



TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE: A THEORETICAL SERMON

Maxwell Nwinye

Department on Management, Faculty of Management Sciences

University of Port Harcourt

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
High operating challenges affecting shipping companies in Rivers State, Nigeria specifically came from neglect on total quality management (TQM). Most of the managers use few workers that are friendly and loyal to function instead of involving the skillful, experienced employees to be resilient against any unforeseen circumstances in the business. Organizations that realized the necessities of applying the measures of total quality management could attract profitability and resilience to withstand pressures or competitiveness. The study investigated total quality management and organizational resilience. The main sermon was on shipping companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. The researcher concluded that successful implementation of total quality management using employee involvement could lead to robustness and agility of the firm.	Total quality management, employee involvement, robustness, organizational resilience.

Introduction

Work environment is branded with uncertainty, high dynamism, and competition. Added to this is the increased occurrence of national disaster and crises situations together with economic, political, and social events, which have affected many organizations regardless of the trade. Ordinarily, Osita-Ejikeme and Amah (2022) suggested that for companies to survive these challenges and difficult policies, it becomes imperative for a firm to be resilient. Corroborating this assumption, Duchek (2020) highlighted that the survival of a firm is not about its fitness, but the ability of the firm to be resilient or agile, bear discontinuity, unexpected changes, in the aspect of unforeseen circumstances. For shipping companies to be resilient, it is important for these firms to be agile and robust to the changing environment. Organizational resilience entails the readiness of organization to adapt to quick recovery, total quality management, and utilized opportunities (Orchiston et al., 2016). Resilient organizations have the capacity to positively adapt to changing business environment without showing any stress (Kantur & Iseri-say, 2015). This indicates that when a firm is resilient, it tends to be proactive in quality delivery which helps to overcome challenges emanating from the business environment and easily adjust to changing circumstances.

Okuwa et al. (2016) noted that organizational resilience relates to the capability of the organization to practice risk management and maintain special qualities or organizational components. The resilient of organizations depend on its continuous process that supports performance of the company and manages

crisis situation (Mitroft, 2005). Furthermore, organizational resilience refers to the capacity or ability of an organization to withstand shocks and to handle unforeseen dangers after their occurrence (Okuwa et. al., 2016). Similarly, Organizational resilience signifies quick respond to turbulent events caused by economic downturns, natural disaster, and disruptions from the business environment. Most organizations including their various units may not have all it takes to forestall every challenge that comes their way. Hence, Hollnagel (2000) identified four basic abilities that define the quality of organizational resilience which includes ability to learn from experience, the ability to react to different challenges, ability to anticipate disruptions, and the capacity to carefully detect what is happening in the business environment. Wildarskey (1988) emphasized that firms with resilience initiative are able to seize opportunities to invoke protective programs to manage unexpected disturbances or events. Robust organizations handle dangers, adapt easily, recovers through total quality management which reflects the changes in the external business environment (Hamel & Valikangas, 2003).

Relying on quality as a competitive defense enables companies to gain competitive advantage. Shipping firms' barriers have been on how to continuously improve the quality service delivery to gain high value. This obstruction may be corrected through total quality management which facilitates long-term success and sustainability. Hence, Prescott (1995) summaries total quality management (TQM) as a practical tactic for managing and measuring continuous improvement of all aspects of the business for the purpose of satisfying the needs and expectations of customers. When organizations implement total quality management there is possibility of operating successfully in an unstable and complicated environment. Total quality management (TQM) acts as a canopy where employees struggle to reduce wastage, increase customer satisfaction, reduce cost, and increase the efficiency of service (Kumar et. al., 2016). Moreover, Singh and Dhalla (2010) claimed that total quality management is the integrated organizational effort designed to improve quality at every level. Correspondingly, total quality management signifies inclusive approach to improve effectiveness, quality, competitiveness, and flexibility through planning or organizing each activity connecting people at all levels. total quality management helps organizations in gaining sustainable competitive advantage (Mehmood, et. al., 2014). Furthermore, total quality management requires the application of systematic tools for managing organizational processes which involves the establishment of basic structure or measures like employee involvement and continuous improvement of quality (Kumar et. al. 2016). The research is aimed at creating the relationship between total quality management and organizational resilience in shipping companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

