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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to develop an integrated conceptual framework of total quality management and corporate social responsibility.

Design/methodology/approach – This study is based on stakeholder theory, which stresses the satisfaction of all stakeholders. Therefore, companies generate profit for their shareholders by producing high quality products and services to emphasize human dignity and to satisfy their employees without harming people and the natural environment.

Findings – The results of the study suggest an integrated conceptual framework by identifying the critical factors that are parallel between quality management and social responsibility to satisfy key stakeholders’ demands.

Research limitations/implications – This study is conceptual in nature, and empirical research is needed to identify the critical factors that promote the application of TQM and CSR practices, which are limited.

Practical implications – The proposed conceptual framework may facilitate the management of an organization to evaluate its quality and social programs and will highlight problem areas that can be improved. This study contributes to the literature on TQM and CSR and captures the important factors for effective TQM and CSR practices. The conceptual framework will help researchers and firms to recognize TQM and CSR initiatives and establish a strengthened relationship between corporate strategy and social conditions.

Originality/value – Previous studies have been conducted separately in the areas of TQM and CSR, and there are still not sufficient number of studies to simultaneously integrate quality management and social responsibility. Thus, there is a critical research gap, which raises the question of how the integration of TQM and CSR practices can be developed. There is a need to recognize the mechanism through which the specific element of CSR would be included as an implicit and/or explicit aspect or whether it should be addressed along with TQM. Therefore, this study proposes an integrated conceptual framework that can be applied to the broader issues of responsibility rather than just quality.
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1. Introduction

In today’s globalized business world, providing the best quality of products or services to customers has become more challenging and demanding. Additionally, companies are confronting pressure to behave in socially responsible ways to serve the interests of their internal stakeholders (e.g. customers, shareholders, employees, creditors and suppliers) and/or external stakeholders (community, society, the environment, non-governmental organizations, public authorities, trade unions and international organizations) in
terms of quality (Frolova and Lapina, 2015) and environmental and social issues (Korschun et al., 2016). For this reason, total quality management (TQM) and corporate social responsibility (CSR) are playing important roles in maintaining sustainable competitive advantage in the global market. Both TQM and CSR are broadly recognized management approaches (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014). TQM emphasizes the continuous improvement of organization processes and adds value and productivity in the satisfaction of customer demands (Wang et al., 2012). CSR represents “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (Commission of the European Communities, 2001). Both concepts (TQM and CSR) share the consensus that internal and external stakeholders remain the significant element for improving stakeholder benefits (Ghobadian et al., 1998; Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014).

In previous studies, different models have been developed to measure business performance and organizational excellence. For example, performance assessment models such as Malcom Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA), European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) and others are based on quality management, but scholars critique on these model because of their and applicability and implications. For example, Wongrassamee et al. (2003) criticized that it is difficult to implement and integrate EFQM framework to any type of organization because of differences in business operations in different organizational context. Even though, well know quality models have been criticized by scholars. For example, TQM become a qualifying criterion to strive with competitors but not the winning criterion (Idris et al., 2003). Other major critiques on TQM described that TQM have lacks of theoretical foundation (Gómez et al., 2017; Thorne and Smith, 2000; Dean and Bowen, 1994). Idris et al. (2003) suggested that without proper theoretical foundation, TQM may not implement in organizations. For example, TQM implementation requires proper knowledge about business process and without appropriate training for employees TQM will not be implemented successfully. In this context, Barouch and Ponsignon (2016) concluded that lack of understanding of the foundations of TQM by managers is one of the main reasons of poor TQM implementation.

However, for TQM success, Karuppusami and Gandhinnathan (2006) suggested that organization must carefully manage and control fundamental factors of TQM. For this reason, Aquilani et al. (2017) highlighted that TQM success is based on customer programs, stakeholders, people and processes. Aquilani et al. (2017) conducted a systematic literature review on papers published from 1993 to 2016 and highlighted a gap in the existing research and found incomplete consideration among management, marketing and quality issues, that all centered on customers and other stakeholders. They advised that organizations must consider a wider view of not only its customers but also other stakeholders such as employee, society and communities and environment to enhance business excellence.

On the other hand, different theories of CSR have been developed in literature and also criticized by scholars. For example, Carroll’s (1979) “Pyramid of CSR” is one of the famous CSR models for theory and practices, include CSR practices, e.g., economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic dimensions. These dimensions in terms of their applicability in the corporate world are quite broad in their nature (Claydon, 2011). Moreover, some organizations are facing difficulties to align Carroll’s “Pyramid of CSR” with their daily corporate activities due to its lack of consideration of environmental management and corporate sustainability (Visser, 2006). More interestingly, this pyramid is one of the underpinning of various CSR models that are widely used by dynamic organizations to make their business practices more ethical and satisfied the expectations of their stakeholders (Geva, 2008).

Although, the contradictions in previous literature, there is a need to operationalize the conceptual framework by integrating both distinct areas (TQM and CSR) into one single comprehensive framework, the reason is that a firm’s survival and success rely on
the ability of its managers to maximize the level of satisfaction for its stakeholders that will result in overall business performance improvement (Bhattacharya, 2016; Mishra and Suar, 2010; Clarkson, 1995; Freeman et al., 2004; Wood, 1991). For this reason, TQM and CSR practices are important for organization to generate profit for its shareholder and satisfy all its relevant related stakeholder (employees, customers, suppliers and society) and to enhance the protection of the natural environment. Consecutively, in order to achieve business sustainability, developing a corporate culture, recognizing main stakeholders, identifying their concerns, and planning organizational policies and practices to improve business performance are encouraged.

