

## Comparing the Human Resource Development Based on the Level of Organizational Excellence

Hasan Mohajer and Mehraban Hadi Peykani

Department of Management, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Isfahan, Iran

**Abstract:** What determines human society eminent is development. The eminence of public institutions and other organizations is the result of using appropriate Human Resources (HR). This resource is certainly the only vital factor in making organized movement which has a direct relationship with the standards of Human Resource Development (HRD). This study aimed at comparing the HRD based on the level of Organizational Excellence (OE) in Esfahan Steel Co., Iran Refractories Co., Sanaye Giti Pasand Co. and Snowa. The participants in this qualitative survey were among 541 the executive, middle and operational managers. The 225 were selected from four companies on the basis of simple random sampling through Cochran formula in 2014. The required data were gathered through the questionnaires whose content and face validity was checked by the experts and the supervisor. Also, the reliability for EFQM and HRD questionnaires were 0.972 and 0.879, respectively. The data were analyzed through independent sample t-test by SPSS 22. As the results show, from nine dimensions in OE, only two (processes and results of society) were significantly different from HRD and other dimensions (leadership, staff, strategy, companies and resources, results of staff, results of customer and the key results) were not significantly different.

**Key words:** European foundation for quality management, human resource development, organizational excellence, total quality management, Iran

---

### INTRODUCTION

Every day, the complexity of the relationship between stakeholders (such as customers, shareholders, managers, employees, suppliers and social and financial agencies) and institutions are increasing. After WWII, the development of system quality control presented a higher complex level of management tools. But soon, the increasing competition in the market showed that more efficient tools are needed. This requirement caused Quality Assurance System (QAS), Quality Management (QM) and international standards to emerge. The utmost level of effort in this area is Total Quality Management (TQM) (Panahian and Panahian, 2005).

Shahin and Dabestani (2011) believed that TQM as an integrated management system improves the whole parts of the organization progressively. And as Jayaram *et al.* (2012) said QM has a positive influence on production quality as well as and the quality of the production process (Fayyaz, 2012).

According to Dale in 1994 organizations require a model in order to exploit comprehensive QM. Pun (2002) believed that these models provide a framework which

tries to conceptualize comprehensive QM. OE is one of the models which give rise to using self-assessment skills (Nodehi *et al.*, 2009). OE Models are applied as the powerful tool to measure the amount of the establishment of the systems in different organizations. When an organization uses these models, it measures the rate of its fulfillment in betterment programs and also its performance in comparison to other, even the best companies (Horri *et al.*, 2009).

As Dale in 1999 declared, fourteen great European companies including Phillips Renault, Volkswagen, Bosch and Fiat (through the establishment of European Foundation for Quality Management) with the support of European Union created the opportunity of EFQM Model. The goal of this model was to motivate and support the management of organization in order to adopt and implement the principles of TQM and to increase competitiveness power of the European industries. Hence and based on the values and fundamental concepts of excellence, EFQM was presented having nine main criteria B five are enabling and four are resulting (Azar and Tavakoli, 2006).

As the researches show, different variables influence to give rise to OE one of which is HRD. Akdere (2006) and Chandler and McEvoy (2000) believed that TQM criteria have a significant relationship with HRD. Also, Alagheband in 2003 declared that quality improvement in manufacturing and industry, health and education is an urge (Nodehi *et al.*, 2009) which needs to be realized by a model such as OE, it could be also known as the organizational development in the all dimensions including HR.

HDR is a procedure which fulfill the necessities and provides an opportunity (alongside strategic orientations and the requirements of organizations) to actualize the staff potentials and capabilities and then use it in order to carry out the organizational aims and plans (Ghaffari, 2005). Among different Human Resource Management (HRM) activities, HD is one of the most common and costly activity. This includes learning new skills, improving available skills and influential methods (Javadain *et al.*, 2009). So, training outstanding individuals known as HRD is a necessity that is required for any organization to sustain and continue its functioning in this changing world. So, when we talk about human as the supreme creature, he has never been so much intelligent and sophisticated like today. In other words, all the talents, heritages and cultures are manifested in human intelligence and knowledge (Matani *et al.*, 2008).