Literature Review

Total Quality Management

Total quality management is the established techniques to control and improve performance aimed at pleasing the customers by provision of adequate resources and making quality the primary goal (Holmes, 1992). Total quality management (TQM) entails three components such as quality, total quality, and management, in which quality signifies meeting customers requirements at lowest cost, total quality relates to people should be involved in quality at all levels, and by assimilating the term management the value of management responsibility is targeted at achieving quality and customer satisfaction (Flood, 1993). Besides, improvement is demonstrated in better service, resulting from changes to processes and systems in the organization. Organizations that emphasize on total quality management are likely to attain favourable market position. Total quality management denotes an

approach to performing business that tries to exploit the competitiveness of an organization through the ceaseless improvement of the quality, individuals, products, services, and environment. (Mehmood et al., 2014). Furthermore, Oakland (2000) advocated that total quality management represents a management system containing values, with continuous development, methodologies and tools, which aim to properly use resources and increase external and internal customers satisfaction. It is also a strategic management scheme that improves business as a whole and add value to customers. Companies practice quality management systems to improve the efficiency of their processes for increase profitability.

The total quality management encompasses both production-oriented and employee relations-oriented elements, that prevent problems and promote long term success (Ngambi & Nkemkiafu, 2015). However, the notion of TQM is beginning to arrest the imagination of chief executives and senior management in service industries, shipping firms, health care, and educational institutions. Governments are developing several national quality campaigns, workshops, quality assurance in universities, and companies are becoming more committed to quality management training. Previously, total quality management was mainly used in manufacturing industries but subsequently applied to other maritime, shipping, and service sectors since it has been recognized as a strategic concept in achieving competitive edge and improving resilience (Talib, et al. 2011). Moreover, total quality management could assist managers in managing the affairs of their organization and improve resilience (Konecny & Thun 2011). Total quality management is a systematic way of guaranteeing that all activities gain a high degree of attention in improving organizational effectiveness. Chang (2005) asserted that total quality management is a set of principles that characterizes the basis of a continuous improvement in organization and sustains competitive advantage. Welikala and Sohal (2008) maintained that if TQM is successfully implemented, it helps the organizations to improve resilience, performance, produce better quality products, reduces costs, increases customer, and employee satisfaction.

Ngambi and Nkemkiafu (2015) insisted that total quality management symbolizes a management strategy applied to increase quality, productivity, suppliers, employees, and image of organizations. Total quality management system uses different types of device and theories to empower employees, build a team atmosphere, and focus on time management to deliver quality products. Ordinarily, the intervention trajectory in total quality management such as statistical process control, failure analysis, and other techniques support to detect and eradicate waste, mistakes, improve efficiency, products, and organizational processes (Oakland, 2000). Total quality management (TQM) appears to be a global topic in the twenty-first century with its pedigrees in the USA and Japan. Great successes have been recorded among Japanese companies during the 1980s, companies all over the world found that it was necessary to have good quality management practices to stay competitive (Yusuff, 2004). Total quality management is a verified technique that guarantees survival of competition and customer satisfaction. Total quality management (TQM) reinforced competitive position, reduced costs, higher profitability, guaranteed higher productivity, enhanced market image, and adaptability to changing or emerging market conditions.

Employee Involvement: Employee involvement refers to quality management system that empowers workers to take the initiative to improve processes and quality (Cochran, 1968). Similarly, employee involvement refers to method of permitting employees to participate in managerial decision-making

and improvement activities appropriate to their levels in the organization (Welikala & Sohal, 2008). Employee involvement signifies a firm strategic planning that empowers workers to participate in all work-related activities to enhance better decisions by identifying areas of improvement. These systems cannot function without the contribution and encouragement of top management. Every employee from top-level managers to the lowest level employee is involved in the continuous improvement process in organizations using this system. Companies provide training and support programs as technique of the quality management system to all employees. TQM companies create an atmosphere of teamwork which allows workers to build cohesion that may enhance performance and resilience in the organizations. The influence of workers involvement in firms changing processes has contributed to effective decision making and resilience capability (Choppins, 2005). Employee involvement gives opportunity to identify mistakes, make immediate corrective actions, reduces labour and management conflict. Workers participation boost employees morale by encouraging more effective communication and cooperation. Giving the managers or supervisors in shipping companies the freedom to take corrective actions against employees who violated work rules or policies may enhance standard and reduce resistance, low output (Hackman & Wageman, 1995). Organizations particularly the shipping companies could implement total quality management or have improvements in quality product or service by full participation of employees in organizations (Deming, 1986).

