



APPLICABILITY OF EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR QUALITY MANAGEMENT (EFQM) EXCELLENCE MODEL IN HEALTH SECTOR IN TURKEY

Serap Kalfaoğlu¹
Eda Ayçeken

Received 11.03.2022.
Accepted 27.05.2022.
UDC – 005.6:355.72-027.551(560.11)

Keywords:

*Performance Measurement; EFQM
Excellence Model; Quality Improvement.*

ABSTRACT

EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) was established in 1988, by 14 leading European organizations with the mission of being the driving force of Sustainable Excellence in Europe and the vision of a world in which European institutions achieve excellence and is a non-profit organization based on the membership system. In this study, the satisfaction of the employees, one of the criteria of the EFQM excellence model, is tried to be measured. For this purpose, the evaluation of the situation according to the EFQM criteria at the Private Hospitals in Konya/Turkey, which conducts quality studies in line with EFQM model, is aimed to determine the level of satisfaction of the hospital department managers. As a result of the study, the satisfaction of the staff of the hospitals is at a moderate level. Also, managers' satisfaction levels do not change according to the department they work in. It is observed that the people in the management level benefit the employees to raise the working standards.



© 2022 Published by Faculty of Engineeringg

1. INTRODUCTION

Changing market conditions and increasingly intense competition have required companies to pursue different fields in order to maintain their assets. The European Foundation for Quality Management has developed the EFQM Excellence Model to lead these companies. It is a management model heard in 1991 by a group of industry and academics from all over the world. The model is a model created to help public sector, private sector and non-governmental organizations to make self-evaluations based on the criteria of the concept of excellence, to identify their strengths and weaknesses, to

direct them for improvements and to prepare their plans for their development.

Today, more than 30,000 companies in the world, especially in Europe, use EFQM Excellence Model as a management model. The founder in Turkey of EFQM Excellence model, Quality Association (KalDer) belonging to European Foundation for Quality Management is responsible for the management of this model (KalDer, Turkey Quality Association, 2006).

Taking into consideration the content and basic criteria of the model, in this study, the satisfaction status of the

¹ Corresponding author: Serap Kalfaoğlu,
Email: serapkalfaoğlu@selcuk.edu.tr.

people working in selected hospitals and also the question of whether or not this degree of satisfaction has changed according to the department they work for has been questioned. Within the scope of this study conducted in the health sector, firstly, detailed information about the content of the model is given and whether the hypotheses established in the conclusion section are verified is explained.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

EFQM will be covered in all details in the conceptual framework part of the study.

2.1 EFQM Excellence Model

EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management), was established in 1988 by 14 leading European organizations (Bosch, British Telecom, Bull, Ciba-Geigy, Dassault, Electrolux, Fiat, KLM, Nestle, Olivetti, Philips, Renault, Sulzer, Volkswagen) with the mission of being the driving force of Sustainable Excellence in Europe and the vision of a world in which European institutions achieve excellence (Nabitz et al., 2000: 192). It is a non-profit organization based on the membership system. The EFQM Excellence Model, which is used in the National Quality Award, is a model whose limits are not fully defined. Businesses also support different approaches that provide lasting excellence (Ulas, 2002).

The EFQM Excellence Model is a practical tool for identifying deficiencies and promoting solutions that address these deficiencies, showing the status of businesses on the path to excellence. The EFQM Excellence Model was proposed in 1992 as a draft framework for organizations evaluating the European Quality Award. The model has been widely used recently. It provides a good basis for both national and regional quality awards in the organizational field in Europe (Eskildsen and Dahlgaard, 2000).

The prominent theme of the model is employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction and excellent business understanding. The EFQM Excellence Model is based on the fact that numerous approaches may be available to ensure lasting excellence in all dimensions of performance, and aims to achieve excellent results reflected in performance, customers, employees and society.

Total quality management principles form the basis of the EFQM Excellence Model (Yılmaz, 2010). In this sense, the model is the most preferred model for total quality management in Europe. The EFQM Excellence Model incorporates many different principles of total quality management and serves as a catalyst for organizational awareness. Therefore, total quality management and EFQM Excellence Model, provides the necessary success for businesses and organizations to maintain their presence in the market (İnan et al., 2010).