McLean in 2001 believed that HRD can be defined integrally as the process of developing human expertise through organizational development, staff training and functional development. In other words, it a short-term or long-term process for developing knowledge, expertise, productivity and job satisfaction at different individual, team, organizational or national levels (Nezhad and Davari, 2009).

Considering OE, the researchers in this study are going to compare HRD in companies that OE is implemented (i.e., Isfahan Steel and Iran Refractories companies) and also not implemented (Snowa Industrial Group and Sanaye Giti Pasand companies). It means with reference to HRD, how the companies that lack the implementation of EFQM differ from those which hold it. It should be added that the following research considered the four great companies well-known in industry and leading topones even in Middle East. Regarding the topic, many researches have been conducted in Iran or other countries.

The results of analyzing performance evaluation of Gillan University of Applied Science by Taqvaii (2013)

indicated that based on OE Model, the indices of leadership, strategy, HR results, society results, HR, partnership, procedures, the results obtained from the students and the key results of performance have the respective priority. Analytical results of t-test showed that the status of the components is above average which is optimum but still far from the desired point that the excellence model planned.

MiriMoghaddam (2013) conducted a study entitled recreation of the criteria for the results of OE Model in EFQM (version 2010) which was in accordance with petrochemical companies. The results showed that in customer results criteria 57 indices were presented; also in staff criteria 145 indices, in society criteria 83 indices and in key results criteria 146 indices were presented. The benefits of the obtained indices were first, high suitability of the indices and the countrys petrochemical industry and suitability of indices and cultural and indigenous patterns.

Beigi (2012) analyzed the relationship between HRD and the chain of Knowledge Management (KM) value. The results showed that the latter has a significant positive relationship with HRD in empowerment, education and participation dimensions.

Fayyaz (2012) investigated, the role of TQM in productivity of general directorate of Youth and Sport in Isfahan. He found that TQM has a positive influence on the productivity and this effect is achieved more by HRD. Moradi (2011) analyzed the status of instruction in Isfahan Steel in order to present strategies for HRD. The results showed that instructional needs analysis, instructional design, implementation of instruction and instruction evaluation are below average at the present level and above average at the desired level. There is a significant difference between instructional needs analysis, design, implementation and evaluation at the present level.

In the study entitled strategic HRM in Germannon-profit organizations by Walk *et al.* (2014) the researchers found that failure or success in implementing methods of HR may be influenced by the external environment.

Ozbag *et al.* (2013) investigated the influence of HRM capabilities on innovation through KM capacityin 122 large and medium organizations in Turkey. The researchers found that HRM capabilities has asignificant positive relation with those capacities of KM that leads to innovation.

Chi and Lan (2011) observed a significant relationship between KM and dimensions of HRD. The results also showed that management of knowledge assets, investment on employees and their empowerment will bring about KM growth in the organization.

Connell in 2008 investigated, the role of HRM inability, excellence and globalization of organizations which involved 80 managers of Australian engineering Company. He demonstrated that the companies must devote more money to education and planning in order to allocate a larger share of the market to themselves. Regarding the relevant theories and literature, the hypotheses of this study are as follows:

### Hypotheses

**Main hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HRD in Isfahan Steel and Iran Refractories companies and HRD in Snowa Industrial Group and Sanaye Giti Pasand companies with reference to OE:

- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding organizational leadership dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding staff dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding strategy dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding companies and resources dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding processes, products and services dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding results of staff dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding results of customer dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding results of society dimension
- There is a significant difference between HRDs regarding results dimension

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This descriptive survey is conducted practically using quantitative data. The target population of this study includes 541 executive, middle and operational managers in four companies (Isfahan Steel, Iran Refractories, Snowa Industrial Group and Sanaye Giti Pasand companies) (Table 1). Based on Cochran's sampling model, 225 managers were selected.

In this study, the researchers applied stratified sampling which identified the specific number of participants from each company.