Employees' involvement in decision making is essentially at the heart of the TQM concept (Welikala & Sohal, 2008). Employee involvement and participative management are often used interchangeably which provide the foundation for quality efforts and strategy development. The low success in TQM programs were as a result of lack of emphasis on human resource projects namely leadership, training, participative management, rewarding and appraisal systems, decision-making process (Welikala & Sohal, 2008). Acceptance of total quality management as a managerial philosophy, brought significant human resources recognition and the implication problems were related to people. Employee involvement created more profitable and competitive advantage through higher employee satisfaction, and quality of life at work. Indeed, Purushotham (2010) noted that personnel commitment and employee empowerment had a significant positive relationship with organizational performance and resilience.

Continuous Improvement: Deming (1986) described continuous improvement as management practice that engages in quality bring forth incremental progresses and innovations in products, processes, and services. Continuous improvement denotes a system which relates higher quality to lower costs and higher market share to enhance customers satisfaction (Cochran, 1968). Continuous production initiative provides learning experience that may lead to a predictable decrease in the manufacturing cost per unit over time. Oakland (2000) perceives continuous improvement as a process management which involves documenting management procedures, with instructions for machine operation at each work station to curtail the operator error. James (1996) regarded continuous improvement as an initiative that increases success and reduces failures. Consequently, continuous improvement points toward constant upgrading in the products, processes, and services. The workers in an organization may acquire new knowledge and skills by participating in TQM and quality improvement (Juran & Gryna, 1993).

Total quality management may do little to improve the resilience of an organization unless all staff grip it, and this often requires advancement in quality and change in an organization's culture. Vodafone (2006) inspires workers to evaluate the present procedures by improving business processes through

innovation, monitoring, and reviewing the performance indicators. Continuous improvement enables organizations to maintain standard, fulfils customers need, and organizational goals. Moreover, James (1996) postulates that continuous involvement, comprises organization contribution in terms of resilience by continuously implementing small changes in work processes. Continuous improvement expands flexibility, responsiveness, and the ability to adapt quickly to changes within its environment (Purushotham, 2010).

Organizational Resilience

Resilience is the ability to vigorously reinvent an organization when conditions change, in order to respond to uncertain conditions at the organizational level (King et al., 2015). Organizational resilience refers to the ability of preventing disruptions and recover quickly from unfavourable circumstances (Shin et al., 2012). Similarly, Nwinye (2024) elucidated organizational resilience as the potentials that an organization has to recover from adversity and move on to achieve growth in the face of discontinuity or crisis. Organization is assumed to be resilient when it could maintain a desirable performance level under changing environment and bounce into stable operation. Organizational resilience is the capability of a firm to sustain growth, adapt, and get well from a devastating condition. Rexhepi and Modenesi (2016) expanded the concept of organizational resilience to mean capability to forestall predicaments, respond to short-term shocks, recover from surprising distractions. Resilience allows organization to have control quickly in the face of unanticipated change and to maintain a general sense of well-being while managing many changes (Sheffi, 2006). Organizational resilience assists firms to respond to turbulent situations caused by economic downturns, natural disaster, and man-made tragedies. Although, the term resilience originates in science, denoting to a material's ability to return to its original shape following distortion. Furthermore, organizations including shipping companies could succeed when they get ahead of crisis, respond to threats, and ready to adapt to disruptions in the environment (Rexhepi & Modenesi, 2016).

Resilience is particularly important for organizations providing goods and services to deploy methods of preventing disruptions in their operations processes. Organizational resilience occurs when the company engages in transformative activities, resume, withdraw from collapse, bounce back, or positively adjust during unfortunate circumstances. Resilience involves the survival of the organization under uncertainty, destruction, and restore to the original state. Organization with high resilience may adjust appropriately and shape a new capacity encountered with a variety of dramatic changes. McPhee (2014) claimed that the adaptive components of organizational resilience include agility, robustness, and shock absorption.

Robustness: Robustness entails a complex system's capacity to continue functioning in the face of functional shocks or disturbances (Osita-Ejikeme & Eketu, 2021). Robustness is explained as a system's ability to adapt to pressure or unanticipated external changes (Golden & Powell, 2000). Robustness is clarified as the ability to endure or survive external surprises, to maintain stability in the event of uncertainty. Robustness comprises shock resistance to preserve a firm fundamental culture and core characteristics in changing situations. An organization is robust when it retains functionality regardless of new markets or location. Hence, robustness refers to the adjustment of institutions to maintain stability following uncertainty or transformation (Capano & Woo, 2016). Robustness symbolizes a system where companies adapt its behaviour to change in the environment and get ahead

of internal system failure. Robustness is described as a firm capacity to recover from failures and exceptions. Ordinarily, recovery from disorder involves implementing certain corrective actions to restore the system's ideal behaviour. Capacity building is an element of robustness where the managers influence culture, structures, policies, procedures, technologies, or even initiate change.