The EFQM Excellence Model always keeps the model up-to-date by collecting data from the best work gathered in and out of Europe. In this way, the model is dynamic and offers up-to-date ideas about management. Accordingly, the model has been addressed four times in 1997, 1999, 2003 and 2010 and new approaches have been developed with the existing knowledge. In the light of the studies conducted in 1999, the model was named as “EFQM Excellence Model (KalDer, 2010).

At the focal point of the model is a logic called RADAR. RADAR is a dynamic assessment framework and effective tool management by presenting a structured approach by examining the performance of any business. RADAR states that an organization should consider the following (Moeller et al., 2000). RADAR includes the following elements:

- Identify the outcomes that should be achieved as part of its strategy.
- To plan and establish integrated approaches to achieve the required results both in the present and in the future.
- Disseminate approaches to ensure implementation.
- Evaluate and improve results based on monitoring, analysis and continuous learning activities.

Results (R): The result size shows what an organization has achieved. In an organization that has achieved excellence, results should always show a positive trend or good performance, objectives should be appropriate and achievable, performance should be high compared to other organizations. In addition, the results should include relevant areas and activities.

Approach (A): Includes what the organization is planning and why. In an organization that has achieved excellence, this approach is expected to provide a clear basis. It should have well-defined and developed processes and should clearly focus on and integrate with the needs of the shareholder. On the other hand, it should be linked to other approaches by adapting to the policy and strategy of the organization.

Deployment (D): Includes what the organization is doing to realize its approach. In an organization that has achieved excellence, the approach is expected to be systematically applied to the relevant areas.

Assessment (A) and Review (R): This dimension includes an organization's approach and what it does to evaluate and examine the distribution of the approach. In an organization that has achieved excellence, it is expected that the approach and dissemination will be regularly measured and learning activities will be carried out. As a result of these two activities, the application of improving the information obtained is determined. Priorities are set and this approach is used to plan and carry out improvement.

In line with today's advanced quality and management approaches, countries that adopt an understanding of organizational excellence support this modern approach with the help of different international models. Deming in Japan (1951), Malcolm Baldrige in the USA (1987) and EFQM in Europe (1992) are the most recognized and most widely used models of organizational excellence (Nabitz et al., 2000: 192). The EFQM Excellence Model is categorized into 9 main titles, each of which is referred to as benchmarks. Each criterion is supported by a wide range of sub-criteria for better understanding. As seen in Table 1, while observing the formation, context and structure of the Model, five of the nine criteria form the "input" criteria while the remaining four form the "result" criteria (Moeller et al., 2000; Nabitz et al., 2000).

Table 1. EFQM Excellence Model

Input Criteria	Output Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Employees • Policies and Strategies • Partnership and Resources • Processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee Results • Customer Results • Key Performance (Business) Results • Self-Assessment

Source: KalDer, 2010.

The arrows on the table show the dynamics of the model. These arrows refer to the approach to learning, creativity and innovation that provides improvements in inputs and, consequently, results in improvements.

Input criteria are listed as follows;

Leadership: Leaders should participate in the determination of quality culture and cultural development activities and take initiatives within the framework of these activities. The leadership perception that supports quality and continuous improvement will set an example for the employees of the organization and this determination will trigger the success of the organization. In addition to these tasks, leaders must provide the resource requirements of employees, creating long-term organizational objectives, to facilitate coordination by organizing such activities and to make efforts to achieve these goals (Pakdil, 2004: 171-172).

Excellent organizations have leaders who shape the future, serve as an example of the culture and ethical approach of the organization and arouse confidence. The leaders of excellent organizations have a flexible character and guarantee that the factors affecting the success of the organization are predicted and implemented (KalDer, 2010; EFQM, 2003).

Employees: Of the resources owned by an organization, the only resource that is not changed by another resource is human. Human resources are an active element for organizations to compete in their market and continue their activities. By referring to the phrase the best person knows how a job is done, employees should be given the opportunity to actively participate in the decision-making

process and to reveal and develop their creativity (Pakdil, 2004).

Excellent organizations give importance to their employees and create a culture in which personal and organizational goals benefit each other. Such organizations also improve the capabilities of their employees; to support employees in business and private life, to communicate with them well, to know them well, to motivate, to appreciate and reward employees' knowledge and skills in the organization offers the opportunity to use (KalDer, 2010).

Policy and Strategies: The structure of policies and strategies is an essential element for quality. Following the opportunities and threats in the market where the organization is located, transferring all the processes to the employees and exchanging information with the employees are among the requirements of the model (Yılmaz, 2010).

