

Supplier Evaluation Framework Based on Balanced Scorecard with Integrated Corporate Social Responsibility Perspective

Worapon Thanaraksakul and Busaba Phruksaphanrat

Abstract—In this research a supplier evaluation framework based on Balanced Scorecard (BSC) with integrated Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been developed from literature review of 76 related papers. It was found that quality, delivery, and cost are the most significant criteria. Moreover, some criteria are changed according to shorten product life cycle, technologies, improvement of service, evolution of production system, and emergence of supply chain management (SCM). Based on BSC and CSR, 5 perspectives namely financial, customer, internal business process, learning and growth, and corporate social responsibility are proposed for categorizing supplier selection criteria. Measures for each criterion are also collected for decision makers. This framework is presented in the form of a table in which both criteria and measures are contained, this would be facilitated to use. Moreover, its BSC basis verifies suitability of a supplier with the corporate strategies. As a consequence, evaluating supplier using the proposed framework can be helpful for decision makers to qualify the most eligible supplier who can meet qualifications and buyer's strategies as well as environmental and social responsibility issues.

Index Terms—Balanced Scorecard (BSC), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Strategic Supplier Selection, Supplier Evaluation, Supplier Selection Criteria

I. INTRODUCTION

Supplier selection and evaluation is one of the most critical activities in purchasing or procurement process [1]. This evaluation process consists of 4 stages i.e., defining objective, formulating the selection criteria, qualifying the suitable alternatives, and final selection. To qualify the prospective suppliers, the effective defining of selection criteria is necessary [2],[3]. Beyond the high significance on the product cost and partners relationship, it has considerable impacts on the buyer's corporate competencies [4],[5].

The early research by Dickson (1966) conducted a questionnaire and sent to 273 purchasing agents and managers selected from the list of the National Association of Purchasing Managers, cover USA and Canada. There are 170 mails regarding the 23 important criteria that were ranked

with respect to the observation. He found that quality, delivery, performance history, and warranty policies are the most critical criteria for 1960s [6]. Afterward, there are many of researchers have conducted their research in this domain. In Weber *et al.* (1991) [2], based on 74 reviewed papers they found that price, delivery, production capacity, and location are the most often treated criteria. In other researches, many of them found that the cost, quality, and delivery are the most important criteria [2],[6]-[11]. Some paper noted that the choice of criteria may differ as a result of one culture to another [12]. However, it has been found that the 23 criteria presented in [6] still cover the majority of those presented in the literature until nowadays though some of them have been changed according to time [2],[13],[14].

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) model was presented by Robert S. Kaplan and David P. Norton since 1992. It has been proposed to be a strategic approach and an organizational performance evaluation which can be used for strategy and policy implementation [15]. It is included by 4 perspectives i.e., financial, customer, internal business process, and learning and growth. Nevertheless, some authors recommend to charge the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) perspective, in term of environmental viewpoint, in a supplier selection process as a result of recent massive emergence of global warming and social responsibility issues [16]-[18].

To obtain the supplier whose strategies and qualifications harmonize with the buyer's objectives, an intensive study of criteria is needed. So, the 76 existing research papers are studied and compared. Next, BSC and CSR are used to create a proposed framework of a supplier evaluation for categorizing supplier selection criteria.

In this research, the 23 criteria in [6] are served as a principal for categorizing criteria. Some criteria those are not exactly match with the principal but hereabout relevant would be adopted into implicated categories and proper renamed e.g., formerly the communication systems criterion was renamed to information technology and communication systems likes the attitude criterion was changed as attitude and strategic fit and so on. Other criteria which could not be classified in any category of the principal will be added into the principal as new criteria namely, safety awareness, environmental and social responsibility, economical factors, terrorism risk, domestic political stability, quality system, innovation and R&D, customer relationship, product reliability, and cultural congruence. For this research, there are 76 relevant research papers containing "Selection criteria", "Supplier evaluation", "Supplier selection", and "Vendor selection" in their titles or keywords.

Manuscript received December 30, 2008.

W. Thanaraksakul is a Graduate Student of Industrial Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Thammasat University Rangsit Campus, Klong Luang, Pathum Thani 12120, Thailand (corresponding author; e-mail: nyusuke@live.com, lbusuba@engr.tu.ac.th).

B. Phruksaphanrat is an Assistant Professor of Industrial Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Thammasat University Rangsit Campus, Klong Luang, Pathum Thani 12120, Thailand (e-mail: lbusuba@engr.tu.ac.th).