However, previous studies have been conducted separately in the areas of TQM and CSR, and there are still no sufficient studies that integrate both quality management and social responsibility. Thus, a critical gap exists that has raised the research question of whether integrated TQM and CSR practices can be developed. To address this gap and related questions, there is a need to recognize and identify the mechanism through which specific elements of CSR can be included as being implicit and/or explicit or alongside TQM. For example, Benavides-Velasco et al. (2014) concluded that TQM practices (leadership, employees, strategy, partnership and resources, processes, products and services) have a significant and positive association with customer and employee satisfaction. They argued that TQM has no direct effect on the satisfaction of society’s needs because the level of satisfaction of a society concerning its actions is more related to CSR actions. Further, their results emphasized that the level of development of CSR is positively influenced by the implementation of TQM. Thus, they suggested that future research should examine the relationships of both TQM and CSR implementation simultaneously because the adoption of both approaches provides benefit for its stakeholders. García-Bernal and Ramírez-Alesón (2015) found that the adoption of TQM only has direct and significant effects on operational performance. This is because the effectiveness in internal processes and the operational perspective consequently lead to the improvement of other performance dimensions such as financial performance, customer satisfaction and other stakeholder performance issues. Further, they argued that CSR is related to TQM and stakeholder wealth maximization so that future research might be conducted with a more complex model to capture this relationship and provide a better understanding of the intrinsic stakeholder orientation. Duckworth (2015) also suggested that CSR features should be included in quality management research and its outcomes.

Therefore, this study proposes integrated conceptual frameworks by identifying the critical factors that are parallel between quality management and social responsibility to satisfy key stakeholder demands. The proposed integrated conceptual framework in this study is important two ways. First, it contributes to the literature on TQM and CSR and it simultaneously captures most of the important factors for effective TQM and CSR practices. Second, it allows researchers to recognize the constructs and associated items that are common in TQM and CSR approaches. In this way, researchers can develop the instruments with their requirements and be supported to use the common items that are shared in the two approaches. Additionally, regarding practical implications, the conceptual framework will facilitate the management of an organization to evaluate its quality and social programs, and it will highlight problem areas that can be improved. Therefore, firms will be able to recognize TQM and CSR initiatives and establish a strengthened relationship between corporate strategy and social conditions. The structure of this study is as follows: first, we discuss the theories that underpin the conceptual framework of the study, and we provide a literature review of the TQM and CSR literature. Next, dimensions of the proposed and conceptual model will be established. Finally, discussion and conclusions will be presented with theoretical and practical implications, limitations and future research directions.
2. Theoretical foundation—stakeholder theory
Drawing on the existing literature of stakeholder theory, business is about how stockholders and managers interact and create value for an organization. This notion will encourage managers to articulate the shared values that they create to generate performance and then push managers to articulate what kinds of relationships they want to create with their stakeholders to achieve their objectives (Freeman et al., 2004). Consequently, the managers are responsible for arranging corporate activities with a balance between conflicting stakeholder demands. When organizations satisfy the explicit needs of shareholders and creditors, a firm must not ignore the implicit needs of other stakeholders (Huang and Kung, 2010). In this context, stakeholder theory comprises the relationship between organizations and their formal members, informal members, and society at large. This association addresses how organizations interact with their stakeholders and create value for them (Simionescu and Dumitrescu, 2016). In this context, stakeholders always support an organization’s business activities, and they provide dynamic resources and opportunities to thrive and flourish in the competitive world. Morally and socially, the organizations are responsible for meeting their stakeholders’ expectations and needs (Park and Ghauri, 2015).

In addition, stakeholder orientation is considered to be one of the key strategic firm objectives (Bhattacharya, 2016; Greenley and Foxall, 1997), and it plays a significant role in the accomplishment of an organization’s strategic objectives and determines its success or failure (Cordeiro and Tewari, 2015). In fact, the stakeholder’s orientation may help the organization to design goods and/or services and create value. As a result, when firms produce goods and services that meet the needs of their stakeholders, this ultimately will affect their overall business performance (Park and Ghauri, 2015). Husted and de Sousa-Filho (2017) suggested that to obtain superior organizational performance, there is a need to attract greater stakeholder orientation in the competitive organizational marketplace. Donaldson and Preston (1995) and Freeman (1994) argued that an organization may tailor the benefits and interests of all types of stakeholders (e.g., investors, competitors, internal and/or external customers and society at large) by adopting this concept.

Following the stakeholder theory, this study extended further the integrated concept of TQM and CSR practices toward a betterment of all stakeholder groups. Therefore, stakeholder theory provides the foundation of this study and argues that organizations should maximize shareholder wealth by producing high quality products and services for its customers, but they should not harm people, the community and/or society and the natural environment.