The required data was collected through HRD questionnaire (Rao *et al.*, 1999) and OE questionnaire made by the researchers. The reliability of the

Table 1: Population statistics

Scope	The name of company	No. of executive, middle and operational managers
Hold EFQM certificate	Isfahan steel	200
	Iran refractories	50
Lack EFQM certificate	Snowa industrial group	136
	Sanaye Giti Pasand	155
Total		541

Table 2: Population statistics

The name of company	No. of executive, middle and operational managers	No. of participants
Isfahan steel	200	83
Iran refractories	50	21
Snowa industrial group	136	57
Sanaye Giti Pasand	155	64
Total	541	225

questionnaire was checked by the supervisor, expert knowledge and some of the participants. The validity of the questionnaires was examined by Cronbach alpha. It was measured 0.879 and 0.972 for HRD and EFQM, respectively.

The collected data was analyzed by student t-test in order to determine the significant difference of different HRD dimensions. The statistical analysis was done by SPSS version 22 in two levels of descriptive and inferential (Table 2).

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

At first, the researchers investigated whether there is a significant difference at levels HRD (Table 3). Main hypothesis comparison of HRD on the basis of OE. Result; there is no significant difference in HRD between the companies which EFQM is not implemented and those which do not.

The above mentioned result was gained while Jimenez and Martinez (2009) showed in his research that HRM has a positive influence on achievement in TQM.

In this study, the results showed that there is no difference in HRM between the two groups of companies. It can be concluded that implementing EFQM does not necessarily lead to HRM. The reason would be that the ultimate goal of Iranian companies from establishing EFQM is just to obtain its certificate and leaders of the organizations do not adhere to strict implementation of the model. So, just the name of model does not lead to HRD. It is important to mention that in research by Jimenes and Martinez (2008), the significant relationship between HRD and TQM is observed. So, no research is conducted to investigate the relation of HRD and OE.

According to the results of this study, the researchers want to study whether each dimension of the model make any significant difference in HRM or not:

Table 3: Independent sample t-test  
t-test results

Hypothesis	Dimension	f-statistics	Significance		Two tailed significance level	95% confidence interval		Result
			level	t-statistics		Lower endpoint	Upper endpoint	
Main	HRD	1.115	0.292	0.864	0.399	-0.0855	0.2142	Not significant
1	Leadership	5.900	0.016	-1.210	0.227	-0.2587	0.0617	Not significant
2	Staff	3.977	0.047	-1.166	0.245	-0.2697	0.0693	Not significant
3	Strategy	2.233	0.136	-0.828	0.409	-0.2127	0.0869	Not significant
4	Partnerships and resources	0.347	0.556	-0.205	0.838	-0.1492	0.1211	Not significant
5	Processes, products and services	0.264	0.608	2.551	0.011	0.0452	0.3524	Significant
6	Results of staff	0.000	0.990	-0.113	0.910	-0.2072	0.1847	Not significant
7	Results of customers	0.034	0.854	1.863	0.064	-0.0087	0.3110	Not significant
8	Results of society	3.424	0.066	2.878	0.004	0.0758	0.4048	Significant
9	Key results	9.862	0.002	1.640	0.103	-0.0290	0.3148	Not significant

- $H_1$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding organizational leadership dimension

Result; there is no relationship between the levels of HRD. This result is in contrast with the results of the research done by Javadain *et al.* (2009) which identified strengths and weaknesses of the oil industry. They set forth HRD Model with respect to the industry outlook in year of 1404. According to their study, if outlook is properly defined for an organization, it would lead to HRD. Obviously, leaders of the organizations are responsible for setting the outlook. This duty is itself one of the dimensions of OE Model. Also, Adhikari (2010) found a clear relationship between HRM and the extent of the realization of organizational goals. And, professional HRM provides a learning environment and contributes to achieving organizational goals. It is clear that the leaders are responsible for the extent of the realization of organizational goals and leadership is among nine dimensions of the model. Overall, these results indicate the significant difference between HRM regarding leadership dimension.

Contrarily, the results of this study indicated that leadership dimension doesn't make any significant difference in HRM. Therefore, the hypothesis rejects the results of researches done by Javadain *et al.* (2009) and Adhikari (2010). To explain more about this finding, it should be mentioned that the leaders and managers do not pay much attention to their mission on setting goals, the principles and moral values, developing missions and organizational goals. The failure in this dimension would lead to staff growth and development which itself impedes HRD.

