

TOTAL PRODUCTIVE MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORK
FOR AUTOMOTIVE COMPANIES IN MALAYSIA

ADNAN BIN BAKRI

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Mechanical Engineering)

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

NOVEMBER 2015

DEDICATION

To my beloved wife, Roslinda and all of my children: Nabil Irsyad, Nureen Najihah, Muhammad Nabil Ikhwan, Nureen Batrisyia and Nureen Faezatul Sofea, for the doa, love and endless support.

..And to the memory of my late parents who will forever be my inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the Most Beneficent and the Most Merciful. It is with deepest sense of gratitude to the Almighty that gives me strength and ability to complete this thesis. Throughout the journey, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians and practitioners. They have contributed significantly towards my understanding and thoughts in this research.

In particular, I would like to take this opportunity to express my solemn thanks and greatest gratitude to my respected supervisor, Assoc. Professor Dr. Abd. Rahman bin Abdul Rahim, and to my co-supervisor, Professor Dr. Noordin bin Mohd Yusof for their invaluable advice, guidance, encouragement, support and motivation throughout the entire course of this research. My next appreciation goes to the honorable panel of experts, Professor Dr. Nooh bin Abu Bakar (internal examiner), Assoc. Professor Dr. Mohd. Nizam bin Abd. Rahman (external examiner) and Professor Ir. Dr. Sha'ri bin Mohd. Yusof (Chairman of the viva-voce). They have ensured the "validity" of my research to follow the utmost standard of UTM "The Research University"...JAZAKUMULLAHU KHAIRAN KATHIRA...The completion of this thesis could not have been accomplished without your support and guidance.

Lastly, I would also like to convey my gratitude to all of my colleagues and friends from Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), University Kuala Lumpur (UniKL) and automotive companies, who assisted me throughout the research journey. Their invaluable views, supports and tips are useful indeed. Unfortunately, it is not possible to list all of them in this limited space.

ABSTRACT

Total productive maintenance (TPM) is an extensive maintenance management approach aimed towards improving the overall equipment effectiveness (OEE). A review on literature revealed that current TPM frameworks are generic and have inadequate coverage on the critical success factors (CSFs) constructs in its structure. These frameworks do not address the operational context particularly in providing the guideline for implementation, thus make it incomplete to be used in adopting TPM methodology. This research aims to provide a more comprehensive TPM framework with a set of significant CSFs and guideline for implementation. First, a conceptual framework (*denoted as TPM Framework I*) was developed with seven significant CSFs constructs as its main components, namely: management commitment and leadership; employee participation; training and education; effective communication; strategic planning; structured implementation approach, and; monitoring and evaluation. It was used for data collection through a mixed method research approach which integrates single-embedded (in-depth) design case study and survey. A methodological triangulation utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods has been used throughout the research, which includes: semi-structured interview; document analysis; direct and participant observation; analysis of artifacts, and; exploratory survey. The case study aims at providing an insight of how the largest automotive company and six of its subsidiaries implement TPM by exploring “what” and “how” the CSFs constructs are emphasized. Multiple unit of analysis were explored individually and results are drawn together to yield an overall picture of the actual TPM practice. Cross-case analysis and descriptive statistics was used for data analysis. Findings and feedbacks from the case study were synthesized to develop the improved conceptual framework (*denoted as TPM Framework II*) which was then validated through expert validation involving eight respondents from other automotive companies. The inputs from expert validation were analyzed and incorporated for the development of final conceptual framework (*denoted as Final TPM Framework III*). It filled the gap of previous research by integrating most aspects of CSFs constructs from both human and operational context. Another novelty of Final TPM Framework III is the inclusion of extensive implementation plan and introduction of new additional structures of CSFs such as: address all eight pillars of TPM; holistic involvement of business stakeholders, and; employees’ skill development linking with equipment life cycle. Such new characteristics have not been addressed in previous TPM framework. Final TPM Framework III can be generalized to automotive companies since it was synthesized from intensive case study and incorporated other automotive companies’ input mainly through expert validation exercises. Final TPM Framework III enables the management of automotive companies to take effective actions in handling issues related to TPM implementation.

