

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was: (1) to investigate whether or not service industries in Thailand have a knowledge and understanding of the Baldrige Award criteria; (2) to compare management style currently being used with that of the Baldrige Award criteria, in order to determine agreements and differences as between the two; (3) to compare productivity ratios as between service industries making greater and lesser use of the criteria, to determine whether there is any significant difference; and (4) to investigate management styles with a view to seeking a style appropriate to developing the management potential of the service sector in Thailand. Four groups of companies from the service sector were taken, that is: (1) Financial Institutions (17 companies); (2) Transportation Industry; (21 companies); (3) Hotel, Restaurant and Tourist Business (22 companies); and (4) Health Care and other services (21 companies). Numbers of company personnel sampled, from all four service sectors, were: 61 from Top Management, 90 from Middle Management, 100 from Lower Management, and 127 from non-managerial staff. Opinions were obtained regarding the management techniques the respondents' companies were using. The findings were as follows: (1) As to knowledge of the Baldrige Award criteria: No companies had employed consultants with a view to implementing the relevant management techniques. However, all 70 companies asserted that they had implemented some 70.38% of the 19 prescribed criteria without knowing that these were in fact those of the Baldrige Award. (2) Comparison of management techniques used with those of the Award showed that these Thai service industries made most use of management techniques associated with criteria on (1) Employee Education, Training and Development; (2) Product and Service Processes; (3) Customer Satisfaction and Relationships; (4) Organizational Effectiveness Results; and (5) Customer Focused Results. On the contrary, management techniques less used were those relating to: (1) Supplier and Partnering Processes; (2) Organizational Leadership; (3) Support Processes; (4) Supplier and Partner Results; (5) Public Responsibility and Citizenship; and (6) Strategic Development. (3) Comparison of productivity ratios as between companies making a greater, and those making a lesser, used of the criteria showed no difference statistically significant at a .05 level. However, the ratios were higher for those using, than for those not using, the criteria. (4) In order to determine a management style appropriate to enhancing the potential of the Thai service sector to become highly productive, it is suggested that these companies give more attention to the Baldrige Award criteria. It is believed that the productivity of those companies that put sufficient effort into utilizing the criteria will be definitely higher than that of those companies who disregard the criteria.