So, it is suggested that the leaders clearly explain their mission, vision, values, policies and strategies, plans, goals and objectives of the organization in such a way that they will act on and the employees understand.

- $H_2$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding staff dimension

Result; there is no relationship between the levels of HRD. According to Moradi (2011), staff training leads to HRD. Also, Matani *et al.* (2008) showed that in-service training courses are effective in HRD. It is obvious that this training leads to staff development which is one of the characteristics of staff dimension. Contrarily, Lansbury in 2006 who studied about American managers found that there is no relationship between HRD and organizational assessment. The latter is one of the duties of organizations toward their staff.

However, the result of 2nd hypothesis revealed that the staff dimension doesn't make any significant difference in the levels of HRD. So, it supports the results of the study done by Lansbury in 2006 but disagrees with the findings that were obtained by Moradi (2011) and Matani *et al.* (2008).

Consequently, it is implied that the organizations pay little attention to staff development including training service, recruitment management, succession planning, performance management and use of reward and punishment for employees. And as a result, the employees who are working will lack appropriate abilities and skills. This means no development in staff and HR.

In this part, it is suggested that management of hiring new employees, creating a working path and succession planning must be conducted properly in organizations. Also, rewards, job displacement, adjustment and other employment matters should be aligned with policies and strategies.

- $H_3$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding strategy dimension

Result; the levels of HRD are not significantly different based on the strategy dimension. Makhmali in 2005, found that choosing and implementation of strategies which fits KM influence the quality and quantity of development of HR. As well Mohebi in 2004 observed that choosing appropriate strategies to remain

competitive in a global environment requires HRD to be more focused. So, the results show that appropriate selection of strategy leads to HRD.

Contradictorily, the result of this study showed that the strategy dimension doesn't make any significant difference in levels of HRM. So, this result rejects the findings of Makhmali in 2005 and Mohebi in 2004. To explain more about this finding, it can be mentioned that policies and strategies of the organization are not developed based on the present and future needs and expectations of stakeholders. Hence, failing to develop an appropriate strategy leads to failure in achieving organizational goals which will frustrate the staff. This frustration neglect HRD.

Considering this dimension, it is suggested that leaders analyze the performance of top organizations and competitors and finally make rational decisions:

- $H_4$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding partnerships and organizational resources dimension

Result; the levels of HRD are not significantly different based on partnerships and organizational resources dimension.

Beigi (2012) found that HRD has a significant relationship with chain of KM value. Similarly, Chi and Lan (2011) investigated a significant relationship between dimensions of HRD and KM. According to their studies, KM is one of the organizational resources and it is a must for any organization. So, by referring to partnerships and organizational resources dimension, there will be a significant difference in the level of HRD.

However, the fourth hypothesis argues against these findings and indicates no relation. It is concluded from this contradictory result (to the studies of Beigi, 2012; Chi and Lan, 2011) that the organizations do not have the appropriate management of financial resources, equipment, information and knowledge. This will cause waste of different resources. Since, the knowledge is one of the resources, losing it will impede HRD which is dependent on knowledge resources.

Considering this dimension, it is suggested that organizations work hard to implement KM in organizations in order to acquire, increase and use knowledge effectively. As well, it is advised to use information and communications technology to support and improve the operating efficiency of the organization:

- $H_5$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding processes, products and services of organization dimension

Result; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding processes, products and services dimension.

Soltani in 2002 conducted a study in which he found that efficiency and effectiveness of processes can be achieved through developing HR in all aspects (occupational, behavioral, standardizing and tutorial). Thus, the results of our study is in line with Soltani's which shows that this dimension make a significant difference in the levels of HRD. To talk more about this dimension, it can be mentioned that EFQM certification centers force the organizations who intend to implement OE Model to design and improve their process. This improvement prevents organization from parallel works, chaos and worthless activities which increase the efficiency and effectiveness of activities and finally, HR is developed.

To end up the discussion about this dimension, it is advisable to establish Process Management System (PMS) properly in the organization through corporate communications and then re-engineering processes in order to improve it. Furthermore, the processes (including key processes) which as certain policy and strategy should be designed so properly:

- $H_6$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding results of staff dimension

Result; there is not any significant difference between levels of HRD in this dimension. Bowen and Ostroff (2004) investigated that the potency of HRM system can contribute to employees ability to achieve organizational effectiveness. The ability of employees is among the indicators of results of staff dimension. So, the former leads to organizational effectiveness regarding to Bowen and Ostroff. And, when an organization is effective, it can be claimed that HRD has occurred.

