

References

- Ackoff, R. L. (1999). Recreating the Corporation: A Design of Organizations for the 21st Century, Oxford University Press: New York, NY.
- Anderson, J. C., Rungtusanatham, M., & Schroeder, R. G. (1994). A theory of quality management underlying the Deming management method, *Academy of Management Review*, 19(3): 472-509.
- Asif, M., Awan, M. U., Khan, M. K., & Ahmad, N. (2013). "A model for total quality management in higher education," *Quality and Quantity*, 47: 1883-1904.
- Asif, M. & Raouf, A. (2013). "Setting the course for quality assurance in higher education," *Quality and Quantity*, 47: 2009-2024.
- Bonstingl, J. J. (1992). "The quality revolution in education," *Educational Leadership*, 50(3): 4-9.
- Brenneman, D. (2002). "For colleges, this is not just another recession," *Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review*, June 14, (Reprinted in *Indiana Alumni Magazine*, November/December 2002)
- Crosby, P. B. (1979). Quality is Free, McGraw-Hill: New York, NY.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of the Crisis, MIT Press: Cambridge, NY.
- Hill, F. M. (1995). "Managing service quality in higher education: The role of the student as primary consumer," *Quality Assurance in Education*, 3: 10-21.
- Jacobson, R. (1991). "Business schools turn to public relations to help shape their images," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 38(7): A19.
- Koch, J. V. & Fisher, J. L. (1998). "Higher education and total quality management," *Total Quality Management Business Excellence*, 9(8): 659-668.
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A. (1996). "Customer contributions to quality: A different view of the customer-oriented firm," *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 791-824.
- Mark, E. (2013). "Student satisfaction and the customer focus in higher education," *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1): 2-10.
- Michael, R., Sower, V., & Motwani, J. (1997). "A comprehensive model for implementing total quality management in higher education." *Benchmarking for Quality Management and Technology*, 4(2): 104-120.
- Packard, T. (1995). "TQM and Organizational Change and Development," in Total Quality Management in the Social Services: Theory and Practice, B. Gummer and P. McCallion, Eds., Albany, NY: Rockefeller College Press.
- Shea, C. & Howell, J. M. (1998). "Organizational Antecedents to the Successful Implementation of Total Quality Management: A Social Cognitive Perspective," *Journal of Quality Management*, 3(1): 3-24.
- Sila, I. & Ebrahimpour, M. (2003). "Examination and comparison of the critical factors of total quality management (TQM) across countries," *International Journal of Production Research*, 41(2): 235-268.
- Tang, Z., Chen, X., & Wu, Z. (2010). "Using behavior theory to investigate individual-level determinants of employee involvement in TQM," *Total Quality Management*, 21(12): 1231-1260.
- Temponi, C. (2005). "CI framework: implications for academia." *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13(1): 17-36.

Appendix

The following questions provide background information about your role at this College.

1. Are you a tenured faculty member at this College?
Yes ___ No ___
2. Are you the chair of your department?
Yes ___ No ___
3. What is your current rank at this College?
 Full-Time Instructor
 Assistant professor
 Associate professor
 Professor
4. Do you feel that your teaching style is lecture based?
Yes ___ No ___
5. Does your teaching style include any in-class discussions?
Yes ___ No ___
6. Do you assign projects that require your students to work in teams?
Yes ___ No ___
7. Do you feel the majority of your students take an active role in their education?
Yes ___ No ___
8. Beyond your class lectures and required office hours in which of the following activities have you participated in the current academic year (please check all that apply)?
 Cultural events (experience events, theater, choir, art exhibition)
 Athletic events (varsity or intramural)
 Faculty committee
9. Do you feel that students are the customers of higher education?
Yes ___ No ___

The following questions ask you about the Service Excellence Training program.

10. To your knowledge has your department chairperson completed the Service Excellence Training program? (if you don't know then check No)
Yes ___ No ___ I am the chairperson ___
11. In your opinion which of the following groups should be required to complete the Service Excellence Training program (check all that apply, if none then leave blank)?
 Administrative personnel
 Staff
 Faculty
12. Have you completed in the Service Excellence Training program?
Yes, I have completed all of the program sessions (**please go to question 15**) ___
No, I have not completed the program but intend to (**please go to question 15**) ___
No, I have not and do not intend to complete the program (**please go to question 13**) ___
13. If you have **NOT** taken the Service Excellence Training program and **DO NOT** intend to complete the program, which of the following are reasons why you have not completed the program (please check ALL that apply)?
 Content is not relevant for faculty.
 Not a condition of employment
 It was requested by administration.
 No monetary incentive or other perk
 The program is too lengthy considering other faculty responsibilities on campus
 Negative feedback about the program communicated by prior participants
 Other (please list below)

14. Referring to question 13, beside each check box please rank in order of importance the reasons why you do not intend to complete the program with 1 being the most important reason.
15. If you **HAVE** completed the Service Excellence Training program or **INTEND** to complete the program, what do you feel motivated you to do so (please check ALL that apply)?
 Requested to attend by administration
 To develop a sense of community
 To include it as a resume builder
 Positive feedback about the program communicated by prior participants
 Curiosity of the training program
 Asked by department chair
 Good training opportunity
 Other (please list below)

16. Referring to question 15, beside each check box please rank your reasons for wanting to participate in the training with 1 being the most important reason. **If you have any other concerns about this topic or this survey please feel free to write on the back of this sheet or attach any additional comments to this survey before you seal it in the provided envelope. Thank you for your participation.**