Excellent organizations base their mission and vision on a shareholder-based strategy. Policies, programs, objectives and processes are created to implement the strategy (KalDer, 2010; KalDer, 2006; EFQM, 2003).

Partnerships and Resources: When the cooperation and resource criteria, which are extremely important, are examined, the development of cooperation is important in terms of financial resources. Considering the management of buildings, equipment and material resources, it should be examined whether they are used efficiently. Excellent organizations should plan and manage their strategies and policies to support cooperation between external suppliers, institutions and internal resources (KalDer, 2006; EFQM, 2003).

Processes: The process criterion is known as the most important input criterion. Processes need to be reliably defined, fully understood and followed. Perfect organization processes, products and services by designing and develops to give value to customers and other partners manages (Inan et al., 2010; EFQM, 2003).

Output criteria are listed as follows;

Employee Results: It measures employee productivity and satisfaction through a real approach. Evaluates the performance of the employees objectively and objectively by considering the extent to which the organization's objectives are achieved. Absenteeism rate of the employees, job satisfaction, the extent to which they participate in business processes, the task within the organization and the general evaluation of the employee should be made by considering the work accidents (KalDer, 2006).

Customer Results: It determines the extent to which the studies are effective on the customers and reviews the applied methods to ensure that reasonable decisions are taken on the identified deficiencies. It aims to ensure that

the quality of service is permanently ensured and reached its maximum level by examining in detail how the overall image formed on the customers and how much effect it provides. Another important point is how important and effective the support provided before and after sales in order to ensure customer loyalty (KalDer, 2006; EFQM, 2003).

Business Results: Criteria derived from input data relate to what the organization does to achieve business results. The criteria in the results relate to what the enterprise has achieved and continues to reach them in terms of business results. The main purpose of the organization is to address issues such as earning capacity, profit and organizational capacity level for its partners and shareholders. Organizations that achieve a high level of performance in all of the criteria are considered as excellent organizations (KalDer, 2006).

Self-Assessment: The most common use of the Excellence Model is that it is a “self-assessment” tool for organizations. Comprehensive systematic and regular evaluation studies are called EF self-evaluation arak by comparing the work of a company, its processes and the results of these processes with a model based on EFQM Excellence Model. It is used to make the appearance and status of the organization work clear and to form the criterion results in the model (Barlı et al., 2012).

Participation of an organization's employees in the process improvement works enables the organization to increase the efficiency, motivation and sensitivity of the organization. Self-assessment enables employees to regularly and systematically deal with the processes and results of their organizations. It is used as a draft for organizational development by allowing organizations to identify areas in need of improvement with their strengths and strengths by evaluating the interconnection of employees, processes and results with each other (Jonica et al., 2010).

Organizations using the self-assessment method form effective plans by establishing an effective relationship. In this direction, the results of the self-evaluation allow the formation of a common language that can compare the performances of the organizations or parts of the organization. At the same time, the outputs developed as a result of self-assessment contributes to the formation of strategic management and action plans of enterprises (Saban & Vargun, 2011).

Self-assessment provides the opportunity to make benchmarking with other enterprises that are similar or different from those applying the criteria adopted throughout Europe. Thus, companies aiming to achieve perfection can compare what these superiorities of companies with superior features and qualifications are in terms of sustaining their activities and increasing their own opportunities and examine what causes them. By taking advantage of the better ones, there is an attempt to reach the superior features (Eren, 2012: 106).

Self-assessment in the long run (Duman, 2009: 25);

- Reduces costs,
- Improves performance results,
- Balances long and short term investments,
- regulates the approach in the plans of the enterprise,
- Establish a holistic approach to quality,
- Increases the ability to respond to customer expectations,
- Ensures the continuity of the quality image,
- Supports the establishment of relationships between suppliers and customers.

Self-assessment options are as follows depending on the skill level of the enterprise in using the model, the resources allocated for the project and how much it can give itself to this task;

Question List Method: This method is an excellent method for obtaining information about the opinions of employees. If a ready and validated question list is used, it is considered as a method that requires minimum resources and can be defined in a very short time. In this type of question lists, multiple choice answers are used instead of yes / no answers. Questionnaires are prepared for SMEs and large-scale enterprises that cover all aspects of the model with the name of EFQM Question List (Dikmen, 2010).