But, our finding is not similar to Bowen and Ostroff (2004) study, since it does not make the intended difference in HRD. More explanation about this finding reveals that the organizations have not fulfilled their responsibility towards the indicators of the results of staff including capabilities, increase of motivation, satisfaction and employee involvement. The lower these indicators, the less the development and excellence of staff will be. With regards to the results of this dimension, it's wise to create motivation in staff by performance-based rewards in order to achieve the organizational objectives. The staff also requires enough motivation to participate at in-service training course:

- $H_7$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding results of customers dimension

Result; there is not any significant difference between levels of HRD in this dimension. Beykzadeh and Behboodi in 2009, found a significant difference between customer-orientedness and OE Model criteria. Also, Talebi in 2008 examined that the establishment of QAS cause valuable results such as customer orientation.

Our finding in this dimension is against the results of previous studies. To clarify this finding, it can be declared that the organizations don't pay attention to innovation in product design, environmental aspects, dealing with complaints, product training, responding to customer. It will consequently cause dissatisfaction of customer. This dissatisfaction means that the mechanism of the organizations does not run properly. The reason is failure in staff development which is also a failure in HR development. However, the significance level in statistics of this dimension was 0.064 which a little above 0.05. So, making change in organization by focusing more on factors of customer results leads to HRD.

It's highly suggested to have active communication with customers in order to get comments, determine the needs and expectations and dealing with them:

- $H_3$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding results of society dimension

Result; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD in this dimension. Hoseini in 2005 investigated Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and found that its increase has remarkable effect on the increase of HRD index. Since, increasing GDP indicates economic growth which itself is among the indicators of results of society dimension. So, the finding in this study corresponds to Hoseini's claim about the eighth dimension.

Talking more about the result, we know that results of society has a cross-organizational dimension. So, when organizations want to establish EFQM Model, they try to observe some of the indicators of this dimension some of which are as follows: the principles of citizenship such as reducing noise and unpleasant odor; reducing risks associated with health and disasters; using water, electricity and gas properly; reducing pollution and emission of toxic gases; supporting sports and recreational activities, etc. These indicators work as aspects of advertising. So, applying the parameters increase the level of satisfaction in employees. Consequently, efficiency and development of staff will be achieved.

To summarize this dimension, the researchers suggest that the performance of the organizations should remain in a way that it will have a positive impact on regional and national economy:

- $H_9$ ; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD regarding key results dimension

Result; there is a significant difference between levels of HRD in this dimension. Mahdavi and SahlAbadi in 2011 found in their studies that value of HR, per capita value of HR and the growth rate of the value of HR have a significant relation with the output rate of the shares. The researchers explained more about this finding and declared that this rate is among the indicators of key results dimension. Also, Adhikari (2010) found that HRD has a clear relation with organizational performance. Jimenez and Martinez (2009) investigated similarly that HRM leads to performance improvement. However, our finding in this dimension does not support the two previous studies and rejects the existence of any relationship.

The researchers believe that the reason why this has been the result, claim that the organizations do not devote themselves to key indicators of performance such as: intellectual capital, KM, the output rate of the shares, process performance, the rate of reliability and innovation and intellectual property. In this case, the organization lacks the desired dynamism and gradually changes more to a defensive organization. This dominant condition in organization will diminish creativity and innovation of staff and as a result, HR will not develop.

## CONCLUSION

The concluding suggestion for this dimension is that the product manufacturing process must have a good and proper performance. And the leaders must implement KM in their organization.