3. Total quality management
TQM is defined as a holistic management approach with an emphasis on the continuous improvement of all the functions within an organization (Amin et al., 2017; Molina-Azorin et al., 2009), with the objective of meeting customer demands and providing customer satisfaction (Kaynak, 2003). There are three quality management approaches in the literature. First, there are the contributions of quality management gurus such as Crosby (1979), Deming (1986), Ishikawa (1985) and Juran (1988). Second, there are the MBNQA, EFQM and Deming Prize awards for the achievement of excellence. Third, there are the measurement instruments by Saraph et al. (1989), Flynn et al. (1994) and Ahire et al. (1996). Initially, organizations emphasized the improvement of their technical processes and quality-control related issues in the final product and the provision of service. Today, concepts such as statistical quality control, quality assurance and TQM are used interchangeably in various organizational contexts to drive organizational success (Feigenbaum, 1991; Zink, 2007). This concept has been substantially followed by Japanese organizations that have implemented the notion of quality under the umbrella of TQM in
their organizations. The strategic importance of TQM practices has encouraged many organizations to implement TQM practices to achieve competitive advantages (EFQM, 2010) and enhance business performance (Lasrado et al., 2017; Jitpaiboon and Rao, 2007).

However, researchers have identified various dimensions of TQM across industries and countries (Bouranta et al., 2017; Dubey and Gunasekaran, 2015). A variety of dimensions of TQM has significantly helped organizations to achieve their objectives and to obtain sustainable advantages. For this reason, different scholars have identified a set of key variables to achieve quality (Saraph et al., 1989; Flynn et al., 1994; Powell, 1995; Black and Porter, 1996; Ahire et al., 1996; Grandzol and Gershon, 1998). For example, Oakland (1998) noted the hard and soft practices of TQM to suggest five different points, including management commitment, customer-supplier chains, quality systems, statistical process control (SPC) tools and teamwork.

In the hotel industry, Amin et al. (2017) identified seven soft TQM practices that consist of leadership, training, employee fulfillment, customer focus, continuous improvement, supplier quality management and process management. In addition, Saraph et al. (1989) identified TQM dimensions that consist of the roles of divisional top management, the quality department, training, product and/or service design, supplier quality management, process management and/or operating procedures, quality data and reporting and employee relations. Ahire et al. (1996) further enhanced the TQM dimensions and developed an instrument that includes top management commitment, customer focus, supplier quality management, design quality management, benchmarking, SPC usage, internal quality information usage, employee empowerment, employee involvement, employee training, product quality and supplier performance. Although these instruments are important, Zhang et al. (2000) and Das et al. (2008) note that their paradigms and dimensions depend on specific industries and countries. Additionally, Singh and Smith (2006) argued (Saraph et al., 1989; Ahire et al., 1996) for the theory that measurement scales have limited reliability and validity by using simple exploratory techniques. Singh and Smith (2006) highlighted Flynn et al. (1994) stating that the instruments are too broad and have too much of a focus on world-class manufacturing companies. Other criticisms include the point that the universal acceptance of these scales is low because the scales are developed and validated in developed countries, and there is a possibility that cultural values, economic conditions, or political and social differences might exist in underdeveloped and developing countries (Tannock and Ahmed, 2008; Singh and Smith, 2006). To close this gap, Idris (2011) and Singh and Smith (2006) proposed that TQM should incorporate community-related issues and include an environmental focus (Wu et al., 2015) for its implementation. These two concepts are important for organizations as part of their responsibility to society and their stakeholders.

4. Corporate social responsibility

For the last few decades, the corporate world has developed relationships between organizations, stakeholders and society to improve the effectiveness of businesses and profitability (Carroll and Buchholtz, 2014). Freeman (1984) argued that a corporation is not only responsible for making a profit; it also has several responsibilities toward its stakeholders and society. This objective is in line with Bowen’s (1953) concept of CSR as “an obligation to pursue those policies to make those decisions or to follow those lines of action that are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society” (Bowen, 1953, p. 6). Although the concept of CSR has roots in the early 1950s, over the decades the subject has generally been defined in multidimensional terms. Although there are numerous definitions of CSR, it has been understood as follows: “social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time” (Carroll, 1979, p. 500). The concept of CSR has received wider
recognition and acceptance in corporate practices, and it has become an essential requirement of various regulatory bodies in every sector of the economy, particularly in emerging economies (Puppim de Oliveira and Jabbour, 2017; Jamali, 2008). In fact, in the era of globalization, stakeholders have high expectations of organizational and business practices. Every organization, whether it operates in a developed or developing economy, strives to satisfy the demands of their key stakeholders. For their successful operations, they realized that CSR practices are vital from the perspective of stakeholders and regulatory bodies (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004). For this reason, organizations are attempting to integrate the CSR notion in their business practices and to develop a corporate culture where every member has shared values and beliefs about the new way of doing business.

Other scholars have suggested CSR definitions based on social, economic, political and environmental contexts (Carroll and Buchholtz, 2014; Rahman, 2011). For instance, Elkington (1997) developed the concept of the Triple Bottom Line, which includes three dimensions: the economy, society and the environment. The focal point of the Triple Bottom line concept comprises social responsibility (People), environmental responsibility (Planet) and economic responsibility (Profit). In this regard, a socially responsible organization considers economic prosperity, social equity and environmental protection. The concept of the Triple bottom line has been widely accepted in the corporate world, and it has created a solid foundation for CSR (Rahman, 2011). The concept of people, planet and profit expresses that what is good for the environment and what is good for society is also beneficial for the organization. The Triple bottom line dimensions of the CSR model have been operationalized in the existing literature (Lantos, 2001, 2002; Panapanaan et al., 2003).