Matrix Method: EFQM constitutes the success matrix of the company within the framework of excellence. It can be used by management staff or representatives of the unit from which the self-assessment is initiated at any level of the organization. This method is part of a four-step teamwork approach that provides management members with the opportunity to participate in planning and improvement activities within business patterns.

These stages are as follows:

- Step 1: Opening
- Step 2: Individual Rating
- Step 3: Reconciliation Meeting
- Step 4: Activity Scoring

Teamwork Method: Management superiority suggests the active participation of the unit managers who will implement the self-assessment. Therefore, business managers are responsible for presenting the data and findings obtained in their work to other managers in a report. Experiences in this area argue that two people who have received adequate training in this area should be assigned to assess the pathway to be followed. This process consists of five stages (Dikmen, 2010). These stages are as follows;

- Education,
- Data collecting,
- Scoring,
- Reconciliation on the improvement plan,
- Review.

Self-Assessment Form Method: The self-assessment form can be created by individuals or teams within the organization. This form is evaluated by trained evaluators. The critical success factor for this approach depends on the quality of the data obtained. Interviewers who are experts in interview techniques should pay attention to concentrate on the sub-criterion and sub-criterion areas, taking care not to shift the issue from their feelings and thoughts to the employee's feelings and thoughts. Evidence for each criterion, strengths, goals and points open to improvement are recorded (Simsek, 2007).

Reward Simulation Method: It is a copy of the application process for the European Quality Award (EQA). EQA generates a report containing the regulations in accordance with the rules specified in the application manual. Then, this report is reviewed by a group of trained evaluators (Birsell, 2002).

All five different methods are used for self-evaluation and none of them can be considered as the “best” approach. The best approach for the organization depends on the culture of the organization and the benefits it wants to achieve from this process.

The idea of re-emergence in health care emerged in the 1980s, and as a result, all countries began to seek new resources without caring for their resources. The concept of quality in health care has increased to a great extent as the consequences of inadequacies and errors in health services will have serious impact on human life due to this understanding of re-formation in health and the characteristics of health services itself (Çiçek et al., 2006).

The change in the existing needs in the society may require the change of the content of the services produced by the enterprise or the organization completely. Today, this active change in every environment affects the health sector. For this reason, the quality of the services produced is at the beginning of the ability of enterprises to maintain their competitiveness in the market and survive in this rapidly changing environment (Aktan & Toraman, 2003).

For this purpose, organizations have tried to provide a good service with a method called Quality Assurance System. Quality Assurance System; it is called an activity within the organization aiming to analyze the quality systematically and regularly and to prevent low-quality quality and this system has a long history in many European countries (Kaya, 2003).

The way in which health services are provided is an important factor that demonstrates both the social and economic levels of countries. Health care enterprises should work systematically when determining their quality management and apply quality assurance system and total quality management on the basis of production

and presentation of the current service. (Küçükaksu et al., 2004).

Different implementation models have been developed in order to conduct quality management and evaluation activities effectively (Kara, 2009). Thanks to these models developed through applications, organizations see the weak and strong aspects of the service they provide, and aim to provide better service by turning to certain improvements in their organizations according to these criteria.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to measure the satisfaction level of employees, which is one of the criteria of EFQM excellence model. For this purpose, the status of the satisfaction of the employees was tried to be determined by the situation evaluation according to EFQM criteria in selected private hospitals which conducts quality studies in line with EFQM model. According to this model, which evaluates the establishment activities with nine criteria based on excellence; customer satisfaction is ensured as a result of an appropriate leadership approach, formation of policies and strategies, and effective management of employees, resources and processes.

In this study, it was aimed to answer these following questions:

- What are the satisfaction levels of of the hospital department managers? Less, medium or more?
- Do managers' satisfaction levels change according to the department they work in?

The study differs from other studies in the field in terms of analysis in the health sector. With this study, which was carried out by considering health sector managers, it was aimed to fill the current research gap. Considering the low level of satisfaction of the health sector employees in the previous studies, it is also important to study whether or not there is a change with the proposed model.

The hypotheses planned to be tested within the scope of the research are as follows;

H1. There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' opinions about the department they work on and “how the human resources are planned, managed and improved?”.

H2. There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' opinions about the department they work on and “how are their knowledge and competencies determined, developed and maintained?”.