ABSTRAK

Kaedah *total productive maintenance* (TPM) merupakan kaedah pengurusan penyelenggaraan yang menekankan kepada peningkatan dalam *overall equipment effectiveness* (OEE) sesuatu mesin. Analisa dari literatur menunjukkan kerangka konseptual TPM yang sedia ada tidak mempunyai konstruk *critical success factors* (CSFs) yang lengkap dan tidak menyediakan pelan pelaksanaan, menjadikannya tidak sesuai untuk digunakan sebagai sumber rujukan dalam melaksanakan TPM. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menghasilkan satu kerangka konseptual TPM yang lebih holistik, dengan penekanan kepada konstruk CSFs yang signifikan dan penyediaan panduan untuk pelaksanaan. Untuk tujuan itu, kerangka konseptual (*TPM Framework I*) telah diolah dengan tujuh komponen utamanya: kesungguhan dan kepimpinan pihak pengurusan; penglibatan pekerja; latihan dan pendidikan; keberkesanan komunikasi; perancangan strategik; pelaksanaan secara terancang, dan; pemantauan dan penilaian. Kerangka konseptual ini telah digunakan sebagai asas kepada pengumpulan data bagi kajian melalui kaedah metod campuran yang mengintegrasikan kajian kes (*single-embedded design case study*) dan kaedah soal selidik. Pendekatan triangulasi dengan penggunaan kaedah kualitatif dan kuantitatif telah digunakan sepanjang proses kajian melibatkan: temu bual soalan terbuka; analisis kandungan dokumen; pemerhatian; analisis artifak, dan; soal selidik. Kajian kes bermatlamat untuk meneroka “bagaimana” dan “apakah” konstruk CSFs yang ditekankan oleh syarikat automotif utama dan tujuh anak syarikatnya dalam melaksanakan TPM. Segala maklumat dari kajian kes telah dikumpul dan dianalisis menggunakan kaedah *cross-case analysis* dan *descriptive statistics* kearah perumusan kerangka konseptual TPM II (*TPM Framework II*). Kerangka konseptual TPM II ini kemudiannya telah dirujuk kepada lapan pakar dari industri automotif untuk disahkan. Komen dari pakar-pakar tersebut kemudiannya telah digunakan untuk merumuskan kerangka konseptual TPM III (*Final TPM Framework III*). Kerangka konseptual TPM III ini telah memenuhi lompang dalam kajian-kajian lepas dengan mengintegrasikan hampir keseluruhan konstruk CSFs dari konteks kemanusiaan dan operasi (*human and operational context*). Ianya juga telah dilengkapi dengan plan pelaksanaan dan penekanan terhadap konstruk tambahan dalam CSFs: penekanan terhadap lapan asas TPM; penglibatan menyeluruh *business stakeholders*, dan; kemahiran pekerja selari dengan *machine life cycle*. Ciri-ciri khas ini belum pernah diperkenalkan dalam kerangka konseptual TPM yang sedia ada. Kerangka konseptual TPM III ini boleh digunakan pada semua kilang automotif kerana ianya telah diolah hasil kajian kes secara intensif di kilang automotif utama dan anak-anak syarikatnya. Input dan pandangan pakar-pakar dari kilang-kilang automotif lain juga telah memperkasakan lagi kerangka ini. Kerangka konseptual TPM III ini adalah bermatlamat untuk dijadikan sumber rujukan bagi pihak pengurusan kilang automotif bagi mengambil langkah penambahbaikan dalam menangani masalah yang berkaitan dengan pelaksanaan TPM.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | TITLE | PAGE |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| | DECLARATION | ii |
| | DEDICATION | iii |
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iv |
| | ABSTRACT | v |
| | ABSTRAK | vi |
| | TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| | LIST OF TABLES | xix |
| | LIST OF FIGURES | xxii |
| | LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xxv |
| | LIST OF APPENDICES | xxviii |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH | 1 |
| | 1.1 Background of the Research | 1 |
| | 1.2 Problem Statement | 3 |
| | 1.2.1 The Need of In-depth Study in TPM | 3 |
| | 1.2.2 TPM Research in Automotive Industry | 3 |
| | 1.2.3 TPM Research on CSFs Constructs | 4 |
| | 1.2.4 Absence of Comprehensive TPM Framework | 5 |
| | 1.3 Research Questions | 5 |
| | 1.4 Research Objectives | 6 |
| | 1.5 Research Scope | 6 |
| | 1.6 Significance of the Research | 7 |
| | 1.7 Outline of the Thesis | 8 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | 9 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 9 |
| 2.2 | Overview of Quality Improvement Initiatives | 9 |
| | 2.2.1 Maintenance Management in QI Initiatives | 11 |
| 2.3 | Overview of Maintenance Management | 14 |
| | 2.3.1 Breakdown Maintenance | 15 |
| | 2.3.2 Preventive Maintenance | 15 |
| | 2.3.3 Predictive Maintenance | 15 |
| | 2.3.4 Reliability Centered Maintenance | 16 |
| | 2.3.5 Computerized Maintenance Management System | 17 |
| | 2.3.6 Total Productive Maintenance | 17 |
| | 2.3.7 Comparison of Various Approaches in Maintenance Management | 17 |
| | 2.3.8 Rationale of TPM as Research Focus | 19 |
| 2.4 | Overview of TPM Methodology | 23 |
| | 2.4.1 Historical Perspective of TPM | 23 |
| | 2.4.2 TPM Philosophy | 23 |
| | 2.4.3 Focus of TPM | 24 |
| | 2.4.4 Benefits of TPM | 25 |
| 2.5 | Operational Approach of TPM | 26 |
| | 2.5.1 TPM Pillar 1: Autonomous Maintenance | 28 |
| | 2.5.2 TPM Pillar 2: Focused Improvement | 29 |
| | 2.5.3 TPM Pillar 3: Planned Maintenance | 29 |
| | 2.5.4 TPM Pillar 4: Quality Maintenance | 31 |
| | 2.5.5 TPM Pillar 5: Training and Education | 31 |
| | 2.5.6 TPM Pillar 6: Early Management | 32 |
| | 2.5.7 TPM Pillar 7: TPM in Administrative and Support Department | 32 |
| | 2.5.8 TPM Pillar 8: Safety, Health and Environment | 33 |
| 2.6 | Overall Equipment Effectiveness | 34 |
| 2.7 | TPM Implementation Steps | 36 |
| 2.8 | Review of Existing Research in TPM | 37 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 2.8.1 | Recent Theme in TPM Research | 38 |
| 2.8.2 | Common Research Theme in Malaysia | 39 |
| 2.8.3 | TPM Research in Malaysian Automotive Industry | 40 |
| 2.9 | Critical Success Factors | 42 |
| 2.9.1 | Definition of Critical Success Factors | 43 |
| 2.9.2 | CSFs Constructs in TPM | 46 |
| 2.9.2.1 | Management Commitment and Leadership | 45 |
| 2.9.2.2 | Employee Participation | 46 |
| 2.9.2.3 | Strategic Planning | 48 |
| 2.9.2.4 | Structured Implementation Approach | 49 |
| 2.9.2.5 | Training and Education | 51 |
| 2.9.2.6 | Effective Communication | 52 |
| 2.9.2.7 | Monitoring and Evaluation | 53 |
| 2.10 | Research Framework | 53 |
| 2.10.1 | Review of Existing TPM Frameworks | 54 |
| 2.10.1.1 | Framework by McKone <i>et al.</i> (1999) | 55 |
| 2.10.1.2 | Framework by Park and Han (2001) | 56 |
| 2.10.1.3 | Framework by Ahmed <i>et al.</i> (2004) | 57 |
| 2.10.1.4 | Framework by Seng <i>et al.</i> (2006) | 58 |
| 2.10.1.5 | Framework by Ahuja and Khamba (2008) | 59 |
| 2.10.1.6 | Framework by Batumalay and Santhapparaj (2009) | 60 |
| 2.10.1.7 | Framework by Lazim and Ramayah (2010) | 62 |
| 2.10.2 | Comparative Analysis of Existing TPM Framework | 63 |
| 2.10.3 | Absence of Comprehensive TPM Framework | 67 |
| 2.11 | Summary | 67 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3 | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 68 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 68 |
| | 3.1.1 Overview of the Research Methodology | 68 |
| 3.2 | Phase I of the Research | 71 |
| | 3.2.1 Problem Identification | 71 |
| | 3.2.2 Determine Research Objectives | 71 |
| | 3.2.3 Determine the Research Theme | 72 |
| | 3.2.4 Development of the Research Framework | 72 |
| | 3.2.5 Selection of Research Design | 73 |
| | 3.2.6 Review on Case Study Approach | 75 |
| | 3.2.6.1 Case Study Operational Approach | 75 |
| | 3.2.6.2 Advantages of Case Study Approach | 76 |
| | 3.2.6.3 Review on Research Approach | 78 |
| | 3.2.6.4 Review on Research Approach Employed by Malaysian Researchers | 79 |
| | 3.2.7 Selection of Case Study Company | 80 |
| 3.3 | Phase II of the Research | 80 |
| | 3.3.1 Case Study Planning and Design | 81 |
| | 3.3.1.1 Case Study Training | 81 |
| | 3.3.1.2 Determine Case and Unit of Analysis | 83 |
| | 3.3.1.3 Selection of Case Study Design | 84 |
| | 3.3.2 Preparation for Data Collection | 90 |
| | 3.3.2.1 General Case Study Protocol | 91 |
| | 3.3.2.2 Semi-structured Interview Question | 93 |
| | 3.3.2.3 Questionnaire | 93 |
| | 3.3.2.4 Validation of Case Study Protocols | 94 |
| | 3.3.2.5 Pilot Test | 95 |
| 3.4 | Phase III of the Research | 96 |
| | 3.4.1 Data Collection | 96 |
| | 3.4.1.1 Qualitative Data Collection Tools | 97 |
| | 3.4.1.2 Quantitative Data Collection Tools | 102 |
| | 3.4.2 Data Analysis | 102 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 3.4.3 | Development of TPM Framework II | 104 |
| 3.4.4 | Framework Validation Protocol | 104 |
| 3.4.5 | Validation of TPM Framework II | 105 |
| 3.5 | Phase IV of the Research | 107 |
| 3.5.1 | Development of Final TPM Framework III | 107 |
| 3.5.2 | Development of Implementation Plan | 107 |
| 3.6 | Discussion: Quality Assurance of the Research | 108 |
| 3.6.1 | Construct Validity | 108 |
| 3.6.2 | Internal Validity | 109 |
| 3.6.3 | External Validity | 110 |
| 3.6.4 | Reliability | 110 |
| 3.7 | Summary | 112 |
| 4 | CASE STUDY RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS | 113 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 113 |
| 4.2 | Research Framework | 113 |
| 4.3 | Case Study Company | 115 |
| 4.3.1 | Background of Unit of Analysis | 116 |
| 4.3.1.1 | Unit of Analysis 1: Main Plant | 118 |
| 4.3.1.2 | Unit of Analysis 2: Multi-Vehicle Factory | 118 |
| 4.3.1.3 | Unit of Analysis 3: Engine Transmission Manufacturing | 118 |
| 4.3.1.4 | Unit of Analysis 4: Additional Plant | 119 |
| 4.3.1.5 | Unit of Analysis 5: Plant Services Department | 119 |
| 4.3.1.6 | Unit of Analysis 6 : Innovation and Improvement Department | 119 |
| 4.4 | Case Study Results: Qualitative Method | 120 |
| 4.4.1 | CSFs 1: Management Commitment and Leadership | 120 |
| 4.4.1.1 | Clear Company Policy on TPM | 120 |
| 4.4.1.2 | Recognition of TPM as Part of Vital | |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| | Constituent | 121 |
| 4.4.1.3 | Allocation of Sufficient Resources | 122 |
| 4.4.1.4 | Lead TPM Steering Committee | 124 |
| 4.4.1.5 | Offering Rewards and Incentives | 125 |
| 4.4.2 | CSFs 2: Employee Participation | 127 |
| 4.4.2.1 | Change in Working Culture | 127 |
| 4.4.2.2 | Active Participation in AM and SGA | 128 |
| 4.4.2.3 | Equipment Ownership and Teamwork | 130 |
| 4.4.2.4 | Participation of All Employees | 130 |
| 4.4.3 | CSFs 3: Strategic Planning | 131 |
| 4.4.3.1 | Development of Master Plan | 131 |
| 4.4.3.2 | Benchmarking Activities | 132 |
| 4.4.3.3 | Plan for TPM Certification | 132 |
| 4.4.4 | CSFs 4: Structured Implementation Approach | 133 |
| 4.4.4.1 | Follow the Establish TPM Implementation Framework | 133 |
| 4.4.4.2 | Empowerment of Middle- managers to Support TPM | 136 |
| 4.4.4.3 | Application of Tools, Techniques and Technology | 137 |
| 4.4.4.4 | Integration of TPM with Other Quality Improvement Initiatives | 138 |
| 4.4.4.5 | Involvement of Business Stakeholders | 139 |
| 4.4.5 | CSFs 5: Training and Education | 140 |
| 4.4.5.1 | Structured Training Program | 140 |
| 4.4.5.2 | Development of Employee Competency | 141 |
| 4.4.5.3 | Inculcate Kaizen Culture | 143 |
| 4.4.5.4 | Trainer Competency | 144 |
| 4.4.6 | CSFs 6: Effective Communication | 144 |
| 4.4.6.1 | Open Communication and Exchange of Information | 144 |
| 4.4.6.2 | Awareness and Promotional Activities | 146 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 4.4.6.3 | Feedback System | 146 |
| 4.4.7 | CSFs 7: Monitoring and Evaluation | 147 |
| 4.4.7.1 | Scheduled Monitoring and Follow Up | 147 |
| 4.4.7.2 | Measurement Performance Based on OEE | 148 |
| 4.4.7.3 | Assessment of Employee Competency | 149 |
| 4.4.7.4 | Enforcement by Management | 150 |
| 4.5 | Case Study Results: Quantitative Method | 151 |
| 4.5.1 | Operators Perceptions' on TPM Implementation | 152 |
| 4.5.2 | Operators' Perception on the Role of Teamwork | 154 |
| 4.5.3 | Operators' Perception on Management Commitment and Leadership | 155 |
| 4.5.4 | Assessment on Operators' Knowledge in TPM | 156 |
| 4.5.4.1 | Question 1 | 158 |
| 4.5.4.2 | Question 2 | 158 |
| 4.5.4.3 | Question 3 | 159 |
| 4.5.4.4 | Question 4 | 160 |
| 4.5.4.5 | Question 5 | 160 |
| 4.6 | Case Study Analysis | 161 |
| 4.6.1 | Addressing the TPM Framework I | 161 |
| 4.6.1.1 | Management Commitment and Leadership | 162 |
| 4.6.1.2 | Employee Participation | 164 |
| 4.6.1.3 | Strategic Planning | 166 |
| 4.6.1.4 | Structured Implementation Approach | 167 |
| 4.6.1.5 | Training and Education | 169 |
| 4.6.1.6 | Effective Communication | 171 |
| 4.6.1.7 | Monitoring and Evaluation | 172 |
| 4.6.2 | Addressing RQ1 | 174 |
| 4.6.3 | Addressing RQ2 | 174 |
| 4.6.4 | Addressing RQ3 | 177 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 4.6.5 | Addressing RQ4 | 177 |
| 4.6.6 | Recommendations for TPM Improvement at Case Study Company | 178 |
| 4.6.6.1 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Management Commitment and Leadership | 178 |
| 4.6.6.2 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Employee Participation | 179 |
| 4.6.6.3 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Strategic Planning | 179 |
| 4.6.6.4 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Structured Implementation Approach | 181 |
| 4.6.6.5 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Training and Education | 183 |
| 4.6.6.6 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Effective Communication | 184 |
| 4.6.6.7 | Recommendation Related to the Constructs of Monitoring and Evaluation | 185 |
| 4.7 | CSFs Constructs Anchored from the Case Study | 188 |
| 4.7.1 | Management Commitment and Leadership | 188 |
| 4.7.1.1 | Understanding TPM Philosophy | 189 |
| 4.7.2 | Employee Participation | 189 |
| 4.7.3 | Strategic Planning | 190 |
| 4.7.4 | Structured Implementation Approach | 190 |
| 4.7.4.1 | Focus on All Eight Pillars of TPM | 191 |
| 4.7.4.2 | Integration of Tools, Techniques and Technology | 191 |
| 4.7.4.3 | Involvement of External Business Stakeholders | 192 |
| 4.7.5 | Training and Education | 192 |