5. TQM and CSR integration

Today, globalization and business trends have encouraged firms to provide a better quality of product or service to their customers to compete and remain in the global market. To satisfy these demands, organizations may need to firmly comply with quality standards and meet social and environmental requirements for their future growth and success. The notion of TQM and CSR is broadly recognized as a dynamic integrated management approach that may not only focus on improving business processes but also enhance overall performance. A “cookbook” for satisfying stakeholders and meeting the requirements of the regularity bodies has also been proposed (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014). An extensive review of the literature indicated that TQM and CSR approaches have some common grounds in term of their applicability in organizational business practices (Moratis, 2017; Ghobadian et al., 2007). This point of view is also highlighted by Deming’s (1986) philosophy, in which an organization must develop an environment for managers, employees and customers to interact with each other based on ethical considerations. The ultimate goal of TQM is cost effectiveness, continued improvement and customer satisfaction; these advantages serve not only shareholders and customers but also employees and society (Zink, 2007). In line with this viewpoint, an organization aims to manage a "triple bottom line" such as economic, social and environmental responsibilities due to an increase in customer awareness and the demand for greater transparency (Russo and Perrini, 2010) and a socially responsible image (Mirvis, 2012). However, most scholars have suggested that ethics and people (stakeholders) are the essence of quality management (Tari, 2011) and organizational success (Barrett, 2009). For this reason, quality standards such as the MBNQA and the EFQM have included ethical and social responsibility issues in their application guidelines. Similarly, International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 26000’s standard for social responsibility also incorporated social responsibility to be considered as a practice in quality management frameworks (Holjevac, 2008; Prasad and Shekhar, 2010).
In addition, Ghobadian et al. (2007) investigated the similarities and differences of TQM and CSR and suggested that both concepts have common philosophical roots and overlapping elements such as attaining stakeholder satisfaction, honesty and integrity, and merging the interests of employees, shareholders, customers, suppliers and wider society. Further, they concluded by recognizing and identifying the mechanism through which the specific element of CSR would be included as an implicit part of TQM practices. For example, the ISO, 26000 acknowledged the definition of CSR as follows: “Social responsibility is the responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behavior.” Other studies have highlighted the TQM and CSR nexus (Ghobadian et al., 2007; Van Marrewijk et al., 2004; McAdam and Leonard, 2003). For example, Tari (2011) proposed nine dimensions that are parallel with quality and social responsibility, including leadership, planning, people management, customer focus, supplier management, process management, information and analysis, and design; however, he did not highlight environmental concern, which is an important stakeholder factor along with quality and social responsibility.

Further, the main objective of organizations is to satisfy customer needs and wants; however, firms also have a responsibility for their stakeholders such as employees, suppliers, community and environment (Zink, 2007). There is need to develop a conceptual framework that addresses other stakeholders’ issues. As suggested by Tari (2011), ethics, principles and respect for people (stakeholders) are the key principles of quality management. Like CSR, quality is based on a set of values and beliefs at its focus, such as “do no harm,” “zero-waste,” “makes external costs visible,” and “driving out fear” between management and their stakeholders (Kim et al., 2017; Sapru and Schuchard, 2011). This is similar with Taguchi, who said “a product or service demonstrated good quality of its production and use caused little to no harm to society” (cited by Leonard, 2008).

6. Developing TQSR-M constructs

6.1 Top management/leadership

Leadership is the most prominent factor of TQM (Kaynak, 2003) and CSR implementation (Pedersen and Neergaard, 2008). The gurus of quality such as Deming (1986), Feigenbaum (1991) and Ishikawa (1985) have recognized the important role of top management and its responsibility for an organization. Leadership is a critical factor to successfully implement CSR programs (Angus-Leppan et al., 2010; Waldman and Siegel, 2008). As defined by EFQM (2010), a “good business leader is the top man who directed and was in control of all aspects of his business.” Ehigie and Akpan (2004) stated that leadership is defined in terms of “the capacity of a leader to affect the attitude and actions of others” to accomplish organizational objectives (Robbinsons, 2003).

In addition, commitment is a foundation of effective TQM practice (Zhang et al., 2000), and the main reason for the failure of TQM practices is the lack of top management’s commitment (Seetharaman et al., 2006). Previous studies have established that leadership that is committed to quality is important for the TQM approach, it has a significant impact not only on shareholders but also on other stakeholders such as customers and employees (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2012; Tari, 2011). For instance, if top managers are active in quality improvement, their employees will also be inspired to be involved in quality management and process improvement (Zhang et al., 2000). Leaders should communicate and motivate employees and facilitate them though an effective communication system (Tan and Khoo, 2005). To successfully achieve TQM and CSR practices, top management and/or leadership support is required (Tari, 2011). As a result, leadership plays a significant role in building a sustainable organizational culture in the implementation of TQM and CSR practices.
6.2 Strategic planning management

Strategic planning is another relevant factor of TQM and CSR practices. London (2002) suggested that a clear company strategic plan is necessary for TQM implementation, such as through the placement of an effective strategic plan that is continuously reviewed and improves organizational performance and stakeholder sustainability (Oakland, 2011). Such strategic plans are developed based on an organization's vision, mission and objectives; therefore, the organizational strategy should be focused on the balance of its stakeholder's expectations and needs. An organization's vision statement should reflect its plan and vision, and such plans may include a business plan, quality policy and strategy, a quality improvement plan and benchmark quality practices (Rao et al., 1999; Zhang et al., 2000).