H3. There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' opinions about the department they work on and “how is employee participation and empowerment ensured?”.

H4. There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' opinions about the department they work on and “what kind of dialogue exists between employees and the organization?”.

H5. There is a statistically significant difference between the participants' opinions about the department they work on and “how the employees are appreciated, recognized and supervised?”.

This research determined the demographic characteristics of the participants by frequency analysis through the SPSS Program, tested the answers given by the participants to the questions in the 2013 EFQM Model and the demographic characteristics of the participants with ANOVA analysis, and also interpreted the Cronbach's Alpha values for the scale, whose validity and reliability was tested before, is still reliable. In addition, the averages of the participants' approaches to the scale expressions were taken and their satisfaction levels were determined. In this study, in which the survey method and questioning technique, which are quantitative research methods, were used, random sampling technique was also used.

As can be seen in Table 2, as a result of the *frequency analysis*, it was found that most of the participants were women, 25-31 years old, high school graduates, working in the bed services department for 4-6 years.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Demographic Characteristics of Participants		Number	Proportional Distribution (%)	
Gender	Male	18	36,0	
	Female	32	64,0	
Age	18-24	13	26,0	
	25-31	21	42,0	
	32-38	14	28,0	
	46-Up	2	4,0	
Education Status	High School	23	46,0	
	Undergraduate	16	32,0	
	Licence	10	20,0	
	Master	1	2,0	
Department Worked	Urgent	10	20,0	
	Bed Services	13	26,0	
	Operating Room	9	18,0	
	X-Ray	5	10,0	
	Laboratory	2	4,0	
	Administrative Works	3	6,0	
	Technical Services	2	4,0	
	Other	6	12,0	
	How many years have you been working?	1-3	18	36,0
		4-6	20	40,0
7-10		11	22,0	
11-15		1	2,00	
TOTAL		50	100	

As a result of the *frequency analysis*, most of the participants were undecided to “developing human resources policies, strategies and plans”, “the participation of all employees and their representatives in the formulation of policies, strategies and plans related to human resources”, “strategy, structure of the

organization and key processes are ensured”, “employee satisfaction survey is conducted to improve policies, strategies and plans related to human resources”, “innovative organizational approaches are used to improve working style”, “employees are directed to teamwork” and “surveys, interviews, etc., which are used to receive feedback from all employees”; they agree with “recruitment and career development processes are managed”, “employment is provided in a fair and honest manner” and “all activities are evaluated in a fair and honest manner, equality of opportunity for employees is provided in a fair and honest manner”.

As a result of the frequency analysis, most of the participants are undecided to “knowledge and competence of employees (knowledge and ability to do the job) are determined, classified and harmonized with the needs of the organization”, “individual and team-level learning opportunities”, “work is carried out to improve the work experiences of the employees”, “work is done to improve the team skills of the employees”, “training and development plans are formed and implemented in order to bring the employees to the expectations of the organization” and “the performance of the employees is better evaluated”; they are agree with “training and development plans are prepared and implemented in order to make the employees in line with the expectations of the organization” and “it is ensured that the targets at the individual and team levels should be in harmony with the objectives of the organization”

On the other hand, it was observed that most of the participants are undecided to “encouraged to participate in improvement activities as individuals and teams”, “participation is encouraged, innovative and creative initiatives are supported” and “employees are encouraged to team work”; they are agree with “employees are encouraged and supported to participate in internal conferences and ceremonies” and “employees are empowered to make decisions on their own”.

Also, most of the participants were undecided about the questions “communication needs of the employees should be determined”, “communication policies based on communication requirements are being developed plan and experience and knowledge from best practices are shared”; they are strongly agree with “top-down, bottom-up and horizontal communication channels are created and used in the institution”.

Furthermore, most of the participants are undecided about the questions which “employment-related issues such as remuneration of employees, job distribution and dismissal are made in line with the institution's policy and strategy”, “additional opportunities such as charity fund private health insurance nursery” and “social and cultural activities” and “employees are provided with convenience and services such as flexible working hours and service tools”; they are agree with “employees are known for the purpose of continuing their participation

and exercising their powers” and “raising awareness and participation in health, safety, environment and social responsibility issues for their employees”.