Agility: Sheffi (2006). described agility as the ability to exercise knowledge by seizing opportunities more than other competitors. Agility is the successful application of innovation, haste action, flexibility, quality by integration of available resources, and best practices to provide customer driven products and services (Yusuf et al., 2003). Agility signifies a firm effort to utilize the limited resources in responding to opportunities and threats. Organizational agility helps to maintain competitive advantage in stormy environment (Barney & Arikan, 2001). It is considered as the ability of an organization to introduce change by taking corrective measures to fit into the situation. Agility is useful for employees to transform the information received, into action. Mathiassen et al., (2006) noted that agility illustrates how organization reacts to changes using available information system to practice innovation. Agility is the integration of efficiency, knowledge management, sustainable change, and organizational resources. Managers are to operate within an environment that cares for teamwork, employee learning, innovation, information dissemination, efficiency, and rewards for agile employees (Sheffi, 2006).

Theoretical Framework

Dynamic Capability Theory: Teece et al. (1997) narrated that dynamic capability entails the ability of an organization to create change, adapt, or influence business environment. In essence, Teece (2007) clarified dynamic capabilities as the capacity of an organization to integrate, grow, and integrate internal and external skills essential in responding to rapidly changing settings. This assertion indicates that a firm's success does not only depend on existing resources and capabilities, but comprising the ability to adapt to a changing environment. Dynamic capability refers to business capability to enforce agility, manage threat, utilize opportunities and acquire tangible assets. Teece (2007) outlined three main basics of dynamic capability which include sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring. Sensing states the ability of a company to recognize and respond to changes in its environment. Seizing refers to the ability to take advantage of opportunities offered by these changes. Reconfiguring represents the ability to adapt and change the company's resources, capabilities, and strategy in order to take advantage of these opportunities. Furthermore, Augier and Teece (2009) noted that when organizations and related shipping firms imbibe core competence, minimize delays, and adapt to technology and new government policies they may achieve longer-term competitive advantage. However, this theory may be criticized from the point of country club management, especially if a manager prefers low skill employees that are loyal to competent employees by favouring his loyalist (Teece et al., 1997). The size of organization and cultural disparity affecting countries may also hinder the application of this theory.

Conclusion

The lack of employee involvement and quality improvement have been identified as major reasons for the non-sustainability of total quality management (TQM) in the shipping companies, Rivers State, Nigeria. From the outcome of the study, the researcher concluded that total quality management has significant relationship with organizational resilience. The practice of total quality management contributes to robustness needed for promoting quality delivery of products or services in the shipping

companies. When continuous improvement of quality is upheld it reduces operating costs and customers dissatisfaction. Furthermore, Shipping companies should implement total quality management by allowing the employees to use their initiatives to effect changes in the organization. Management of shipping companies should engage in continuous improvement on quality of products or services to achieve robust performance.