Table I Rank of supplier selection criteria

Criteria	Abbr	No. of Papers	%
Quality ^[6]	QLT	74	97.37
Delivery ^[6]	DLV	72	94.74
Cost ^[6]	CST	72	94.74
Production facility and capacity ^[6]	PFC	52	68.42
Flexibility and reciprocal arrangement ^[6]	FLX	52	68.42
Technical capacity and support ^[6]	TCS	49	64.47
Repair services and follow-up ^[6]	RSF	45	59.21
Information technology and communication systems ^[6]	ITC	41	53.95
Financial status ^[6]	FNS	40	52.63
Innovation and R&D	INV	38	50.00
Operating controls ^[6]	OPR	34	44.74
Quality system	QTS	33	43.42
Management and organization ^[6]	MGT	32	42.11
Personnel training and development ^[6]	PTD	24	31.58
Product reliability	PRT	24	31.58
Performance history ^[6]	PMH	23	30.26
Geographical location ^[6]	GEO	23	30.26
Reputation and references ^[6]	REP	21	27.63
Packaging and handling ability ^[6]	PKG	18	23.68
Amount of past business ^[6]	PSB	18	23.68
Customer relationship	CTR	18	23.68
Warranties and claim policies ^[6]	WCP	15	19.74
Procedural compliance ^[6]	PCC	15	19.74
Customer satisfaction and impression ^[6]	CSI	15	19.74
Attitude and strategic fit ^[6]	ATD	14	18.42
Labor relations record ^[6]	LRR	9	11.84
Economical aspect	ECN	9	11.84
Desire for business ^[6]	DFB	8	10.53
Environmental and social responsibility	ENV	6	7.89
Safety awareness	SFT	5	6.58
Domestic political stability	DPS	5	6.58
Cultural congruence	CTC	4	5.26
Terrorism risk	TRR	2	2.63

Note: Abbr: Abbreviation

No. of Papers: Number of papers that appeared the criterion

%: Counted fractions of the criterion to the overall in percentages

^[6]: The criteria relating to those 23 criteria which appeared in [6]

II. SUPPLIER SELECTION CRITERIA

The papers related to supplier selection criteria were conducted in various contexts. Some were studied in global supplier selection context [19]-[21]. Meanwhile, some were conducted under advanced technology manufacturers [22],[23], developing country [9],[24], supply chain management system [5],[11],[25]-[29], buyer-supplier relationship and integration [30]-[36], and other conditions so far [1],[37]-[41]. These contexts are different in both criteria and their priorities. The basic criteria are quality, delivery, cost, systems, processes, flexibility, and service. Risk factors including domestic political stability, economical aspects, and terrorism risk should be also included [19],[20]. In the developing country scene, it is necessary to focus on product reliability and the supplier's capacity in both technical and production [9],[24]. Whereas the advanced technology manufacturing increases emphasizing on supplier's flexibility and capability in the field of R&D [22],[23]. Moreover, there are many of other contexts that affect the selection of criteria e.g., type of industry, corporate strategy, etc. Another approach of study is an empirical study, most of them usually consider in quantitative criteria based on operations research and computational techniques for finding out the numerical solutions that prioritize the selection criteria such as Activity

Based Costing Approach (ABC) [42],[43], Linear Programming (LP) [7],[29],[44], Linear Mixed Integer Programming (LMIP) [30],[45], Fuzzy Multiple Objective Linear Programming (FMOLP) [46],[47], and Genetic Algorithm (GA) [48] as well. The approaches that applied to determine the qualitative criteria namely, Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) [22],[35],[49]-[56], Fuzzy-AHP (FAHP) [26],[48],[57] Analytic Network Process (ANP) [4],[58], weights assessment approach [59], and Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT) [60],[61] are used in supplier evaluation process to figure out the best alternative.