As a result of *reliability analysis*; The α value of the questions in “How are human resources planned, managed and improved?” is 0.916; The α value of the questions in “How are the knowledge and competencies of the employees determined, developed and maintained?” 0.874; The α value of the questions in the section “How is employee participation and empowerment ensured?” is 0.781; The α value of the questions in the section “What kind of dialogue is between employees and the organization?” is 0.813; The α value of the questions in the section “How are employees appreciated, recognized and observed?” is 0.840. Therefore, it can be said that the reliability of the scale used is high.

In addition, there were no questions with low correlation and affecting reliability more. It can be said that the internal consistency of the data is good. It can be said that the scale is equally distributed among the questions.

One way ANOVA was used to test H1 hypothesis. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3, and as a result ($p > 0.05$), it was found that there was no significant difference between the participants' opinions about the questions in “How Human Resources are Planned, Managed and Improved?” and their work department. So, H1 could not be confirmed.

Table 3. “How are human resources planned, managed and improved?” Section Variance Analysis Results

	Total of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1,505	7	0,215	0,364	0,918
Within Groups	24,815	42	0,591		
Total	26,320	49			
STATISTICS INFORMATION					
How are human resources planned, managed and improved?	Department		Mean	Standard Deviation	
	Urgent		3,0200	0,69730	
	Bed Services		2,8462	0,82018	
	Operating Room		3,1000	0,73314	
	X-Ray		2,9600	1,10815	
	Lab		2,9000	0,42426	
	Administrative Works		2,5667	0,35119	
	Technical Services		3,4000	0,14142	
	Other		3,1833	0,73290	

The results of the one-way analysis of variance to test the H2 hypothesis are shown in Table 4, and as a result ($p > 0,05$) there is not a significant difference between the worked department and the opinions of the participants regarding the questions in the section “How to Identify, Develop and Maintain Employees' Knowledge?”. So, H2 could not be confirmed.

Table 4. “How is the knowledge and competence of employees determined, developed and maintained?” Section Variance Analysis Results

	Total of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	1,582	7	0,226	0,480	0,844
Within Groups	19,770	42	0,471		
Total	21,352	49			
STATISTICS INFORMATION					
How is the knowledge and competence of employees determined, developed and maintained?	Department		Mean	Standard Deviation	
	Urgent		3,1750	0,55025	
	Bed Services		2,9808	0,51752	
	Operating Room		3,0417	0,85923	
	X-Ray		3,3750	0,53033	
	Lab		2,9375	0,44194	
	Administrative Works		2,6667	0,52042	
	Technical Services		2,6875	1,32583	
	Other		3,1875	0,92787	

The results of the one-way analysis of variance to test the H3 hypothesis are shown in Table 5, and as a result ($p > 0,05$) there is not a significant difference between the worked department and the opinions of the participants regarding the questions in the section “How to ensure employee participation and empowerment?”. So, H3 could not be confirmed.

Table 5. “How to ensure employee participation and empowerment?” Section Variance Analysis Results

	Total Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	2,465	7	0,352	0,864	0,543
Within Groups	17,122	42	0,408		
Total	19,587	49			
STATISTICS INFORMATION					
How to ensure employee participation and empowerment?	Department		Mean	Standard Deviation	
	Urgent		3,1200	0,63386	
	Bed Services		3,2615	0,49251	
	Operating Room		3,3778	0,67412	
	X-Ray		3,0000	0,76158	
	Lab		3,3000	0,42426	
	Administrative Works		2,6000	0,34641	
	Technical Services		3,8000	0,28284	
	Other		,90995	0,37148	

The results of the one-way analysis of variance to test the H4 hypothesis are shown in Table 6, and as a result ($p > 0,05$) there is not a significant difference between the worked department and the opinions of the participants regarding the questions in the section “What kind of dialogue is there between employees and the organization?”. So, H4 could not be confirmed.

Table 6. “What kind of dialogue is there between employees and the organization?” Section Variance Analysis Results

	Total Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	,891	7	0,127	0,221	0,978
Within Groups	24,179	42	0,576		
Total	25,070	49			
STATISTICS INFORMATION					
What kind of dialogue is there between employees and the organization?	Department	Mean	Standard Deviation		
	Urgent	3,0500	1,01242		
	Bed Services	3,0769	0,64051		
	Operating Room	3,2500	0,62500		
	X-Ray	3,0000	0,84779		
	Lab	3,1250	0,88388		
	Administrative Works	2,6667	0,52042		
	Technical Services	3,1250	0,53033		
	Other	2,9583	0,69672		

The results of the one-way analysis of variance to test the H5 hypothesis are shown in Table 7, and as a result ($p > 0,05$) there is not a significant difference between the worked department and the opinions of the participants regarding the questions in the section “How are employees recognized and respected?”. So, H5 could not be confirmed.