| | | | |
|----------|---------|--|------------|
| | 4.7.6 | Effective Communication | 193 |
| | 4.7.7 | Monitoring and Evaluation | 193 |
| | 4.8 | Improvement of TPM Framework I | 194 |
| | 4.9 | Summary | 196 |
| 5 | | DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPTUAL TPM FRAMEWORK | 197 |
| | 5.1 | Introduction | 197 |
| | 5.2 | Level of Framework | 197 |
| | 5.3 | Descriptions of TPM Framework II | 199 |
| | 5.4 | Summary of Specification for TPM Framework II | 203 |
| | 5.4.1 | Simple Structure and Self-explanatory | 204 |
| | 5.4.2 | Integration of All Possible CSFs Constructs | 204 |
| | 5.4.3 | Implementable | 205 |
| | 5.4.4 | Revisable | 205 |
| | 5.4.5 | Integrate with Tools, Techniques and Technology | 206 |
| | 5.5 | Validation of TPM Framework II | 206 |
| | 5.5.1 | Respondent Demographic | 207 |
| | 5.5.2 | Background of Individual Respondent Company | 208 |
| | 5.5.2.1 | Company A | 208 |
| | 5.5.2.2 | Company B | 208 |
| | 5.5.2.3 | Company C | 209 |
| | 5.5.2.4 | Company D | 209 |
| | 5.5.2.5 | Company E | 210 |
| | 5.5.2.6 | University F | 210 |
| | 5.5.2.7 | University G | 210 |
| | 5.5.3 | Response to the Framework Attributes | 211 |
| | 5.5.4 | Response to the Framework Constructs | 213 |
| | 5.5.4.1 | Understanding the philosophy | 213 |
| | 5.5.4.2 | Management Commitment and Leadership | 214 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| 5.5.4.3 | Strategic Planning | 214 |
| 5.5.4.4 | Employee Participation | 214 |
| 5.5.4.5 | Training and Education | 215 |
| 5.5.4.6 | Effective Communication | 215 |
| 5.5.4.7 | Focus on All Eight Pillars of TPM | 216 |
| 5.5.4.8 | Involvement of External Business Stakeholders | 216 |
| 5.5.4.9 | Integration of Tools, Techniques and Technology | 217 |
| 5.5.4.10 | Monitoring and Evaluation | 217 |
| 5.5.4.11 | Summary of Response to the Framework Constructs | 218 |
| 5.5.5 | Individual Respondent Review to the TPM Framework II | 224 |
| 5.5.5.1 | Respondent A1 | 224 |
| 5.5.5.2 | Respondent A2 | 224 |
| 5.5.5.3 | Respondent B1 | 225 |
| 5.5.5.4 | Respondent B2 | 225 |
| 5.5.5.5 | Respondent C1 | 226 |
| 5.5.5.6 | Respondent C2 | 226 |
| 5.5.5.7 | Respondent D1 | 226 |
| 5.5.5.8 | Respondent E1 | 227 |
| 5.5.5.9 | Respondent F1 | 227 |
| 5.5.5.10 | Respondent G1 | 228 |
| 5.6 | Improvement Suggestion for TPM Framework II | 228 |
| 5.7 | Development of Final TPM Framework III | 230 |
| 5.7.1 | Core Starting point | 232 |
| 5.7.1.1 | Understanding the TPM Philosophy | 232 |
| 5.7.1.2 | Management Commitment and Leadership | 233 |
| 5.7.2 | Human –Contextual Strategy | 234 |
| 5.7.2.1 | Training and Education | 234 |
| 5.7.2.2 | Communication | 238 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 5.7.2.3 | Employee Participation | 239 |
| 5.7.3 | Operational-Contextual Strategy | 240 |
| 5.7.3.1 | Strategic Planning for TPM | |
| | Implementation | 240 |
| 5.7.3.2 | Address All of TPM Pillars | 243 |
| 5.7.3.3 | Involvement of External Business | |
| | Stakeholders | 247 |
| 5.7.3.4 | Integration of Tools, Techniques | |
| | and Technology | 253 |
| 5.7.3.5 | Monitoring and Evaluation | 254 |
| 5.8 | Proposed Implementation Plan | 255 |
| 5.8.1 | Phase I: Preparatory Stage | 258 |
| 5.8.1.1 | Instill the Top Management | |
| | Commitment | 258 |
| 5.8.1.2 | Justification of Implementing the | |
| | Final TPM Framework III | 258 |
| 5.8.1.3 | Allocation of Resources | 258 |
| 5.8.1.4 | Establish New Company Policy | 259 |
| 5.8.1.5 | Steering Committee and Champion | |
| | Team | 259 |
| 5.8.1.6 | Awareness Training for Steering | |
| | Committee and Champion Team | 260 |
| 5.8.1.7 | Benchmarking and Consultation | 260 |
| 5.8.1.8 | Dissemination of Top Management | |
| | Decision | 260 |
| 5.8.1.9 | Awareness Training for Stakeholders | 261 |
| 5.8.2 | Phase II: Planning Stage | 262 |
| 5.8.2.1 | Explicit Master Plan | 262 |
| 5.8.2.2 | Plan for Pilot Project | 263 |
| 5.8.2.3 | Training for Pilot Team | 263 |
| 5.8.2.4 | Plan for Monitoring and Evaluation | 264 |
| 5.8.2.5 | Strategy to Entice Total Participation | 264 |
| 5.8.2.6 | Formation of Cross Functional Team | 264 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| | 5.8.2.7 Promoting the SGA | 265 |
| | 5.8.3 Phase III: Pilot Project | 265 |
| | 5.8.4 Phase IV: Full Implementation | 266 |
| 5.9 | Summary | 266 |
| 6 | CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 267 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 267 |
| 6.2 | Conclusions of the Research | 267 |
| | 6.2.1 Addressing RO1 | 267 |
| | 6.2.2 Addressing RO2 | 268 |
| | 6.2.3 Addressing RO3 | 269 |
| | 6.2.4 Addressing RO4 | 269 |
| | 6.2.5 Addressing RO5 | 270 |
| 6.3 | Research Contributions | 271 |
| | 6.3.1 Development of TPM Framework for Automotive Company | 271 |
| | 6.3.2 Promotion of CSFs Focus in TPM Implementation | 271 |
| | 6.3.3 Proposed Measure for Case Study Company | 272 |
| | 6.3.4 Promotion of Case Study Methodology | 272 |
| | 6.3.5 New Body of Knowledge in TPM | 272 |
| 6.4 | Dissemination of Knowledge | 273 |
| 6.5 | Recommendations for Future Research | 273 |
| | 6.5.1 Actual Implementation of the Framework in Automotive Company | 273 |
| | 6.5.2 Expand the Coverage of the Case Study in Automotive Industry | 273 |
| | 6.5.3 Improvisation on the CSFs Constructs | 274 |
| | 6.5.4 Further Research on the New Insight of TPM | 274 |
| 6.6 | Closing Remarks | 275 |
| | REFERENCES | 276 |
| | Appendices A-P | 295 - 349 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| 2.1 | Previous studies in TQM, lean manufacturing and JIT | 12 |
| 2.2 | Comparison on the approaches in maintenance management | 18 |
| 2.3 | TPM research in Malaysia | 21 |
| 2.4 | Priorities and goals of TPM | 26 |
| 2.5 | Seven steps AM | 28 |
| 2.6 | Detail of six major losses related to equipment maintenance | 35 |
| 2.7 | Twelve-step TPM implementation | 36 |
| 2.8 | Summary of CSFs constructs derived from previous study | 44 |
| 2.9 | Summary of elements emphasized in previous TPM framework: A comparison based on independent variables | 64 |
| 2.10 | Summary of elements emphasized in previous TPM framework: A comparison based on dependent variables and methodology used | 65 |
| 2.11 | Summary of elements emphasized in previous TPM framework: A comparison based on the CSFs constructs | 66 |
| 3.1 | Selection criteria of research design | 74 |
| 3.2 | Comparison between case study and survey study | 78 |
| 3.3 | Case study boundaries | 84 |
| 3.4 | Four-types of case study design | 85 |
| 3.5 | Selection factors for the single-case study approach | 88 |
| 3.6 | Finalized case study design for the research | 90 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 3.7 | Case study protocol developed for this research | 92 |
| 3.8 | Questionnaire and its subdivisions | 94 |
| 3.9 | Selection criteria for expert validation | 95 |
| 3.10 | Selection criteria for the interview respondents | 98 |
| 3.11 | Distribution of respondents for the interview | 99 |
| 3.12 | List of documents to be examined | 100 |
| 3.13 | List of archival records to be checked | 101 |
| 3.14 | Data analysis method from the previous research | 103 |
| 3.15 | Selection criteria for expert validation of TPM Framework II | 105 |
| 3.16 | Assurance of the validity of the research | 111 |
| 4.1 | Typical data from problem identification activity | 129 |
| 4.2 | Activities in the three-phase TPM implementation program | 135 |
| 4.3 | Summary of the key module for AM training | 142 |
| 4.4 | Type of communication employed for dissemination of TPM information | 145 |
| 4.5 | Monitoring activities for TPM | 148 |
| 4.6 | Auditing standards for TPM | 150 |
| 4.7 | Work areas for questionnaires distribution | 152 |
| 4.8 | Operators' perception of TPM program | 153 |
| 4.9 | Operators' perception on the role of teamwork in TPM | 154 |
| 4.10 | Operators' perception on management commitment and leadership in TPM | 156 |
| 4.11 | Assessment to measure the operators' understanding on TPM methodology | 157 |
| 4.12 | Five-point Likert scale used for rating of CSFs constructs | 161 |
| 4.13 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of management commitment and leadership | 163 |
| 4.14 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of employee participation | 165 |
| 4.15 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of strategic planning | 166 |
| 4.16 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of structured | 168 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| | implementation approach | |
| 4.17 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of training and education | 170 |
| 4.18 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of effective communication | 171 |
| 4.19 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of monitoring and evaluation | 173 |
| 4.20 | TPM pillar emphasis | 174 |
| 4.21 | Summary of the CSFs constructs and level of emphasis | 175 |
| 4.22 | Recommendation to enhance the TPM implementation | 186 |
| 4.23 | Summary of improvement for TPM Framework I | 195 |
| 5.1 | Detail elements in TPM Framework II | 200 |
| 5.2 | Summary of specification for TPM Framework II | 203 |
| 5.3 | Content of the validation protocol for TPM Framework II | 206 |
| 5.4 | Summary of respondent demographic profiles | 207 |
| 5.5 | Summary of respondents' feedback to TPM Framework II attributes | 212 |
| 5.6 | Five-point Likert scale used for framework validation | 213 |
| 5.7 | Cross-case comparison on the response to the framework content | 219 |
| 5.8 | Suggestions for Improvement of TPM Framework II | 229 |
| 5.9 | Improvement for TPM Framework II | 230 |
| 5.10 | Dedicated TPM training | 235 |
| 5.11 | Training for AM | 237 |
| 5.12 | TPM pillars and its key activity | 246 |
| 5.13 | The role of external business stakeholders | 249 |
| 5.14 | Summary of activities involved in the four phases of implementation plan | 257 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------|--|------|
| 2.1 | Concept in maintenance management | 14 |
| 2.2 | The meaning of total in TPM | 24 |
| 2.3 | TPM with eight pillars approach | 27 |
| 2.4 | TPM with five pillars approach | 27 |
| 2.5 | The activities of specialized maintenance | 30 |
| 2.6 | Six major losses related to equipment maintenance | 35 |
| 2.7 | Framework by McKone <i>et al.</i> (1999) | 55 |
| 2.8 | Framework by Park and Han (2001) | 56 |
| 2.9 | Framework by Ahmed <i>et al.</i> (2004) | 57 |
| 2.10 | Framework by Seng <i>et al.</i> (2006) | 59 |
| 2.11 | Framework by Ahuja and Khamba (2008) | 60 |
| 2.12 | Framework by Batumalay and Santhapparaj (2009) | 61 |
| 2.13 | Framework by Lazim and Ramayah (2010) | 62 |
| 3.1 | Methodology adopted for the research | 70 |
| 3.2 | Identification of problem statement for the research | 71 |
| 3.3 | Classification of research design | 73 |
| 3.4 | The communal between this research aims and Yin's assertion on case study | 76 |
| 3.5 | Case study and its sub components | 77 |
| 3.6 | Research methodology applied by the previous researchers | 79 |
| 3.7 | Typical steps in case study methodology | 81 |
| 3.8 | Summary of stages involved in development of TPM framework | 107 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.1 | TPM Framework I | 114 |
| 4.2 | Unit of analysis approached in the case study | 117 |
| 4.3 | Relation among the unit of analysis in the case study | 117 |
| 4.4 | Company X quality policy towards business survival | 122 |
| 4.5 | Organization chart of the case study company | 123 |
| 4.6 | Structure for TPM steering committee in company X | 125 |
| 4.7 | Kaizen suggestion flow | 126 |
| 4.8 | Approach in gaining employee participation | 128 |
| 4.9 | Evidences of active employee participation | 129 |
| 4.10 | Basic TPM operational approaches | 131 |
| 4.11 | Typical shop floor manpower planning | 137 |
| 4.12 | Sequence of AM training | 141 |
| 4.13 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of management commitment and leadership | 163 |
| 4.14 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of employee participation | 165 |
| 4.15 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of strategic planning | 167 |
| 4.16 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of structured implementation approach | 169 |
| 4.17 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of training and education | 171 |
| 4.18 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of effective communication | 172 |
| 4.19 | Level of emphasis related to the constructs of monitoring and evaluation | 173 |
| 5.1 | Level of framework | 198 |
| 5.2 | TPM Framework II | 200 |
| 5.3 | Final TPM Framework III | 231 |
| 5.4 | Relation of skills development and equipment failure rate | 236 |
| 5.5 | Communication item | 239 |
| 5.6 | Five main elements to enhance planning and preparation works | 241 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.7 | The hierarchy of TPM pillars | 245 |
| 5.8 | Involvement of external business stakeholder towards achieving the TPM target | 248 |
| 5.9 | Relation of equipment life cycle and EM activity | 251 |
| 5.10 | Involvement of DOSH and equipment supplier towards zero industrial accident | 253 |
| 5.11 | Integration of tools, techniques and technology towards improvement in TPM implementation | 254 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|-------|---|--|
| 4M1E | - | Man-Machine-Method-Material-Environment |
| 5S | - | Shop Floor Control |
| AM | - | Autonomous Maintenance |
| BM | - | Breakdown Maintenance |
| CAPD | - | Check-Act-Plan-Do |
| CBM | - | Condition Based Maintenance |
| CLTM | - | Cleaning-Lubrication-Tightening-Minor repair |
| CMMS | - | Computerised Maintenance Management System |
| CQI | - | Continual Quality Improvement |
| CSFs | - | Critical Success Factors |
| DIY | - | Do-it-yourself |
| DOE | - | Design of Experiment |
| DOSH | - | Department of Safety and Health |
| EIT | - | Equipment Improvement Team |
| EM | - | Early Management |
| ETM | - | Engine Transmission Manufacturing |
| FI | - | Focused Improvement |
| FMEA | - | Failure Mode and Effect Analysis |
| FMECA | - | Failure Mode and Effect Critical Analysis |
| FTA | - | Fault Tree Analysis |
| GRR | - | Gauge Repeatability and Reproducibility |
| HAZOP | - | Hazard and Operability Analysis |
| HOQ | - | House of Quality |
| ICC | - | Innovative and Creativity Circle |
| ICT | - | Information and Communication Technology |
| IID | - | Innovation and Improvement Department |