In this research, 76 relevant papers were reviewed and summarized as shown in Table I. It is shown the rank of selected criteria by the number of paper counted in percentages. It indicates that the most considered criteria in the high level ranking with the percentages over 90 are quality (QLT), delivery (DLV), and cost (CST). This result is similar to existing works [2], [6]-[11]. The medium level ranking range from 50 to 70 percentages contains production facility and capacity (PFC), flexibility and reciprocal arrangement (FLX), technical capacity and support (TCS), repair services and follow-up (RSF), information technology and communication systems (ITC), financial status (FNS), and innovation and R&D (INV), respectively. The criteria in which fall between 10 and 50 percentages are considered as the low level ranking criteria. They are operating control (OPR), quality system (QTS), management and organization (MGT), personnel training and development (PTD), product reliability (PRT), performance history (PMH), geological location (GEO), reputation and reference (REP), packaging and handling ability (PKG), amount of past business (PSB), customer relationship (CTR), warranties and claim policies (WCP), procedural compliance (PCC), customer satisfaction and impression (CSI), attitude and strategic fit (ATD), labor relations record (LRR), economical aspect (ECN), and desire for business (DFB). The remainders of those criteria are 5 criteria that their percentages are less than 10. These are environmental and social responsibility (ENV), safety awareness (SFT), domestic political stability (DPS), cultural congruence (CTC), and terrorism risk (TRR), resulting from the emersion of new issues i.e., global warming, safety, CSR, and stability.

Table II Comparison of selection criteria

Abbr	[6]	[2]	New Rank	Abbr	[6]	[2]	New Rank
QLT	1	3	1	REP	11	8	18
DLV	2	2	2	PKG	18	13	19
CST	6	1	3	PSB	21	22	20
PFC	5	4	4	CTR	-	-	21
FLX	23	19	5	WCP	4	23	22
TCS	7	6	6	PCC	9	16	23
RSF	15	11	7	CSI	17	20	24
ITC	10	18	8	ATD	16	12	25
FNS	8	9	9	LRR	19	17	26
INV	-	-	10	ECN	-	-	27
OPR	14	14	11	DFB	12	21	28
QTS	-	-	12	ENV	-	-	29
MGT	13	7	13	SFT	-	-	30
PTD	22	15	14	DPS	-	-	31
PRT	-	-	15	CTC	-	-	32
PMH	3	10	16	TRR	-	-	33
GEO	20	5	17				

Note: Abbr : Abbreviation

[2] : Criteria ranking from [2]

[6] : Criteria ranking from [6]

Afterward, all of criteria were compared with two distinguish papers of Dickson (1966) and Weber *et al.* (1991). Reference [6] is the pioneer paper on supplier selection. Whereas in [2], the 74 related papers are classified and investigated the change during twenty years after [6]. Both [2] and [6] also have been cited by many researchers [5],[10],[19],[45],[46],[63]-[86].

Then, the rank from the investigation is compared with [2] and [6] as shown in Table II. There are several remarkable points that should be noted.

Firstly, the QLT, DLV, CST, PFC, TCS, and FNS are basic significant criteria that have been generally used for last four decades. Secondly, the FLX criterion has been massively increased significant from prior, from the rank of 23rd in [6], 19th in [2], and 5th in the new rank. That might resulting from a shorten product life cycle, obsolescence speed, change of production system, and emergence of supply chain management (SCM). Thirdly, increasing of customer service and customer's bargaining power cause the RSF criterion more importance. In addition, ITC criterion has also increased more meaning as a result of the IT era. Then, there are 10 criteria that have not been taken into account before. Those criteria can be classified into two groups. The first ones contained the criteria which have cooperated in the other criteria. These criteria are PRT, ECN, ENV, and SFT. Another is the criteria that have emerged in the latter time. There are INV, QTS, CTR, DPS, CTC, and TRR criteria. In contrast, the 8 criteria are apparently diminished significance on account of advanced in production and SCM together with global quality standard equality i.e., PMH, GEO, REP, PCC, CSI, ATD, LRR, and DFB. Anyway, there are 6 criteria, OPR, MGT, PTD, PKG, PSB, and WCP, which have a steady significance on supplier evaluation process for range of time.

III. BALANCED SCORECARD AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

A. *Balanced Scorecard (BSC)*

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) model was first introduced and proposed to be a framework for performance evaluation by Robert S. Kaplan and David P. Norton in 1992 [15],[87]. It can be used for strategy and policy implementation. The BSC represents a translation of business strategy into set of measures by defining long term strategy, objectives, and the mechanism for achieving and obtaining feedback regarding those objectives. It is composed of 4 perspectives that can be briefly expressed as follows: [15],[88]-[90].

Financial Perspective: To indicate whether firm strategy, implementation, and execution contribute to bottom line improvement. The measures are profits, Return on Investment (ROI), and Economical Value Added (EVA).

Customer Perspective: To identify the outcomes associated with delivering differentiate value to satisfy the source of business profit. The customer satisfaction, customer retention, new customer acquisition, market position, and market share are considered as measures.

Internal Business Process Perspective: To satisfy shareholders and customers by excellence at some business internal process. Generic measures are quality, response time, cost, and new product to market lead time.