Organizational strategic planning should be developed based on proper planning processes and include quality and social issues (Tari, 2011). Following this concept, the organization develops a strategy for social responsibility, community relations and environmental issues (Pedersen and Neergaard, 2008). In addition, the organization should also analyze its internal and external stakeholder needs and integrate them into its organizational strategies. Pedersen and Neergaard (2008) suggested that organizations must include ethics, values and social issues in the organizational vision and mission. Following this perspective, Graafland et al. (2004) suggested the inclusion of benchmark economic, social and environmental issues into organizational strategies. This is referred to as the responsible care of stakeholders, and it has subsequently led to a positive relationship between formal planning and social responsibility (Galbreath, 2010). As a result, organizations are able to engage in better strategic planning to satisfy stakeholder expectations.

6.3 Human resource management

For the implementation of quality and social initiatives, human resources management (HRM) is another important factor that contributes to the long-term success of an organization (Dubey et al., 2015; Voegtlin and Greenwood, 2016; Joseph et al., 1999). To obtain competitive advantage, the skill and abilities of an organization’s employees are vital (Wickramasinghe and Gamage, 2011). For instance, Dubey et al. (2015) suggested that HRM will improve an employee’s capabilities through training, empowerment, teamwork, innovation and participation in improvement activities through TQM implementation. Employees are important because they provide inspiration, creativity, vision and the motivation that leads to organizational success (EFQM, 2010). Consequently, effective HRM will develop protocols for recognition and a reward- or prize-criteria approach for quality practices (Meyer and Collier, 2001).

In the CSR context, the previous literature explained that HRM practices contribute to CSR and vice versa. For example, recruitment and selection practices will help organizations to find potential employees and select them based on the fit between their CSR values and organizational values (Davies and Crane, 2010; Gully et al., 2013). Conversely, CSR can attract job applicants (Cooke and He, 2010) through an organization’s openness to diversity and equal opportunity (Rupp et al., 2013). Additionally, HRM practices can enhance employees’ commitment to the implementation of CSR practices and promote a socially responsible culture (Cooke and He, 2010; Davies and Crane, 2010; Kim and Kim, 2010; Brammer et al., 2007; Shen and Jiuhua Zhu, 2011).

6.4 Process management

Process management is a key part of quality strategy (Porter and Parker, 1993). It refers to a series of activities that are designed by an organization to produce products and services that add value for its customers and other stakeholders (Bou-Llusar et al., 2009; EFQM, 2010). According to Prajogo and Sohal (2006), organizations must continuously find ways to
increase process improvement to be productive and engage in lean innovation. Sadikoglu and Zehir (2010) highlight that process management will improve the quality of a product by reducing variation in the processing, which leads to improved operational reliability, innovation and an increase in productivity (Prajogo and Sohal, 2006). Moreover, effective process management design will minimize the negative impact on the environment, which results in a reduction in costs and an increase in profit (Wilson and Collier, 2000).

In the context of CSR execution, Nijhof et al. (2008) argued that an individual employee is not able to achieve the objective of CSR because competence and cooperation are required at all organizational and management levels. Management awareness and commitment to social and environmental issues play a significant role in the implementation of CSR practices (Sethi, 2005). The management and/or organizational process of CSR implementation is defined by Maignan et al. (2005) as discovering organizational values and norms, identifying stakeholders and their respective salience, identifying the main issues of concern to the identified key stakeholders, assessing the meaning of CSR that fits the organization of interest, auditing current practices, prioritizing and implementing CSR changes and initiatives, promoting CSR by creating awareness and getting stakeholders involved, and gaining stakeholders’ feedback.

6.5 Supplier management
Supplier management refers to the ability of a firm to optimize the flow of high quality and value in exchange for of the cost of materials and components from a highly qualified and innovative supplier (Goffin et al., 1997; Oly Ndubisi et al., 2005). There are three criteria to select a supplier based on quality: supplier evaluation, supplier selection and supplier development (Schiele, 2007; Reuter et al., 2010). Effective and efficient supplier management will help an organization to fulfill the quality standard of materials to produce high quality products. As a result, organizations will be able to manage to reduce variance in processes and the rate of damaged materials and maintain their inventory levels (Truong and Nguyen, 2017). For this reason, supplier management becomes an important factor for quality management because major quality problems arise due to poor quality materials, which result in extra costs for the buyer and decrease the quality of an organization’s image (Das et al., 2008).

Due to the complexity of supplier management operations and increased ecological pressures from markets and several stakeholders, organizations are emphasizing and have expressed concern about the importance of green and environmentally friendly products from their suppliers to fulfill CSR standards (Luthra et al., 2017). In addition, organizations must ensure that their suppliers comply with corporate codes of conduct and avoid environmental and social misconduct (e.g. environmental protection, labor laws and child labor) (Reuter et al., 2010).