| | | |
|---------|---|---|
| JIPM | - | Japan Institute of Plant Maintenance |
| JIT | - | Just-In-Time |
| KPI | - | Key Performance Index |
| K-T | - | Kepner-Tregoe |
| Lean | - | Lean Manufacturing |
| MAI | - | Malaysia Automotive Institute |
| MAJAICO | - | Malaysia-Japan Automotive Industries Corporation |
| MCSA | - | Motor Current Signature Analysis |
| MIDA | - | Malaysia Industrial Development Authority |
| MITI | - | Ministry of International Trade and Industry |
| MMC | - | Mitsubishi Motors of Japan |
| MPC | - | Malaysian Productivity Corporation |
| MPV | - | Multi Purpose Vehicle |
| MSA | - | Measurement System Analysis |
| MVF | - | Multi-Vehicle Factory |
| NAP | - | National Automotive Policy |
| OA | - | Organizational Achievement |
| OEE | - | Overall Equipment Effectiveness |
| OEM | - | Ecology Oriented Manufacturing |
| OSHA | - | Occupational Safety and Health Act |
| PQCDSM | - | Productivity, Quality, Cost, Delivery, Safety, Morale |
| PDCA | - | Plan-Do-Check-Action |
| PdM | - | Predictive Maintenance |
| PM | - | Planned Maintenance |
| PrM | - | Preventive Maintenance |
| P-M | - | Phenomenon-Mechanism |
| PPAP | - | Production Part Approval Process |
| QI | - | Quality improvement |
| QFD | - | Quality Function Deployment |
| QM | - | Quality Maintenance |
| RCA | - | Root Cause Analysis |
| RCM | - | Reliability Centered Maintenance |
| RO | - | Research Objective |

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| RQ | - | Research Question |
| SGA | - | Small Group Activity |
| SHEM | - | Safety, Health and Environment Management |
| SIRIM | - | Standards and Industrial Research Institute of Malaysia |
| SIMs | - | Small-Medium Industries |
| SOP | - | Standard Operation Procedure |
| SPC | - | Statistical Process Control |
| SWOT | - | Strength-Weakness-Opportunity-Threat Analysis |
| TE | - | Training and Education |
| TPM | - | Total Productive Maintenance |
| TPMAS | - | TPM in Administrative and Support Department |
| TPMC | - | TPM Coordination |
| TPS | - | Toyota Production System |
| TQM | - | Total Quality Management |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX | TITLE | PAGE |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| A1 | List of Existing Research in TPM | 295 |
| A2 | Comparison of Single Case vs Multiple Case Study | 298 |
| B | Sample of E-mail Communication for the Case Study | 300 |
| C | General Case Study Protocol | 301 |
| D | Semi-structured Interview Question | 304 |
| E | Questionnaire for Operators | 310 |
| F | Assessment Test: Question and Answering Scheme | 312 |
| G | Respondents Profile | 313 |
| H | Sample of Responses for the Questionnaire and Assessment Test | 315 |
| H1 | Summary of the data collected in the case study through a qualitative method | 318 |
| H2 | Summary of the data collected in the case study through quantitative methods | 322 |
| H3 | Source of evidences from the case study | 324 |
| I | Sample of Cover Letter for Framework Validation | 325 |
| J | Sample of Framework Descriptions | 326 |
| K | Sample of Question for Framework Validation | 331 |
| L | Sample of Respondent Feedbacks for the Framework Validation Exercise | 339 |
| M | Sample of OEE Data from Company X | 345 |
| N | Sample of Audit Results from Company X | 346 |
| O | Sample of Data from Management Walkabout (Gemba) at Company X | 347 |
| P | List of Conferences and Publications | 348 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 Background of the Research

In order to face intense competition in the borderless world, manufacturing organizations must be supported by efficient maintenance and effective manufacturing strategies (Dogra *et al.*, 2011; Ahuja and Khamba, 2008; Marquez and Gupta, 2006). Reliable manufacturing equipment has been considered as significant contributor to organizational competitiveness (Dogra *et al.*, 2011; Sharma *et al.*, 2006; Kutucuoglu *et al.*, 2001). With growing dependence on automation and mechanization, maintenance of manufacturing equipment is becoming more complex and critical (Pophaley and Vyas, 2010; Ben-Daya and Duffuaa, 1995). Due to such characteristic, manufacturing industry players are under enormous pressure to minimize downtime for their business survival (Rolfsen and Langeland, 2012).

Automotive industry is one of the most important manufacturing industries in Malaysia (Salleh *et al.*, 2012; MIDA, 2012; Wad and Govindaraju, 2011; Mahidin and Kanageswary, 2004). Economic contribution by the automotive industry to the overall Malaysian economy by providing employment and attracting capital investment cannot be neglected (Salleh *et al.*, 2012; Johnson *et al.*, 2007). Rapid growth in automotive industry has boosted and stimulated the development of auto-related industry from materials supply to production, sales, service and other auto-related operations (Rosli, 2006; Chand and Shirvani, 2000; Simpson *et al.*, 1998). Such development has also contributed to the skill development and advancement of technological and engineering capabilities in Malaysia (MITI, 2012; Johnson *et al.*,

2007; Rosli, 2006; Mahidin and Kanageswary, 2004; Chand and Shirvani, 2000). The automotive industry has a linkage with a wide range of related industries such as: iron and steel, chemical, rubber and plastic, electrical and electronics industry (MIDA, 2012; Rosli, 2006; Simpson *et al.*, 1998). All those industries have formed a huge supply chain within the automotive industry (Chong *et al.*, 2012; Johnson *et al.*, 2007). Of significance, the automotive industry requires an innovative approach to optimize the maintenance of manufacturing equipment to ensure the product supplies to the end customer have superior, competitive and reliable quality (Sharma *et al.*, 2012; Dogra *et al.*, 2011; Pophaley and Vyas, 2010; Tsang and Chan, 2000; Ben-Daya and Duffuaa, 1995). The continuous fascination of the automotive industry and its significant impact on the global industry growth has attracted many researchers to contribute the idea and explore potential opportunity for the continual improvement, particularly in maintenance management (Aspinwall and Elgharib, 2013; Chong *et al.*, 2012; Rolfsen and Langeland, 2012; Salleh *et al.*, 2011; Harsej and Yusof, 2011; Pophaley and Vyas, 2010; Lazim *et al.*, 2008; Rosli, 2006; Bamber *et al.*, 1999; Bohoris *et al.*, 1995).

The automotive industries in the West have adopted total productive maintenance (TPM) as an effective maintenance strategy for world class performance beside other branch in maintenance management such as reliability centered-maintenance (RCM), condition-based maintenance (CBM) and computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) (Irajpour *et al.*, 2014; Aspinwall and Elgharib, 2013; Bamber *et al.*, 1999). The adoption of TPM methodology by a careful consideration on the critical success factors (CSFs) constructs in those automotive industries has proven to improve the maintenance efficiency (Gates, 2010; Meibodi and Monavvarian, 2010; Deros, 2004). The effective and efficient equipment maintenance through TPM methodology would made a significant contribution to the profitability of the organization through an increased in the production efficiency, improved in product quality, lower operating cost, timely delivery to customers, ensured safety of the workplace and improved morale of the employees (Sharma *et al.*, 2012; Ahuja and Khamba, 2008; Tsahouras, 2007). Such impressive findings in the West have motivated the researcher to further investigate the extensiveness of TPM implementation within the Malaysian automotive industry.