## REFERENCES

- Adhikari, R.D., 2010. Human Resource Development (HRD) for performance management: The case of Nepalese organizations. *Intl. J. Prod. Perform. Manage.*, 59: 306-324.
- Akdere, M., 2006. Quality management through human resources: An integrated approach to performance improvement. *Bus. Rev. Cambridge*, 5: 233-238.
- Azar, A. and G. Tavakoli, 2006. Foundation for quality management excellence model development of Europe: The design phase of a screening model for the selection of the key industry organizations in Iran. *Iran. J. Manage. Sci.*, 4: 55-77.
- Beigi, M., 2012. The relationship between HRD and the chain of knowledge management value. MA Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan, Isfahan, Iran.
- Bowen, D.E. and C. Ostroff, 2004. Understanding HRM-Firm performance linkages: The role of the strength of the HRM system. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 29: 203-221.

- Chandler, G.N. and G.M. McEvoy, 2000. Human resource management, TQM and firm performance in small and medium-size enterprises. *Entrepreneurship: Theor. Pract.*, 25: 43-57.
- Chi, H. and C.H. Lan, 2011. The influences of organizational culture and human resource development on R&D organizational effectiveness: the mediating effect of knowledge management. *J. Intl. Manage. Stud.*, 6: 1-3.
- Fayyaz, M., 2012. The role of TQM in the efficiency of the general administration of sports and youth Isfahan. MA Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan, Isfahan, Iran.
- Ghaffari, A., 2005. Human resource development is key organizations in the twenty-first century. *J. Bus. Transform.*, 48: 100-103.
- Horri, S., H. Akbari, M. Ghergherechi and S. NooriAlamooti, 2009. Analyzing the advantages and achievements of applying the EFQM excellence model in universities and higher education institutions. *Basirat J.*, 44: 97-124.
- Javadain, S.R., M. Sharifi and H. Rayej, 2009. The role of human resources development in achieving vision 1404 oil industry. *J. Human Resour. Manage. Oil Ind.*, 8: 77-100.
- Jayaram, J., S. Ahire, M. Nicolae and C. Ataseven, 2012. The moderating influence of product orientation on coordination mechanisms in total quality management. *Intl. J. Qual. Reliab. Manage.*, 29: 531-559.
- Jimenez, D. and C.M. Martinez, 2009. The performance effect of HRM and TQM: A study in Spanish organizations. *Intl. J. Oper. Prod. Manage.*, 29: 1266-1289.
- Matani, M., R. Hassanzade and M. Matan, 2008. The effect of in-service training in HRD. *Manage. J.*, 11: 48-56.
- MiriMoghaddam, A., 2013. Recreation of the standards of organizational excellence model results in EFQM V2010 in accordance with petrochemical companies. MA Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Najaf Abad, Isfahan, Iran.
- Moradi, F., 2011. The analysis of the status of education in Isfahan Steel Company in order to provide solutions to HRD. MA Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan, Isfahan, Iran.
- Nezhad, T.M. and A. Davari, 2009. Human resources development with the organizational sociology approach. *J. Res. Human Resour. Manage.*, 3: 51-80.
- Nodehi, H., S. Taslimi, M. MirKamali and N. Mirsepasi, 2009. Designing appropriate organizational excellence model in education. *J. Educ.*, 1: 7-28.
- Ozbag, G.K., M. Esen and D. Esen, 2013. The impact of HRM capabilities on innovation mediated by knowledge management capability. *Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 99: 784-793.
- Panahian, H. and M. Panahian, 2005. Design and implementation of the business excellence model based on EFQM. *Res. Strategic Manage.*, 36: 7-29.
- Pun, K.F., 2002. Development of an integrated total quality management and performance measurement system for self-assessment: A method. *Total Qual. Manage.*, 13: 759-777.
- Rao, S.S., T.S. Raghunathan and L.E. Solis, 1999. The best commonly followed practices in the human resource dimension of quality management in new industrializing countries: The case of China, India and Mexico. *Intl. J. Qual. Reliab. Manage.*, 16: 215-226.
- Shahin, A. and R. Dabestani, 2011. A feasibility study of the implementation of total quality management based on soft factor. *J. Ind. Eng. Manage.*, 4: 258-280.
- Taqvahi, L., 2013. Performance evaluation of Gilan University of applied science in EFQM organizational excellence model. MA Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Gazvin, Isfahan, Iran.
- Walk, M., H. Schinnenburg, F. Handy, 2014. Strategic human resource management in German nonprofits. *Intl. J. Voluntary Nonprofit Organiz.*, 25: 991-1021.