6.6 Customer management
Customer management represents as an organizational strategy whereby all aspects of organizational production and the delivery of goods or services are based on customer expectations (Berry and Parasuraman, 2004). Therefore, the main purpose of TQM practices is not only to meet customer demands but also to exceed their expectations (Deming, 1986; Crosby, 1992; Deming, 1986; Juran, 1988). Following this perspective, customer satisfaction has become a more important indicator for many organizations (Brah et al., 2002). An organization’s future success or failure depends on its customer satisfaction (Kanji and Asher, 1993). To develop a good relationship, organizations must determine customer expectations and obtain feedback, involve customers in product design and development (Flynn et al., 1994) and respond to customers’ complaints in a timely manner (Sila, 2007).
In the CSR context, customer management not only emphasizes an increase in customer satisfaction, but organizations are also required to follow ethical guidelines. For example, organizations should not sell any products that have negative effects on consumers’ health (Carroll, 1991). In addition, organizations are expected to inform their customers about materials that will affect a customer’s use (such as products that contain alcohol and nicotine) in their products as part of CSR practices (Adnan Khurshid et al., 2014).

6.7 Social and/or community management
The community is an important stakeholder for organizations, and its dissatisfaction will affect the growth of a business (Idris, 2011). Organizations will receive benefits from their communities, such as customer satisfaction, cost effectiveness and continued improvements due to effective TQM implementation (Zink, 2007). In fact, quality management models such MBNQA and EFQM have demonstrated the importance of social impact, public responsibility and corporate responsibility toward society in business excellence (EFQM, 2010). Carroll (1991) argued for the importance of the ethical and philanthropic components of CSR. Both concepts are important for organizations to perform consistently with the expectations of social mores and ethical norms. Park and Ghauri (2015) suggested that CSR practices should provide assistance to private and public educational institutions and healthy and safe working environments, and they should further develop public–private partnerships and community relationships and engage in participation in social and economic development issues.

6.8 Environmental management
In business today, organizations cannot neglect environmental issues. Governmental regulation and societal pressure motivate organizations to take on greater environmental accountability (Puppim de Oliveira and Jabbour, 2017). Environmental management is a key aspect of TQM and CSR (Wu et al., 2015). The environmental dimension refers to companies taking positive initiative for emission reduction, waste management and environmentally friendly products and processes (Gallear et al., 2015). Globally accepted standards of social responsibility and quality toward the environment include certifications such as ISO 14,000, OHSAS 18,000 (Huang and Kung, 2010).

Some of the environmental practices with which organizations comply include maintaining environmental standards such as recycling programs, green supply chain management practices, life-cycle assessment and environmental monitoring (Pagell and Wu, 2017). Governmental regulation and societal pressure have reinforced organizations to take on additional responsibilities for environmental issues (Daily and Huang, 2001; Walton et al., 1998). In fact, ISO 14000 established the criteria for environmental management systems and provided tools for organizations to manage their environmental responsibilities Table I.

7. Instrument comparison
This study carefully examined three instruments (Saraph et al., 1989; Flynn et al., 1994; Ahire et al., 1996) and combined some dimensions with other previous instruments such as (Zhang et al., 2000; Brah et al., 2002; Sila and Ebrahimpour, 2002; Prajogo and Sohal, 2006; Singh and Smith, 2006; Das et al., 2008; Idris, 2011; Hietschold et al., 2014; Dubey and Gunasekaran, 2015; Nicholas, 2016). These studies examined various TQM dimensions either manufacturing or services sectors organizations and few studies are examined both sectors. For example, the TQM instruments developed in previous literature limit their generalizability only on manufacturing (Ahire et al., 1996; Zhang et al., 2000; Das et al., 2008) or services (Brah et al., 2002) sectors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>TQM approach</th>
<th>CSR approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top management</strong></td>
<td>Top management support (Rao et al., 1999; Das et al., 2008)</td>
<td>Participate in CSR initiatives (Guarnieri and Kao, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top management commitment (Saraph et al., 1989; Ahire et al., 1996)</td>
<td>Top management support (Tari, 2011; Guarnieri and Kao, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top management commitment (Pedersen and Neergaard, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic planning</strong></td>
<td>Vision and Mission (Zhang et al., 2000)</td>
<td>Vision and Mission (Pedersen and Neergaard, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>Quality policy/plan (Rao et al., 1999; Conca et al., 2004)</td>
<td>Strategic plan (Galbreath, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic plan (Sila and Ebrahimpour, 2002; Prajogo and Sohal, 2006)</td>
<td>(Guarnieri and Kao, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmarking (Ahire et al., 1996)</td>
<td>Benchmarking (Graafland et al., 2004; Lee and Kohler, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human resource management</strong></td>
<td>Education and Training (Saraph et al., 1989; Flynn et al., 1994)</td>
<td>CSR education or training (Kim and Kim, 2010; Cooke and He, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee empowerment/involvement (Brah et al., 2002; Das et al., 2008)</td>
<td>Ethical labor standards/decent work (Cooke and He, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork (Flynn et al., 1994; Sila and Ebrahimpour, 2002)</td>
<td>Equal opportunity (Cooke and He, 2010; Rupp et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward and recognition (Flynn et al., 1994; Zhang et al., 2000; Das et al., 2008)</td>
<td>Diversity (Rupp et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process management</strong></td>
<td>Product/services design (Saraph et al., 1989)</td>
<td>Employee involvement (Cooke and He, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPC usage (Flynn et al., 1994; Ahire et al., 1996; Zhang et al., 2000)</td>
<td>Alignment of employees’ needs with CSR policy (Cooke and He, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality information/analysis (Rao et al., 1999; Singh and Smith, 2006; Prajogo and Sohal, 2006)</td>
<td>Identifying the main issues (Carroll, 1991; Wood, 1991; Moir, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous improvement (Grandzol and Gershon, 1998; Das et al., 2008)</td>
<td>Identified key stakeholders (Wood, 1991; Moir, 2001; Maignan et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplier management</strong></td>
<td>Long-term relation (Flynn et al., 1994; Zhang et al., 2000)</td>
<td>Auditing current practices (Maignan et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplier quality (Saraph et al., 1989; Ahire et al., 1996; Das et al., 2008)</td>
<td>Prioritizing and implementing CSR changes and initiatives (Maignan et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplier involvement/feedback (Rao et al., 1999; Zhang et al., 2000)</td>
<td>Gaining stakeholders’ feedback (Maignan et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplier quality audit (Zhang et al., 2000)</td>
<td>(Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer management</strong></td>
<td>Customer orientation (Ahire et al., 1996; Rao et al., 1999; Grandzol and Gershon, 1998)</td>
<td>Involve in new product or service development (Maloni and Brown, 2006; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer feedback Flynn et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Fair Trade (Maloni and Brown, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer complaint (Rao et al., 1999; Sila, 2007)</td>
<td>Incorporate the interests into business decisions (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform about organizational changes (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>child labor/Labor code (Maloni and Brown, 2006; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive prices (Mishra and Suar, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide high quality product/service (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information needed (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfy the complaints Maignan and Ferrell (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy/management systems for customer satisfaction (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006; Mishra and Suar, 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. TQM and CSR (continued)
However, the dimensions of proposed framework of this study may implement of both types of organizations (manufacturing and services). Moreover, as mentioned before the purpose of this study is to develop an integrated framework of quality and social responsibility which is a lack in previous TQM instruments. Therefore, the role of divisional top management and the role of quality departments (Saraph et al., 1989), quality department leadership (Flynn et al., 1994) and top management commitment (Ahire et al., 1996) are integrated in top management and/or leadership dimensions. Furthermore, top management’s commitment to implement social responsibility is necessary, and management is concerned with ensuring that processes are properly executed for their stakeholders (Nayebpour and Koehn, 2003). This study further integrates ethical issues and considers the needs of all stakeholders at all organizational levels. This is because departmental heads are a part of top management, and every department in any organization (manufacturing or services) should be committed to TQM (Das et al., 2008) and CSR practices (Pedersen and Neergaard, 2008).