1.2 Problem Statement

1.2.1 The Need of In-depth Study in TPM

A review on TPM literature revealed that there was insignificant research done to address the TPM implementation in Malaysian context. Based on the 91 journals reviewed, it was found that there were only 15.4 percent of journals contributed by Malaysian researchers. Therefore the TPM research in Malaysia is considered still in its infancy and relatively unsaturated (Chong *et al.*, 2012). Most of the available TPM researches in Malaysia focus on general review (14.3 percent) and survey study (50 percent) instead of reporting the actual implementation using case study approach. Only 35.7 percent of Malaysian researchers employ case study methodology in their research (Chong *et al.*, 2012; Norddin *et al.*, 2012; Bon and Karim, 2011; Lazim *et al.*, 2008; Ahmed *et al.*, 2005). The general review and survey study were mainly aimed at addressing the overall scenario of TPM practice and obtaining generic empirical evidence on the effect of independent variables towards successful TPM implementation. The empirical evidences provided by previous studies are useful as a starting point for further exploration in TPM research. Each of the variables identified could be further investigated by applying a case study methodology for an in-depth study (Yin, 2009). This has created a research gap in investigating in depth various issues in TPM implementation.

1.2.2 TPM Research in Automotive Industry

About 50 percent of TPM researches in Malaysia were conducted in non-specific industry (Lazim and Ramayah, 2010; Batumalay and Santhapparaj, 2009; Seng *et al.*, 2006; Ahmed *et al.*, 2004; Ramayah *et al.*, 2002). Another 28.6 percent of the research portion was conducted in a specific manufacturing industry such as fertilizer, electrical and electronic industry. The number of research focuses specifically in automotive industry was 21.4 percent. Apparently there is a lot of research opportunity related to TPM implementation in Malaysian automotive industry. The automotive industry has also gained the attention of this research since

it is considered as one of the important industries to support the vision of Malaysian government to be a developed nation by year 2020 (MIDA, 2012; Salleh *et al.*, 2011; Putri, 2011). This research is expected to provide an insight of the actual practices on how a Malaysian automotive company adopts TPM methodology.

1.2.3 TPM Research on CSFs Constructs

Previous studies in the West have highlighted the importance of emphasizing CSFs constructs to ensure the success in TPM implementation. Emphasis on CSFs would shorten the learning curve in adopting TPM methodology (Poduval *et al.*, 2013; Majumdar and Manohar, 2012; Ahuja and Khamba, 2008; Bamber *et al.*, 1999). However a review on the literature revealed that the CSFs constructs have not been adequately addressed by researchers. Most of the present research in Malaysia focused on obtaining a broad status of TPM implementation (Ahmed *et al.*, 2004); investigating the factors that could further improve the overall equipment effectiveness (OEE) in manufacturing industries (Batumalay and Santhapparaj, 2009); general review on feasibility of integrating TPM with Six Sigma (Harsej and Yusof, 2011) and study on the possibility of transferring TPM practices to supply chain (Chong *et al.*, 2012). There was an effort to study the CSFs constructs of TPM in Malaysian context by Lazim and Ramayah (2010), Seng *et al.* (2006) and Ramayah *et al.* (2002). However those studies were done with incomprehensive coverage of CSFs constructs. Furthermore, they were conducted through a survey and in a non-specific industry. Therefore, the questions of “how” the Malaysian automotive company adopted TPM methodology, “what” are the constructs of CSFs being emphasized and “what” is the level of its emphasis remained unanswered and requires an in-depth study. As such, this research aims to close those gaps by exploring actual practices on how Malaysian automotive company utilize or apply the CSFs constructs while implementing TPM.

1.2.4 Absence of Comprehensive TPM Framework

There have been many frameworks suggested to guide TPM implementation (Lazim and Ramayah, 2010; Batumalay and Santhapparaj, 2009; Ahuja and Khamba, 2008; Seng *et al.*, 2006; Ahmed *et al.*, 2004; Park and Han, 2001; McKone *et al.*, 1999). However, a comparative analysis on the published TPM frameworks uncovered that none of them have an adequate coverage on the CSFs constructs in their structure, thus make it incomprehensive to be used as a guide in adopting TPM methodology. A review of literature also revealed that, as of to date, there is no integrated TPM framework developed for automotive company that address all constructs of CSFs. This research is aimed to close the gaps by providing a comprehensive conceptual framework as a guide for TPM implementation in automotive company.

1.3 Research Questions

The main focus of this research is related to TPM implementation in Malaysian automotive company. To address that concern, four research questions were identified and formulated as listed:

1. How the company adopts TPM methodology and what is the adoption level?
2. What are the constructs of CSFs being emphasized and their level of emphasis?
3. How CSFs constructs are emphasized? Is there any framework used by the company in emphasizing the CSFs constructs?
4. What are the areas that can be further improved in TPM implementation?

1.4 Research Objectives

This research will assess the status of TPM implementation based on CSFs constructs. The CSFs constructs emphasized by the case study company will be identified and the way the company emphasized those constructs will be explored. Subsequently, any weakness on the adoption of TPM methodology will be identified and as an outcome, the research will propose improvement areas through the refined framework for TPM implementation. The research outlines five objectives, which are:

1. To assess the status of TPM implementation in an automotive company.
2. To identify the CSFs constructs emphasized in TPM implementation.
3. To explore how CSFs constructs are emphasized.
4. To propose potential improvement areas for TPM implementation.
5. To develop a comprehensive TPM framework for automotive industry.

1.5 Research Scope

In order to ensure the research is effective and manageable within the given timeframe, below are the scopes for this research:

1. The developed conceptual TPM framework can be used by automotive company as a guide or roadmap to improve an existing TPM implementation or to start a new TPM implementation program. The research provides a guideline on the implementation of the framework and the actual implementation in any company is beyond the scope of this research.
2. The expert validation of the framework is done only through experts from potential user company.
3. The case study company was selected because of its position as a premier automotive company and its record of TPM implementation. The findings

and results of the study might be biased towards the situation of the company and might not fully represent the situation of other automotive companies as a whole.

4. The primary data obtained in the research is confined to the data collected from March 2010 to June 2013 within the case study company. The results and findings from the research are considered as a snap shot analysis of the data collected. Thus, it might not precisely reflect the actual situation at other times.

1.6 Significance of the Research

TPM methodology promised to yield efficient support to the organization competitiveness, in terms of quality product, reasonable operational cost as well as timely delivery to the customers (Graisa and Al-Habaibeh, 2011; Bamber et al., 1999). In order to expand and promote TPM implementation in developing country such as Malaysia, there must be a strategic implementation plan. Further review and analysis of the current TPM implementation methodology in Malaysian companies requires in-depth investigation, in order to get a clear understanding of its implementation status. This research is expected to provide an insight of the current status of TPM implementation particularly in automotive company. From literature, as of to date, there is no integrated TPM framework developed for automotive company that address the entire CSFs constructs. This research will provide a comprehensive conceptual framework to act as guide for TPM implementation in the automotive industry. The framework can assist the management of automotive company to take proactive measure in managing issues related to TPM implementation. The results from the study would also be beneficial for the case study company to assess their implementation status and make necessary measures for continuous quality improvement (CQI). This research can also act as a foundation for further research in TPM. Each construct of the framework can be further studied and validated with the actual implementation. Further improvement in TPM will improve the quality of the product manufactured by the automotive companies.

1.7 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into six chapters. Chapter One explains the research background, problem statement, research question and research objective. The research scope and the significance of the research concerning TPM implementation in automotive industry were described at the end of the chapter. Chapter Two provides a review of literature on quality improvement initiatives, maintenance management, rationale on the selection of TPM as the research focus, TPM philosophy, TPM implementation methodology, CSFs constructs of TPM, previous study on TPM and comparative study on the existing TPM framework.

Chapter Three outlines the research methodology and procedures. It provides a description on the case study protocol which includes the development of research framework, confirmation on data collection method and data analysis used in this research. Chapter Four explains the development of the research framework (denoted as TPM Framework I) and reports on the results as well as findings of the case study carried out to validate the CSFs constructs embedded in TPM Framework I. Subsequently, Chapter Five discusses the development of the conceptual framework (denoted as TPM Framework II) from the output of case study and literature review. The chapter further explains about validation exercise of TPM Framework II. Chapter Five ended with the explanation on the development of Final TPM Framework III, description of the framework and proposed implementation plan. The conclusion and important implications, limitations and directions for future research are summarized in Chapter Six.

REFERENCES

- Abdallah, A. B. and Matsui, Y. (2007). JIT and TPM: their relationship and impact on competitive performances. *9th International DSJ conference*.
- Agus, A. and Iteng, R. (2013). Lean Production and Business Performance: The Moderating Effect of the Length of Lean Adoption. *Journal Economics and Bussiness Management*. 1(4), 324-328.
- Ahmed, S. and Hassan, M. (2002). Action plans for implementation of total productive maintenance. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*. 2(1), 51-68.
- Ahmed, S., Hassan, M. and Taha, Z. (2004). State of implementation of TPM in SMIs: a survey study in Malaysia. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 10(2), 93-106.
- Ahmed, S., Hassan, M. and Taha, Z. (2005). TPM can go beyond maintenance: excerpt from a case implementation. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 11(1), 19-42.
- Ahuja, I. P. S. and Khamba, J. S. (2008a). Total productive maintenance: Literature review and directions. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 25(7), 709-756.
- Ahuja, I. P. S. and Khamba, J. S. (2008b). An evaluation of TPM initiatives in Indian industry for enhanced manufacturing performance. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 25(2), 147-172.
- Ahuja, I. P. S. and Kumar, P. (2009). A case study of total productive maintenance implementation at precision tube mills. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 15(3), 241-258.
- Almeanazel, O. T. R. (2010). Total productive maintenance: Review on overall equipment effectiveness measurement. *Jordan Journal of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering*, 4(4).

- Al-Refaie, A. and Hanayneh, B. (2014). Influences of TPM, TQM, Six Sigma practices on firms performance in Jordan. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*. 13(2), 219-234.
- Arca, J. G. and Prado, J. C. P. (2008). Personnel participation as a key factor for success in maintenance program implementation: a case study. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 57(3), 247-258.
- Aspinwall, E. and Elgharib, M. (2013). TPM implementation in large and medium size organisations. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*. 24(5), 688-710.
- Albert, H.C. and Tsang, Chan, P. K. (2000). TPM implementation in China: A case study. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 17(2), 141-157.
- Bamber, C. J., Sharp, J. M. and Hides, M. T (1999). Factor affecting successful implementation of total productive maintenance: a UK manufacturing case study perspective. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 5(3), 162-81.
- Bamber, C. J., Sharp, J. M and Castka, P. (2004). Third party assessment: The roles of the maintenance function in an integrated management system. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 10(1), 26-36.
- Bandyopadhyay, J. K. (2004). Implementing Just-in-Time Production and Procurement Strategies. *International Journal of Management*. 12(1).
- Barratt, M., Choi, T. Y. and Li, M. (2011). Qualitative case studies in operations management: trends, research outcomes, and future research implications. *Journal of Operations Management*. 29(4), 329-342.
- Batumalay, K. and Santhapparaj, A. S. (2009). Overall equipment effectiveness (OEE) through total productive maintenance (TPM) practices –A study across the Malaysian industries. *International Conference for Technical Postgraduates, TECHPOS 2009*. Article no. 5412049.
- Baxter, P. and Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*. 13(4).
- Ben-Daya, M. and Duffuaa, S. O. (1995). Maintenance and quality: the missing link. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 1(1), 20-26.
- Blanchard, B.S (1997). An enhanced approach for implementing total productive maintenance in the manufacturing environment. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 3(2), 69-80.