Table 7. “How are employees recognized and respected?” Section Variance Analysis Results

	Total Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1,827	7	0,261	0,548	0,793
Within Groups	20,011	42	0,476		
Total	21,838	49			
STATISTICS INFORMATION					
How are employees recognized and respected?	Department	Mean	Standard Deviation		
	Urgent	3,2333	0,75849		
	Bed Services	3,2949	0,65671		
	Operating Room	3,1852	0,57400		
	X-Ray	3,4667	0,88506		
	Lab	3,8333	0,23570		
	Administrative Works	2,8889	0,67358		
	Technical Services	2,8333	0,23570		
	Other	3,1111	0,75768		

4. CONCLUSION

In today's world trade, where competition is inevitable and the most important factor is the customer, businesses need to be managed correctly in order to sustain and grow their activities. The most important and essential element of success is to win the customer. Making profit, increasing market share, creating branding, growing are the results of satisfied customers.

The internationally recognized Deming Award, the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award and the European Quality Award (EFQM) are fundamentally similar, although formal differences are observed in the models and criteria. Their aims, philosophies and models are influenced by each other. It is essential to realize the philosophy of total quality management. The EFQM European Quality Award model is among the most advanced of these management models.

In this study conducted at the Private Academy Hospital, which provides services in the health sector, the satisfaction of the employees, one of the dimensions of the outcome criteria in EFQM Excellence Model with 95% confidence level and 5% error margin, was tested and hypotheses were not confirmed.

A high reliability scale was used in the study and the internal consistency of the data was quite good. Employees in administrative affairs and inpatient services have very little participation in the statements about «how human resources are planned, managed and improved», while employees in emergency department, x-ray department and laboratory department participate at medium level. Other departments, technical service department and operating room department stated that they had high participation. The statements regarding «how the knowledge and competencies of the employees are determined and maintained», indicate that the personnel working in administrative affairs agree with less, while the employees in the operating room department the middle.

When the statements regarding the section «how the participation and empowerment of the employees is ensured», are examined, it is stated that the technical services are very much attended by the employees while the other part shows that the employees are under-attended.

The statements of «what kind of dialogue exists between the employees and the organization» show that while the technical service employees agree with them, the employees in the administrative affairs department state that they do not agree at all.

Finally, «how the employees are appreciated, recognized and observed» show that laboratory department and X-ray department employees stated that they participated in the middle level, while technical service and administrative affairs employees stated that they never participated.

In the study, it is seen that the satisfaction of the staff of the Private Academy Hospital is at a moderate level. It is observed that management is beneficial in raising the working standards of employees.

In this study, the satisfaction criteria of the employees included in EFQM model are presented. From now on, it

is recommended to apply this criterion to the scope of further hospital research in the researches on this subject. In this way, hospitals will be compared in-house and more specific results will be obtained. Finally, we accept that the model we use is different from the model in 2020. The 2020 model is the latest EFQM Excellence Model and it has changed fundamentally since the previous (2013) one. But, maybe, with this study conducted by considering the 2013 model, the 2020 model data can be compared on the same sample and different results may be encountered in the future. Furthermore, we accept that the number of respondents is too small, as well. Future

studies that will deal with the same issue may address the questions included in the larger sampling on final model. Above all, this research can be a simple application of a model already established in the literature to a specific empirical setting. But, in the world of science, knowledge multiplies with accumulation and is verified by trying again and again. In a universe where even the truth can be falsified, the point of view should always be to move forward and develop for the better. In this context, although each step is aimed to compensate for the mistakes of the previous ones and to eliminate their deficiencies, gaps always remain. We hope that another study will fill the gaps of and be inspired by this study.