Moreover, beyond the organizational strategic vision and mission for TQM and CSR, this study integrates benchmarking into strategic planning because, due to competition, the emergence of new technologies and management practices such as CSR organizations should benchmark their strategies for issues such as transparency (Castro et al., 2017; Rao et al., 1999; Lee and Kohler, 2010). Product/services design and quality should be further integrated with strategic planning because customer demand and the cost of production should be considered during the process of product/service design (Zhang et al., 2000). For HRM, this study includes communication, teamwork, employee involvement and education, training, empowerment, reward and recognition as part of people management are significant factors in any type of organizations (Tari, 2011).

Regarding the process management dimension, this study includes process control and improvement, the evaluation process (Zhang et al., 2000), SPC usage (Ahire et al., 1996), continuous improvement of the company’s products or services (Das et al., 2008), quality data reporting and product/service design (Saraph et al., 1989). We believe that all these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>TQM approach</th>
<th>CSR approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included community responsibilities into policies (Singh and Smith, 2006)</td>
<td>Education/sponsorship (Carroll, 1979, 1991; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed plans to manage risks to community (Singh and Smith, 2006)</td>
<td>Support community activities (arts, culture, sports) (Carroll, 1979, 1991; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best practice shared with community (Singh and Smith, 2006)</td>
<td>Improve the quality of life in the communities (Carroll, 1979, 1991; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community involvement (Singh and Smith, 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental regulations (Carroll, 1979, 1991; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.
dimensions may relate to process management. For example, during the initial stage of product/services design, management could consider and resolve the quality and social impact of a product or services (Tari, 2011). Customer and supplier focus are common in all studies, so both have been included in this instrument with a TQM and CSR approach those are important part of any organizations (manufacturing or services). The uniqueness of this proposed scale is that we have added two more dimensions, those of social and/or community and environmental management. Rao et al. (1999) and Singh and Smith (2006) included quality citizenship and wider community variables, respectively; however, they did not highlight environmental concerns in their studies, which may suggest this has not been satisfactorily addressed in the previous literature. The following comparison table further highlights the scope of this scale Table II.

8. Discussion
The objective of this study is to develop a conceptual framework that integrates TQM practices and CSR. In this study, eight total quality and social responsibility management (TQSR-M) dimensions are proposed that consist of top management and/or leadership, strategic planning, human resource management, process management, supplier and customer management, community and/or social focus and environment. These proposed TQSR-M constructs, which are shown in Figure 1, show that top management is the most important indicator of TQSR-M implementation for both the manufacturing and service industries. It has been suggested by (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2012; Tari, 2011; Zhang et al., 2000; Seetharaman et al., 2006) that top management commitment will help an organization to successfully implement TQSR-M practices. In line with this perspective, if high commitment from top management is established, then the operationalization of strategic planning, HRM, processes and supplier management will be developed. These four dimensions are the pillars in the execution of an organization’s quality practices. In this situation, organizations would be able to generate profit and satisfy customers and regularity bodies (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014). In addition, Freeman’s (1984) theory suggests that organizations should not ignore other stakeholders (society, employees and the natural environment). For this reason, organizations should move to satisfy other stakeholders’ demands for organizational performance and future sustainability.