- Bloom, Neil B. (2005). *Reliability centered maintenance: Implementation made simple*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bohoris, G. A., Vamvalis, C., Trace, W. and Ignatiadou, K. (1995). TPM implementation in Land-Rover with the assistance of a CMMS. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 1(4), 3-16.
- Bon, A. T. and Karim, N. (2011). Total productive maintenance application to reduce defects of product. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*. 7(1), 11-17.
- Bossink, B. A. G. and Blauw, J. (2002). Strategic ambitions as drivers of improvement at DaimlerChrysler. *Measuring Business Excellent*. 6(4), 6-11.
- Bowen, G.A. (2005). Preparing a Qualitative Research-based Dissertation: Lesson Learned. *The Qualitative Report*. 10(2).
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done?* Qualitative Research. London: SAGE Publications.
- Burcher, P.G., Lee, G. L. and Sohal, A. S. (2004). The changing roles of production and operations managers in Britain from the 1970s to the 1990s. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. 24(4), 409-423.
- Burhanuddin, M. A., Ahmad, A. R. and Desa, M. I. (2007). An application of decision making grid to improve maintenance strategies in small and medium industries. *Second IEEE Conference on Industrial Electronics and Applications*. Article no 4318450, 455-460.
- Chan, F. T. S., Lau, H. C. W., Ip, R. W. L., Chan, H. K. and Kong, S. (2005) Implementation of total productive maintenance: a case study. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 95(1), 71-94.
- Chand, G. and Shirvani, B. (2000). Implementation of TPM in cellular manufacturer. *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*. 103 (2000), 149-154.
- Chen, F. (1994). Benchmarking: Preventive Maintenance Practices at Japanese Transplants. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 11(8), 19-26.
- Chinese, D. and Ghirardo, G. (2010). Maintenance management in Italian manufacturing firms: Matters of size and matters of strategy. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 16(2), 56-180.
- Cholasuke, C., Bhardwa, R. and Antony, A. (2004). The status of maintenance management in UK manufacturing organisations: results from a pilot survey. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 10(1), 5–15.

- Chong, M. Y., Chin, J. F. and Hamzah, H. S. (2012). Transfer of TPM practice to supply chain. *Total Quality Management*. 23(3), 467-480.
- Christie, M., Rowe, P., Perry, C. and Chamard, J. (2000). Implementation of Realism in Case Study Research Methodology. *International Council for Small Business Annual Conference*. Brisbane.
- Chua, P. Y. (2006). *Asas Statistik Penyelidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw-Hill.
- Cigolini, R. and Turco, F. (1997). Total productive maintenance practices: a survey in Italy. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 3(4), 259-272.
- Cooke, F. L. (2000). Implementation TPM in plant maintenance: some organizational barriers. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 17(9), 1003-1016.
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A. and Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 11(1), 100-110.
- Cua, K. O., McKone, K. E. and Schroeder, R.G. (2001). Relationships between implementation of TQM, JIT, and TPM and manufacturing performance. *Journal of Operations Management*. 19(1), 675-694.
- Darke, P., Shanks, G. and Broadbent, M. (1998) successfully completing case study research: combining rigour, relevance and pragmatism. *Information System Journal*. 8(2), 273-289.
- Das, A., Paul, H. and Swierczek, F.W. (2008). Developing and validating total quality management (TQM) constructs in the context of Thailand's manufacturing industry. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*. 15(1), 52-72.
- Deros, B. M. (2004). *Development of a benchmarking implementation framework for a small and medium enterprises*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Mechanical Engineering.
- Deros, B.M, Nizam, M., Rahman, A., Jaharah, A. G., Dzuraidah, A. W., Mohd Hazri, H. and Nor Kamaliana, K. (2009). Role of senior management in TQM implementation in Malaysian small and medium enterprises. *The Institution of Engineer*. 72(3).
- Doolen, T. L., Van Aken, E. M., Farris, J. A, Worley, J. J. and Huwe, J. (2008). Kaizen events and organizational performance: a field study. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 57(8), 637-658.
- Dooley, L. M. (2002). Case study research and theory building. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. 4(3), 335-354.

- Dogra, M., Shrama, V. S., Sachdeva, A. and Dureja, J.S. (2011). TPM - a key strategy for productivity improvement in process industry. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*. 6(1), 1-16.
- Eng, E. Q. and Yusof, S. R. (2003). A survey of TQM practices in the Malaysian electrical and electronic industry. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*. 14(1), 63-77.
- Enaghani, M. R., Arashpour, M. R. and Karimi, M (2009). *The relationship between Lean and TPM*. University of Boras: Master of Science Thesis in Industrial Engineering.
- Eisenhart, M. A. (1991). Conceptual framework for research circa 1991: Ideas from a cultural anthropologist: Implications for mathematics education researchers. *Physiology of Mathematics Education –North America meeting*. October 16-19, 1991.
- Eti, M. C., Ogaji, S. O. T. and Probert, S. D. (2004). Implementing TPM in Nigerian manufacturing industries. *Applied Energy*. 79(4), 385-401.
- Ferrari, E., Pareschi, A., Regattieri, A. and Persona, A. (2002). TPM: situation and procedure for a soft introduction in Italian factories. *The TQM Magazine*. 14(6), 350-358.
- Finlow-Bates, T., Visser, B. and Finlow-Bates, C. (2000). An integrated approach to problem solving: linking K-T, TQM and RCA to TPM, *The TQM Magazine*. 12(4), 284-289.
- Fisher, M. (2007). Strengthening the empirical base of Operations Management. *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management*. 9(1), 368-382.
- Fraenkel, J. R. and Wallen, N. E (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gates, L. P. (2010). *Strategic Planning with Critical Success Factors and Future Scenarios: An Integrated Strategic Planning Framework*. Carnegie-Mellon: University Pittsburgh.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for?. *American Political Science Review*. 98(2), 341-354.
- Georgescu (2011). Lean Thinking and Transferring Lean Management - The Best Defence against an Economic Recession? *European Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. 3(1), 1-17.

- Ghrayeb, O., Damodaran, P. and Vohra, P. (2011). Art of triangulation: an effective assessment validation strategy. *Global Journal of Engineering Education*. 13(1), 96-112.
- Gibbert, M. and Ruigrok, W. (2010). The “what” and “how” of case study rigor: Three strategies based on published research. *Organizational Research Methods*. 13(4), 710-737.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*. 8(4), 597–607.
- Graisa, M. and Al-Habaibeh, A. (2011). An investigation into current production challenges facing the Libyan cement industry and the need for innovative total productive maintenance (TPM) strategy. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*. 22(4), 541-558.
- Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 3(1).
- Grudowski, P. (2008). Quality System Documentation of SMEs in Process Management Framework. *Economics & Organization of Enterprise*. 1(1), 77-82.
- Gruenberg, T. (2003). A review of improvement method in manufacturings. *Work Study*. 52 (2), 89-93.
- Gunasekaran, A. and Lyu, J. (1997). Implementation of just-in-time in a small company: A case study. *Production planning and control*. 8(4), 406-412.
- Haddad, T. H. and Jaaron, A. A. (2012). The Applicability of total productive maintenance for healthcare facilities: An implementation methodology. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*. 2(2).
- HajShirmohammadi, A. and Wedley, W. C (2004). Maintenance management - an AHP application for centralization/decentralization. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 10(1), 16-25.
- Hansson, J., Backlund, F. and Lycke, L. (2003). Managing commitment: increasing the odds for successful implementation of TQM, TPM or RCM. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 20(9), 993-1008.
- Hartmann, E. (1992). *Successfully Installing TPM in a Non-Japanese plant*. Pittsburgh: TPM Press.
- Harsej, F. and Sha’ri, M. Y. (2011). Continuous Improvement through an Integrated Maintenance Model. *Contemporary Engineering Sciences*. 4(8), 353-362.

- Ho, S. K. M. and Fung, C. K. H., (1994). Developing a TQM Excellence Model. *The TQM Magazine*. 6(6), 24–30.
- Hoang, D. T., Igel, B. and Laosirihongthong, T. (2010). Total quality management (TQM) strategy and organisational characteristics: Evidence from a recent WTO member. *Total Quality Management*. 21(9), 931-951.
- Hung, L. N. Q. (2006). *Using SWOT Analysis to understand the institutional environments: A Guide for Can Tho University*. Vietnam: Can Tho University.
- Hussein, A. (2009). The use of triangulation in social sciences research: Can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined? *Journal of Comparative Social Work*. 1(1), 1-12.
- Ilie, G. and Ciocoiu, C. N. (2010). Application of fishbone diagram to determine the risk of an event with multiple causes. *Manag Res Pract*. 2(1), 1-20.
- Imai, M. (1986). *Kaizen: The Key to Japan's Competitive Success*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ireland, F. and Dale, B.G. (2001). A study of total productive maintenance implementation. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*. 7(3), 183-191.
- Jadhav, J. R., Mantha, S. S. and Rane, S. B. (2014). Analysis of interactions among the barriers to JIT production: Interpretive structural modelling approach. *Journal of Industrial Engineering International*. 1-22.
- Jain, A., Bhatti, R. and Singh, H. (2014). Total productive maintenance (TPM) implementation practice: A literature review and directions. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*. 5(3), 293-323.
- Jeong, K. Y. and Phillips, D. T (2001). Operational efficiency and effectiveness measurement. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. 21(11), 1404-1416.
- Johnson, D. M., Sun, J. and Johnson, M.A (2007). Integrating multiple manufacturing initiatives: Challenge for automotive suppliers. *Measuring Business Excellent*. 11(3), 41-56.
- Jostes, R. S. and Helms, M. (1994). Total productive maintenance and its link to total quality management. *Work study*. 43(7), 18-20.
- Juran, J. M. (1998). *Juran's Quality Handbook*, 5th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Kaur, M., Singh, K. and Ahuja, I. S. (2012). An evaluation of the synergic implementation of TQM and TPM paradigms on business performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 62(1), 4-14.
- Khan, Z., Bali., R. K. and Wickramasinghe, N. (2007). Developing a BPI framework and PAM for SMEs. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*. 107(3), 345–360.
- Kheng, S. H., and Yusof, S. R. M. (2003). Development Of TPM implementation plan in switchgear and engineering company. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Mechanical Engineering*. 1-6.
- Khanna, V. K (2008). Total productive maintenance experience: A case study. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*. 3(1), 12-32.
- Kim, D., Kumar, V. and Kumar, U. (2011). A performance realization framework for implementing ISO 9000. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 28(4), 383–404.
- Kim, C. S., Spahlinger, D. A., Kin, J. M. and Billi, J. E. (2006). Lean health care: What can hospitals learn from a world-class automaker?. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*. 1(3), 191-199.
- Knox, S. and Burkard, A. W. (2009). Qualitative research interviews. *Psychotherapy Research*. 19(5), 566-575.
- Kodali, R. and Chandra, S. (2001). Analytical hierarchy process for justification of total productive maintenance. *Production Planning and Control*. 12(7), 695-705.
- Kodali, R., Mishra, R. P. and Anand, G. (2009). Justification of world-class maintenance systems using analytic hierarchy constant sum method. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 15(1), 47-77.
- Kohn, L. T. (1997). Methods in case study analysis, *The Center for Studying Health System Change*. Technical Publication No.2, 1-8.
- Konecny, P. A. and Thun, J. H. (2011). Do it separately or simultaneously-An empirical analysis of a conjoint implementation of TQM and TPM on plant performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 133(2), 496-507.
- Kootanaee, J., A., Babu, K. N.,and Talari, H. F. (2013). Just-in-time manufacturing system: From introduction to implementation. *International Journal of Economics Business and Finance*. 1(2), 7-25.