References:

- Aktan, H. T., & Toraman, A. R. (1997). *T.S.K. Sağlık Sistemlerinde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Uygulamaları*. GATA II. Baştabip Oryantasyon Kurs Kitabı. 17-21 Kasım Ankara.
- Barlı, Ö., Avcı, İ. & Avcı, S. B. (2012). EFQM Mükemmellik Modeli'nin Türkiye'deki Bazı Üst Kurullarda Değerlendirilmesi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 26(2), 1-9.
- Birsel, B. (2002). *EFQM Mükemmellik Modeli'ne Bir Araç Olarak Öğrenen Organizasyonlar Felsefesi*. Yüksek lisans tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çiçek, R., Kara, B., & Koyuncu, K. (2006). Sağlık Hizmet Sektöründe Kalite Algılanımı ve Hastanelerde Uygulanmasına İlişkin Bir Araştırma. *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 3, 1-19.
- Dikmen, T. (2010). *EFQM Mükemmellik Modeli ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı*. Yüksek lisans tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Duman, E. (2009). *EFQM Mükemmellik Modeli' nin İnsan Kaynakları Performans Sonuçları Üzerine Etkisi ve Bir Uygulama*. Yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Eren, E. (2012). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınevi.
- Eskildsen, J. K., & Dahlgard, J. J. (2000). A Causal Model for Employee Satisfaction. *TQM*, 11(8), 1081-1094.
- Gökmen, C. (2004). Hastanelerde Kalite Yönetimini Yönetmek. *Hastane Yaşam Dergisi*, 1(2).
- Ionica, A. C., Virginia, B., Edelhauser, E., & Irimie, S. (2010). TQM And Business Excellence. *Annals of the University of Petrosani, Economics*, 10(4), 125-134.
- İnan, A. T., Yayla, Y., & Yıldız, A. (2010). EFQM Mükemmellik Modeli ile İşletmelerin Temel Performans Sonuçlarının İncelenmesine İlişkin Bir Uygulama. *Mühendislik ve Fen Bilimleri Dergisi, Sigma*, 28, 335-345.
- Kara, E. (2009). *Yerel Yönetimlerde EFQM Mükemmellik Modelinin Uygulanması*. Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans tezi. Gebze.
- Kaya, S. (2003). Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Kalite Yönetimi: Çeşitli Ülkelerdeki Uygulamalara Genel Bir Bakış. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 6(2), 57-70.
- Küçükaksu C., Ünlü, S., Yarıcı, T. and Mahmutoğlu, L. (2004). Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Kalite Deneyimi. *Hastane Yaşam Dergisi*, 1(1).
- Nabitz, U., Klazinga, N., & Walburg, J. (2000). The EFQM Excellence Model: European and Dutch Experiences with the EFQM Approach in Health Care. *International Journal of Health Care*, 12(3), 191-201.
- Pakdil, F. (2004). Kalite Kültürünü Etkileyen Faktörler Üzerine Bir Derleme. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(3), 167-183.
- Ruiz-Carrillo, J. I. C., & Fernandez-Ortiz, R. (2005). Theoretical foundation of the EFQM model: the resource-based view. *Total Quality Management*, 16(1), 31- 50.
- Saban, M., & Vargun, H. (2011). Etkin Bir Performans Yönetimi İçin Balanced Scorecard Modeli İle Mükemmellik Modellerinin Birlikte Uygulanabilirliğine Yönelik Teorik Bir Yaklaşım. *Muhasebe Bilim Dünyası Dergisi*, 13(2), 58-66.
- Simsek, A. (2007). *Sağlık Hizmetlerinin EFQM Mükemmellik Modeli İle Değerlendirilmesi ve Gazi Üniversitesi Hastanesi Uygulanması*. Yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Türkiye Kalite Derneği (KalDer). (2006). *Ortak Değerlendirme Çerçevesi (ODÇ) Kuruluşun Özdeğerlendirme Aracılığıyla Geliştirilmesi*. KalDer Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Türkiye Kalite Derneği. (2010). *2010 Ulusal Kalite Ödülü Kitabı*. KalDer Yayınları, İstanbul.

- Ulař, S. (2002). *Toplam Kalite Yönetiminde İnsan Kaynaklarının Rolü: Liderlik Üzerine Bir Uygulama*. Uzmanlık Yeterlilik Tezi, Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası, İnsan Kaynakları Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.
- Yılmaz, H. (2010). Bilgi Yönetimi Sürecinde Performans Yönetim Modellerinin Uygulanması. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(2), 59-76.

Serap Kalfaođlu

Seluk University,
Konya,
Turkey
serapkalfaođlu@selcuk.edu.tr

Eda Eser

Seluk University,
Konya,
Turkey
eda.eser.94@gmail.com