References

1. Augier M., & Teece D. J. (2009). Dynamic capabilities and the role of managers in business strategy and economic performance. *Organization Science*, 20(2), 410-421.
2. Barney, Y. B., & Arikan, A. M. (2001). The resource-based view: Origins and implications. In M. A. Hiff, R. E. Freeman, J. S Harrison (Eds.). *Hand book of strategic management* (pp. 124–188). Black well Publishers Ltd.
3. Capano G., & Woo J. J. (2006). Resilience and robustness in policy design: A critical appraisal. *Springer Policy Science*, 1(5), 1-28.
4. Chang, H. H. (2005). The influence of continuous improvement and performance factors in total quality organization. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 16(3), 413-437.
5. Choppins, J. (2005). Total quality management: What isn't management service quality. 5(1), 1-5.
6. Cochran, E. (1968). Planning production costs: Using the improvement curve. Chandler.
7. Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of the crisis: Massachusetts institute of technology. Center for advanced engineering Study.
8. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business research*, 13, 215-246.
9. Flood, R. L. (1993). Beyond TQM. John Wiley and Sons.
10. Golden W., & Powell P. (2000). Towards a definition of flexibility: In search of the Holy Grail Omega. *The International Journal of Management Science*, 28, 373-384.
11. Hackman, R. J., & Wageman R. (1995). Total quality management: Empirical, conceptual, and practical issues. *Administration Science Quarterly* 40 (2), 309-342.
12. Hamel, G., & Valikangas, L. (2003). The Quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 8(9), 52 – 63.
13. Hollnagel (2000). Coping with complexity: Strategies for information input overload. 2nd Conference on cognitive systems engineering in process control. (CSEPC 2000). Taejon, South Korea, 22-24.
14. Holmes, K. (1992). Total quality management. Pira International.
15. James, P. (1996). Total Quality Management: An introductory text. Prentice Hall.
16. Juran, J. M., & Gryna, F. M., (1988). Juran quality control handbook (4th ed.).
17. King, D. D., Newman, A., & Luthans, F. (2015). Not if, but when we need resilience in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, <http://doi:10.1002/job.2063>.
18. Kantur, D., & Iseri-say, A. (2015). Measuring organizational resilience: A scale development. *Journal of business economics and finance*, 4(3), 456-472.
19. Konecny, P. A., & Thun, J.H. (2011). Do it separately or simultaneously: An empirical analysis of a conjoint implementation of TQM and TPM on plant performance. *International journal of production economics*, 133(2): 496-507.

20. Kumar, V., Singh, J. Kumar, D., & Antil, M. (2016). Total quality management. *National journal of advanced research*, 2(3), 05-08.
21. Mathiassen, L., & Pries – Heje, J. (2006) Business agility and diffusion of information technology. *European journal of information systems*, 15(2), 116-119.
22. McPhee, W. (2014). A new sustainability model: Engaging the entire firm. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 35(2), 4-12.
23. Mehmood, S., Qadeer, & Ahmad, A. (2014). Relationship between TQM dimensions and organizational performance. *Pakistan journal of commerce and social sciences*, 8(3), 662-679.
24. Mitroft, I. I. (2005). From my perspective lessons from 9/11: Are companies better prepared today? *Technological Forecasting Social Change*, 72,(3), 375-376.
25. Ngambi, M. T., & Nkemkafu, A. G. (2015). The impact of total quality management on firm's organizational performance. *American Journal of Management*, 15(4), 69.
26. Nwinye, M. (2023). Corporate social responsibility and organizational resilience in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 60(5), 208-226.
27. Oakland, J. S. (2000). *Total quality management*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
28. Okuwa, J. A., Nwuche, C. A., & Anyanwu, S. A. C. (2016). Human capital development and organizational resilience in selected manufacturing firms in Rivers State. *International of Novel research in Humanity and social sciences*, 3(2), 43-50.
29. Orchiston, C., Prayag, G., & Brown, C. (2016). Organizational resilience in the tourism sector: *Annals of Toursim Research*, 56, 145-148.
30. Osita-Ejikeme, U. E., & Amah, E. (2022). Strategic flexibility and corporate resilience of manufacturing firms in South-South, Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 9(3), 50-73.
31. Osita-Ejikeme, U. E., & Eketu, C. (2021). Information systems flexibility and robustness of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 2(6),119-129. <https://doi.org/10.54660/anfo.2021.3.1.10>
32. Prescott, B. (1995). *Creating a world class quality organization*. Kogan Page Ltd.
33. Purushotham, B. (2010). *Effective implementation of quality management systems*. Woodhead Publishing.
34. Rexhepi, E. & Modenesi, S.R. (2016, August 18). The importance of organizational resilience, PECB. <https://pecb.com/article/the-importance-of-organizational-resilience>
35. Sheffi, Y. (2006). Manage risk through resilience. *Chief Executive*, 214, 28-29.
36. Shin, J., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M. G. (2012). Resources for change: The relationships of organizational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 727–748.
37. Singh, S. B., & Dhalla, R. S. (2010). Effect of total quality management on performance of Indian pharmaceutical industries. *proceedings of the international conference on industrial engineering and operations management*, Dhaka Bangladesh, 9-10.
38. Welikala, D., & Sohal, A. (2008). Total quality management and employees' involvement: A case study of an Australian organization. *Total Quality Management*. 19(6): 627-642.
39. WILDavsky, A. (1988). *Searching for safety*. Transaction Press.
40. Yusuff, R. M. (2004). Manufacturing best practices of the electric and electronic firms in Malaysia. *An International Journal*, 11(4), 361-9.