- Kor, L. K. and Teoh. (2009). *From literature review to developing a conceptual framework to journal writing*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw Hill.
- Kulkarni, A. and Dabade, B. M (2013). Investigation of human aspect in total productive maintenance (TPM): Literature review. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Development*. 5(10), 27-36.
- Kumar, R. and Kumar, V. (2014) Barriers in implementation of lean manufacturing system in Indian industry: A survey. *International Journal of Latest Trends in Engineering and Technology*. 4(2).
- Kumar, P., Varambally, K. V. M. and Rodrigues, L. L. (2013). A Methodology for implementing total productive maintenance in manufacturing industries: A case study. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Development*. 5(2), 32-39.
- Kumaravadivel, A., Ilamparithi, C. and Selvam, B. (2012). The performance measurement of six sigma manufacturing system through overall equipment effectiveness. *Software Engineering and Technology*. 4(7), 277-282.
- Kutucuoglu, K.Y., Hamali, J., Sharp, J.M (2001). Enabling BPR in maintenance through a performance measurement system framework. *The International Journal of Flexible Manufacturing System*. 14(1), 33-52.
- Kwon, O. and Lee, H. (2004). Calculation methodology for contributive managerial effect by OEE as a result of TPM activities. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 10(4), 263-272.
- Labib, A. W (1999). A framework for benchmarking appropriate productive maintenance. *Management Decision*. 37(10), 792-799.
- Lawrence, J. J. (1999). Use mathematical modeling to give your TPM implementation effort an extra boost. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 5(1), 62-69.
- Lazim, H. M., Ramayah, T., Ahmad, N., (2008). Total productive maintenance and performance: A Malaysian SME experience. *International Review of Business Research Papers*. 4(4), 237-250.
- Lazim, H. M. and Ramayah, T. (2010). Maintenance strategy in Malaysian manufacturing companies: A total productive maintenance (TPM) approach. *Business Strategy Series*. 11(6), 387-396.
- Leflar, J. A. (2001). *Practical TPM: Successful Equipment Management at Agile Technologies*. Portland: Productivity Press.

- Ljungberg, O. (1998). Measurement of overall equipment effectiveness as a basis for TPM activities. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. 18(5), 495-507.
- Madu, C. N (2000). Competing through maintenance strategy. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 17(9), 937-948.
- Madu, C. N (2006). *House of quality (QFD) in a minute*. 2nd edition. USA: Chi Publishers.
- Mahidin, M. U. and Kanageswary, R. (2004). The development of the automobile industry and the road ahead. *Department of Statistics Malaysia*.
- Mahmood, W. H. W., Rahman, M. N. A., Mazli, H. and Deros, B. M (2009). Maintenance management system for upstream operations in oil and gas industry. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*. 60, 413-419.
- Majumdar, J. P. and Manohar, B. M. (2012). Implementing TPM programme as a TQM tool in Indian manufacturing industries. *Asian Journal on Quality*. 13(2), 185-198.
- Mariajayaprakash, A., Senthilvelan, T. and Vivekananthan, K. P. (2013). Optimisation of shock absorber process parameters using FMEA and genetic algorithm. *Journal of Industrial Engineering International*. 9(1), 1-10.
- Marquez, A. C. and Gupta, J. N. D. (2006). Contemporary maintenance management: process, framework and supporting pillars. *The Internal Journal of Management Science*. 3(4), 313-326.
- Maurer, R. (2004). *One small step can change your life: The Kaizen way*. New York: Workman Publishing.
- McCarthy, D. and Rich, N. (2004). *Lean TPM: A blueprint for change*. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- McKone, K. E., Schroeder, R. G. and Cua, K.O. (1999). TPM: A contextual view. *Journal of Operation Management*. 1(7), 123-144.
- McKone, K. E., Schroeder, R. G., and Cua, K. O. (2001). The impact of total productive maintenance practices on manufacturing performance. *Journal of Operations Management*. 19(1), 39-58.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Washington: Sage Publication.

- Meibodi, L. A. and Monavvarian, A. (2010). Recognizing critical success factors (CSF) to achieve the strategic goals of SAIPA Press. *Business Strategy Series*. 11(2), 124-133.
- Meng, J. W. and Yusof, N. M. (2012). Survey results of total productive maintenance effects on manufacturing performance in Malaysian electrical and electronics industry. *Jurnal Mekanikal*. 3(5), 82-99.
- Miles, M. B. and Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Miller, C. C. and Cardinal, L.B. (1994). Strategic planning and firm performance: A synthesis of more than two decades of research. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37(6), 1649-1665.
- Min, C. S., Ahmad, R., Kamaruddin, S. and Azid, I.A. (2011). Development of autonomous maintenance framework for semiconductors industries. *International Journal of Industrial and System Engineering*. 9(3), 268-297.
- Mishra. R. P., Anand. G. and Kodali. R. (2006). Development of a framework for world-class maintenance system. *Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Systems*. 5(2), 141–165.
- Misra, K. B. (2008). *Maintenance engineering and maintainability: An introduction*. London: Springer.
- Moayed, F.A. and Shell, R.L. (2009). Comparison and evaluation of maintenance operations in lean versus non-lean production systems. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 15(3), 285–296.
- Mohamed, O. A. (2005). *Identifying the barriers affecting quality in maintenance within Libyan manufacturing organisations (public sector)*. University of Salford: Doctoral Dissertation.
- Mosadeghrad, A. M (2013). Obstacles to TQM success in health care systems. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*. 26(2), 147-173.
- Mostafa, S. A (2004). Implementation of proactive maintenance in Egyptian glass company. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 10(2), 107-122.
- Moulton Jr, J. C. (1998). *National survey of the perceptions of selected school board members regarding the quality and condition, maintenance, and improvement and renovation of existing public school facilities*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Doctoral Dissertation.

- Muthu, S., Devadasan, S. R., Ahmed, S., Suresh, P. and Baladhandayutham, R. (2000). Benchmarking for strategic maintenance quality improvement. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*. 7(4), 292-303.
- Murthy D. N., Atrens, P.A. and Eccleston, J. A (2002). Strategic maintenance management. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 8(4), 287–305.
- Nakajima, S (1988) . *Introduction to TPM*. Cambridge: Productivity Press.
- Ng, K. C., Chong, K. E., and Goh, G. G. G. (2013). Total productive maintenance strategy in a semiconductor manufacturer: A case study in industrial engineering and engineering management (IEEM). *IEEE International Conference*. 1184-1188.
- Nickols, F. (2011). Strategy, strategic management, strategic planning and strategic thinking. *Distance Consulting*. 200(2011), 8.
- Norddin, M., Norddin, K. H. and Mat Saman, M. Z. (2012). Implementation of total productive maintenance concept in a fertilizer process plant. *Jurnal Mekanikal*. 34, 66-82.
- Ohno, T. (1988). *Toyota Production System: Beyond Large-Scale Production*. Portland: Productivity Press.
- Ollila, A. and Malmipuro, M. (1999). Maintenance has a role in quality. *The TQM Magazine*. 11(1), 17-21.
- O.Riis, J., Luxhøj, J. and Thorsteinsson, U. (1997). A situational maintenance model. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 14(4), 349-366.
- Osman, I., Ali, H., Rashid, W. E. W. and Jusoff, K. (2009). TQM in Malaysian automobile industry. *International Business Research*. 2(1), 203.
- Parida, A. and Kumar, U. (2006). Maintenance performance measurement (MPM): issues and challenges. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 12(30), 239-251.
- Park, K. S. and Han, S. W. (2001). Total productive maintenance: Impact on competitiveness and a framework for successful implementation. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*. 11(4), 321–338.
- Patel, S., Pale, B.G. and Shaw, P. (2001). Set-up time reduction and mistake proofing methods: An examination in precision component manufacturing. *The TQM Magazine*. 13(3), 175–179.

- Patra, N. K., Tripathy, J. K. and Choudhary, B.K. (2005). Implementing the office total productive maintenance ('office TPM') program: A library case study. *Library Review*. 54(7), 415-24.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Perry, D. E., Porter, A. A. and Votta, L. G. (2000). Empirical studies of software engineering: A roadmap. *Proceedings of the conference on the future of software engineering*. 345-355.
- Poduval, P. S., Pramod, V. R. and Raj, J. V. P. (2013). Barriers in TPM Implementation in industries. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*. 2(5).
- Pomorski, T. (2004). *Total productive maintenance (TPM): Concepts and literature*. Cincinnati: Union Institute and University.
- Pophaley, M. and Vyas, R. K. (2010). Plant maintenance management practices in automobile industries: a retrospective and literature review. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*. 3(3), 512-541.
- Pramod, V. R., Devadasan, S. R., Muthu, S., Jagathyraj, V. P. and Moorthy, G. D. (2006). Integrating TPM and QFD for improving quality in maintenance engineering. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 12(2), 150-171.
- Prickett, P. W (1999). An integrated approach to autonomous maintenance management. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*. 10(4), 233-243.
- Putri, N. T. (2011). *Self-assessment tool for quality engineering in Malaysia and Indonesia automotive companies*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Mechanical Engineering.
- Rahim, A. R. A. and Baksh, M. S. N. (2003a). Case study method for new product development in engineer-to-order organizations. *Work Study*. 52(1), 25-36.
- Rahim, A. R. A. and Baksh, M. S. N. (2003b). New Product Development Framework for Engineer-to-Order (ETO) Products. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. 6(3), 182-196.
- Rahim, A. A. R. (2006). *Framework for new product development*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Mechanical Engineering.
- Rajput, H. S. and Jayaswal, P. (2012). A total productive maintenance (TPM) approach to improve overall equipment efficiency. *International Journal of Modern Engineering Research*. 2(6).