This study is based on stakeholder theory that stresses to satisfy all stakeholders. In other words, in order to achieve an equitable and cohesive society and long-term sustainability, companies may implement TQM and CSR practices simultaneously in their organization to not only improve business performance but also satisfy their stakeholders. As a result, organizations will gain benefit from TQM and CSR implementation due to the economic, social and environmental effects of this approach. Therefore, a better understanding how the integrated approach of TQM and CSR impact on business performance will significantly help organizations to gain competitive advantages in the global marketplace.

8.1 Theoretical contributions
This study provides several theoretical contributions. First, this study develops an integrated TQSR-M framework. This TQSR-M framework will contribute to the TQM and CSR theory by incorporating the notion of satisfying stakeholders’ demands and future business sustainability. This is because TQM and CSR have the same consensus that the satisfaction of key stakeholders is the significant component for improving overall business performance (Foster and Jonker, 2007; Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014). Previous studies point out that stakeholder’s orientations may help organizations to design goods/services and create value as per stakeholders’ requirements (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014). They also describe stakeholder’s orientation as the organizational culture and behaviors that induce
| Author(s)                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|    |
| Saraph et al. (1989)             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Flynn et al. (1994)              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Ahire et al. (1996)              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Grandzol and Gershon (1998)      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Rao et al. (1999)                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Motwani (2001)                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Zhang et al. (2000)              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Brah et al. (2002)               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Sila and Ebrahimpour (2002)      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Conca et al. (2004)              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Prajogo and Sohal (2006)         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Singh and Smith (2006)           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Das et al. (2008)                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Idris (2011)                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Calvo-Mora et al. (2013)         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Hietschold et al. (2014)         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Dubey and Gunasekaran (2015)      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Nicholas (2016)                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Proposed integrative framework of this study |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

**Notes:**
1 = Top management/leadership, 2 = Training, 3 = Product/services quality design, 4 = Supplier management, 5 = Process management; 6 = quality data reporting, 7 = employee involvement 8 = empowerment, 9 = Reward and recognition, 10 = Teamwork, 11 = Customer focus; 12 = Benchmarking, 13 = continues improvement, 14 = cooperation, 15 = strategic quality Planning, 16 = quality citizenship, 17 = open; organization, 18 = Service culture, 19 = Best practices, 20 = Community focus, 21 = Productivity focus, 22 = Human resource management, 23 = competitor
organizational members to be continuously aware of and proactively act on a variety of stakeholder issues (Ferrell et al., 2010). Stakeholders issues include quality of products, fairness of product information, the transparency of company reports and audit, employees’ relations (working environment, employee welfare and job security) and the social and environmental impact of product (Ferrell et al., 2010; Yau et al., 2007). This study extended further the integrated concept of TQM and CSR practices toward a betterment of all stakeholder groups, because both approaches are useful to solve stakeholder’s issues through quality and social responsibility.

Second, this study contributes to the existing state of knowledge in the areas of TQM and CSR by capturing the critical dimensions of top management and/or leadership, strategic planning, human resource management, process management, supplier and customer management, community and/or social focus and environment in successfully implementing TQSR-M. The dimensions of this proposed study focused on stakeholders’ perspectives adopted from stakeholder theory that could well explain the knowledge as indicators of TQM and CSR. This proposed study will contribute to the knowledge in TQM and CSR area by pulling those factors together in to a single theoretical framework which applied to the broader issues of responsibility rather than just quality.

8.2 Managerial implications
This study also provides several managerial contributions. First, in today’s competitive environment, organizations realize that TQM and CSR practices are vital from the perspective of stakeholders and regulatory bodies (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004). Therefore, the findings of this study would help managers to implement TSQR-M practices and develop TQM and CSR plans, policies and strategies in their organization. The integration of TSQR-M practices in their business will significantly develop a corporate culture for each employee to share their values and beliefs to improve business performance.

Second, the simultaneous investigation of both practices provides an understanding of the ability of an organization to more effectively advance and efficiently obtain corporate
sustainability (García-Bernal and Ramírez-Alesón, 2015). For example, the development of both practices offers several aspects for the management of an organization towards the successful implementation of TQM and CSR such as obtaining a commitment from the top management, having adequate resources to integrate the approaches, and top-down coordination and training (Benavides-Velasco et al., 2014).

Third, the proposed integrated model will provide important insights for the management of an organization to develop a good corporate image in building a good relationship between firms, stakeholders and society, which will increase business performance. In particular, TQM, which is already used in many organizations can encourage and facilitate the development of CSR to satisfy stakeholders and to obtain competitive advantages.

8.3 Limitation and future research direction
This study is conceptual in nature, and empirical research is needed to identify the critical factors that promote the application of TQM and CSR practices, which are limited. Therefore, this study creates an agenda for future research. First, the future research should include the opinions of academics and managers on the broader issues of TQM and CSR measurement scales. Second, future research should be conducted to test this proposed model across industries and countries. Therefore, from the help of proposed conceptual framework, reliable and valid instruments can be developed for measuring TQM and CSR simultaneously.
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