- Ramayah, T., Jantan, M. and Hassan, M. M. (2002). Change management and implementation of total productive maintenance: An exploratory study of Malaysian manufacturing companies. *Utara Management Review*. 3(1), 1-17.
- Raouf, A. (1994). Improving capital productivity through maintenance. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. 14(7), 44–52.
- Robinson, C. J. and Ginder, A. P. (1995). *Implementing TPM: The North American Experience*. Portland: Productivity Press.
- Rolfesen, M. and Langeland, C. (2012). Successful maintenance practice through team autonomy. *Employee Relations*. 34(3), 306-321.
- Rosli, M. (2006). The automobile industry and performance of Malaysian auto production. *Journal of Economic Cooperation*. 27(1), 89-114.
- Rowley, J. (2002). Using case studies in research. *Management Research News*. 25(1), 16-27.
- Runeson, P. and Höst, M. (2009). Guidelines for conducting and reporting case study research in software engineering. *Empirical Software Eng*. 14(2), 131-164.
- Saary, M. J. (2008). Radar plots: a useful way for presenting multivariate health care data. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 61(4), 311-317.
- Salleh, N. A. M., Kasolang, S. and Jaafar, H. A. (2012). Review study of developing an integrated TQM with LM framework model in Malaysian automotive industry. *The TQM Journal*. 24(5), 399-417.
- Sánchez-Rodríguez, C. and Martínez-Lorente, A. R. (2011). Effect of IT and quality management on performance. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*. 111(6), 830–848.
- Seng, O. Y., Jantan, M. and Ramayah, T. (2006). Implementing total productive maintenance (TPM) in Malaysian manufacturing organization: An operational strategy study. *Strategic Maintenance Management*. 196-208
- Seth, D. and Tripathi, D. (2005). Relationship between TQM and TPM implementation factors and business performance of manufacturing industry in Indian context. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 22(3), 256-277.
- Shafeek. H. (2012). Maintenance Practices in Cement Industry. *Asian Transactions on Engineering*. 1(6).
- Shah, B. M. Y (2012). Total Productive Maintenance: A Study of Malaysian Automotive SMEs. *Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering* (Vol. 3).

- Sharma, R. K., Kumar, D. and Kumar, P. (2006). Manufacturing excellence through TPM implementation: a practical analysis. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*. 106(2), 256-280.
- Sharma, M. and Kodali, R. (2008). TQM implementation elements for manufacturing excellence. *The TQM Journal*. 20(6), 599-621.
- Sharma, K., Gera, G., Rajender Kumar, R., Chaudhary, H. K. and Gupta, S.K. (2012). An empirical study approach on TPM implementation in manufacturing industry. *International Journal on Emerging Technologies*. 3(1), 18-23.
- Shetty, P K. and Rodrigues, L. L. (2010). Total productive maintenance of a diesel power generating unit of an institution campus. *Mechanical and Electrical Technology International Conference Proceedings*. 2nd IMET, 68-71.
- Singh, J. and Singh, H. (2012). Continuous improvement approach: state-of-art review and future Implications. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*. 3(2), 88–111.
- Singh, M., Sachdeva, A. and Bhardwaj, A. (2014). An interpretive structural modelling approach for analysing barriers in total productive maintenance implementation. *International Journal of Industrial and Systems Engineering*. 16(4), 433-450.
- Shingo, N. (2007). *TPM in semiconductor plants*. Tokyo: JIPM-Solutions.
- Shingo, S. (2009). *Fundamental Principles of Lean Manufacturing*. Vancouver: Enna Prod.
- Simpson, M., Sykes, G. and Abdullah, A. (1998). Case study: transitory JIT at Proton cars, Malaysia. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*. 28(2), 121–142.
- Simoës, J. M., Gomes, C. F. and Yasin, M. M. (2011). A literature review of maintenance performance measurement: A conceptual framework and directions for future research. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 17(2), 116-137.
- Smyth, R. (2004). Exploring the usefulness of a conceptual framework as a research tool: A researcher's reflections. *Issues in Educational Research*. 14(2), 167-180.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Steinbacher, H. R. and Steinbacher, N. L. (1993). *TPM for America*. Portland: Productivity Press.

- Sun, H., Yam, R. and Wai-Keung, N. (2003). The implementation and evaluation of TPM: Case study in a Hong Kong manufacturing company. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*. 22(3), 224-228.
- Suzuki, T. (1994). *TPM in Process Industry*. Portland: Productivity Press.
- Tajiri, M. and Gotoh, E. (1999). *TPM Implementation: A Japanese Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Talib, F., Rahman, Z. and Qureshi, M. N. (2011). A study of total quality management and supply chain management practices. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 60(3), 268-288.
- Talwar, B., (2011). Comparative study of framework, criteria and criterion weighting of excellence models. *Measuring Business Excellence*. 15(1), 49-65.
- Tan, O. K. (2012). *Framework for new product development for research and development companies in Malaysia*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Management.
- Teeravaraprug, J., Kitiwanwong, K. and SaeTong, N. (2011). Relationship model and supporting activities of JIT, TQM and TPM. *Sonklanakarin Journal of Science and Technology*. 33(1), 101.
- Tellis, W. (1997). Application of a Case Study Methodology. *The Qualitative Report*. 3(2).
- Thun, J. (2004). Potential of Technology-Integrated Mobile Maintenance for TPM. *Second World Conference on POM*. Cancun, Mexico. pp. 1-20.
- Thomas, A., Barton, R., Byrad, P. (2008). Developing a Six Sigma maintenance model. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 14(3), 262-271.
- Tiwari, A., Turner, C. and Sackett, P (2007). A framework for implementing cost and quality practices within manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*. 18(6), 731-760.
- Tsarouhas, P. (2007). Implementation of TPM in food industry: A case study. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*. 13(1), 5-18.
- Tsang, A. H. and Chan, P. K. (2000). TPM implementation in China: a case study. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 17(2), 144-157.
- Urban, W. and Mazurek, A. (2011). The human factor in 5S implementation: perspectives from Poland. *Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies*. Volume One, Issues 1-4.

- Vagias, W. M. (2006). *Likert-type scale response anchors*. Clemson University: Clemson International Institute for Tourism and Research Development, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management.
- Van der Wal, R. W. E. and Lynn, D. (2002). TPM in a South African pulp and paper company: A case study. *The TQM Magazine*. 14(6), 359-366.
- Venkatesh, J. (2007). An introduction to total productive maintenance (TPM). *The Plant Maintenance Resource Center*. 3-20.
- Wad, P. and Govindaraju, V. C. (2011). Automotive industry in Malaysia: An assessment of its development. *International Journal of Automotive Technology and Management*. 11(2), 152-171.
- Waeyenbergh, G. and Pintelon, L. (2009). CIBOCOF : A framework for industrial maintenance concept development. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 121, 633-640.
- Wakjira, W. and Singh, M. (2012). Total productive maintenance: A case study in manufacturing industry. *Global Journal of Researches in Engineering*. 12(1).
- Wang, F. K. and Lee, W. (2001). Learning curve analysis in TPM. *Omega International Journal of Management Science*. 29(6), 491-9.
- Ward, P. and Zhou, H. (2006). Impact of information technology integration and lean/just-in-time practices on lead-time performance. *Decision Sciences*. 37(2), 177-203.
- Willmott, P (1994). *Total Productive Maintenance: The Western Way*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Wireman, T. (2004). *Total Productive Maintenance – An American Approach*. New York: Industrial Press.
- Yamashina, H. (2000). Challenge to world class manufacturing. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 17(2), 132-143.
- Yeasmin, S. and Rahman, K. F. (2012). Triangulation research method as the tool of social science research. *Bangladesh University of Professional Journal*. Vol.1 (1).
- Yeomans, M. and Millington, P. (1997). Getting maintenance into TPM. *Manufacturing Engineer*. 76(4), 170-173.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research, design and methods*. 5th edition. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

- Yusof, S. R. M and Aspinwall, E. (2000). TQM implementation issues: Review and case study. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. 20(6), 634-655.
- Yusof, S. R. M. and Aspinwall, E. (2001). Case studies on the implementation of TQM in the UK automotive SMEs. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 18(7), 722-744.
- Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*. Bil.9,1-6.

Source from internet

- Brereton, P. (2008). *Using a Protocol Template for a Case Study Planning*. Available from: <<http://www.academia.edu>>. Retrieved: September 13, 2011.
- Business Dictionary (2013) *Definition of critical success factors*. Available from: <<http://www.businessdictionary.com/.html>>. Retrieved: December 21, 2013.
- Balance Score Card Institute (2014). *Definition of strategic planning*. Available from: <<http://balancedscorecard.org/Resources/Strategic-Planning-Basics>>. Retrieved: November 3, 2014.
- Department of Occupational, Safety and Health, Malaysia (DOSH) (2014). *Factories and Machinery Act 1967*. Available from: <<http://www.dosh.gov.my/index>>. Retrieved: August 14, 2014.
- Evans, M.(2010). *Creative professional practice in methods and methodology: Case study examples from PhD's in industrial design*. Available from: <<http://www.academia.edu>>. Retrieved: March 20, 2015.
- Gourley, W. (2009). *Conceptualising the interface between English further and higher education*. Available from: <<https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly>>. Retrieved: March 20, 2015.
- Guion, L. A., Diehl, D. C. and McDonald, D. (2011). *Triangulation: Establishing the validity of qualitative studies*. Available from: <<http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>>. Retrieved: Jan 21, 2011.
- Hallgren, M. (2007). *Manufacturing strategy, capabilities and performance. Linköping Studies in Science and Technology*. Available from:<<http://www.diva-portal.org/smash>>. Retrieved: Jan 14, 2014.

- Irajpour, A., Fallahian-Najafabadi, A., Mahbod, M. A. and Karimi, M (2014). *A Framework to determine the effectiveness of maintenance strategies lean thinking approach*. Available from: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/Article ID 132140>>. Retrieved: September 25, 2014.
- Malaysian Automotive Association (MAA) (2010). *Information Malaysian automotive sector*. Available from: <http://www.maa.org.my/listing_map.htm>. Retrieved: August 14, 2010.
- Malaysian Industrial Development Authority (MIDA) (2012). *Business opportunity: Malaysia's automotive industry*. Available from: <http://www.mida.gov.my/ent3>. Retrieved: December 3, 2013.
- Market Watch (2011). *The Malaysian automotive and supplier industry*. Available from: <http://malaysia.ahk.de/fileadmin/Automotive_2011>. Retrieved: December 3, 2013.
- Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) (2012). *Transforming industry: third industrial master plan (IMP3)*. Available from: <<http://www.miti.gov>>. Retrieved: May 26, 2012.
- Neale, P., Thapa, S. and Boyce, C. (2006). *Preparing a case study: A guide for designing and conducting a case study for evaluation input*. Available from: <<http://www.pathfind.org>>. Retrieved: September 21, 2014.
- Tabikh, M. (2014). *Downtime cost and reduction analysis: survey results*. Master Thesis, Malardalen University, Sweden. Available from: <<http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva>>. Retrieved: November 30, 2014.
- Thorne, S. (2000). *Data analysis in qualitative research*. Available from: <<http://ebn.bmj.com/content/3/3/68>>. Retrieved: August 14, 2013.
- Trochim, W. M. (2006). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Available from: <<http://www.socialresearchmethods>>. Retrieved: August 4, 2013.
- Zucker, D. M. (2009). *How to Do Case Study Research*. Available from: <<http://scholarworks.umass.edu/nursing>>. Retrieved: August 21, 2013.