Fig.1 BSC with integrated CSR

Learning and Growth Perspective: To capture the ability of resources to manage a business and adapt to change and provide the infrastructure for achieving the objectives of the other three perspectives. Common measures are including employee satisfaction and information system availability.

B. *Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)*

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) aspects are rapidly emerging as a substantial issue for business and management. Legal and public pressures on the attainment of good environmental practice are mounting [16],[17],[91].

These reasons cause some business and public sectors to include the CSR into its consideration framework. Although the CSR related criterion that is ENV criterion which has a fraction of 7.89 percentages, under the low level ranking, it cannot be disregarded to take CSR perspective into the consideration caused by those continual increased pressures of both conscience and legislation [17],[18].

IV. SUPPLIER EVALUATION BASED ON BSC WITH INTEGRATED CSR

The results from reviewing of supplier selection criteria are extracted into BSC framework which CSR perspective is integrated as shown in Fig.1. This proposed framework composed of 5 perspectives which are financial, customer, internal business process, learning and growth, and corporate social responsibility. It is a supplier evaluation framework based on BSC with integrated CSR. Even though significance of CSR is lower than those 4 exists perspectives, the CSR perspective is still necessary to be satisfied because of the civil and legislative enforcements. The measures for each perspective can be shown as Table III, IV, V, VI, and VII in an alphabetical order of criteria.

From observation, it was found that the internal business process perspective contains maximum number of criteria and all of the high level ranking criteria. However, the medium level ranking was contributed to financial, customer, internal business process and learning and growth perspectives. Although the CSR perspective contains the low level ranking, it cannot be eliminated because of expanding realization of environmental and social responsibility aspects as well as civil and legislative enforcements.

The subsequent processes to complete the framework consist of 5 steps: Firstly, weighting of the importance among perspectives. Then, assigning the weight between those criteria contained in each perspective and set as the performance measures. Thirdly, selecting the significant criteria (or measures) and then identifying the Key Performance Index (KPIs), targets and initiative activities to

Table III The Proposed BSC for supplier evaluation: Financial

FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE		
Criteria	Measures	
Economical aspect (ECN)	- Currency fluctuation - Economical policies - GDP growth	- Growth deferring - Local price control - Tax and custom duties
Financial status (FNS)	- Annual profit and growth - Annual revenue and growth	- Financial stability - Fiscal outlook - Market share

Table IV The Proposed BSC for supplier evaluation: Customer

CUSTOMER PERSPECTIVE		
Criteria	Measures	
Amount of past business (PSB)	- Core competency - Customer base - No. of customers	- Renowned customers
Attitude and strategic fit (ATD)	- Management viewpoint	- Strategic compatibility
Customer relationship (CTR)	- Customer database - CRM activities - Customer retention	- Marketing campaign
Customer satisfaction and impression (CSI)	- Brand royalty - Customer reliance - Customer feedback	- Market position - Market share
Geographical location (GEO)	- Accessibility - Information - technology	- Distance - Trade barrier and tariff
Packaging and handling ability (PKG)	- Product carrying - Standard package compliance	
Performance history (PMH)	- Awards and expertise - Commercial Ability - Production schedule	- Response to market
Repair, services and follow-up (RSF)	- Convenience - Problems solving - Response to change	- Satisfaction on service - Service speed
Reputation and references (REP)	- Customer references - Firm prestige	- Position in industry
Warranties and claim policies (WCP)	- Warranty time range - Satisfaction on claims	

evaluate the score for alternative suppliers. The comparative process is the fourth step, benchmarking with the standards or best practices and the alternative suppliers performance. Finally, selecting the best supplier whose specifications meet the buyer's requirements.

V. CONCLUSION

The 76 research papers which containing corresponding keywords of supplier selection were reviewed, investigated and reclassified into the framework based on BSC with integrated CSR. It is required a judgment effort to classify the selection criteria those often not clear regarding categories and they have been categorized and renamed.

From investigation, it was found that quality, delivery, and cost are the most considered criteria with percentages over 90. Quality, delivery, cost, production facility and capability, technical capability and support, and financial criteria are significant basic criteria generally used for last forty years. And the flexibility and reciprocal arrangement criterion has massively increased significant in the same time. That might resulting from a shorten product life cycle, obsolescence speed, and change of production system, whereas some

criteria are diminished significant. Then, all of related criteria are classified in the framework of BSC with integrated CSR. All of the high level ranking criteria are contained in the internal business process perspective. Meanwhile, the medium level ranking criteria were contributed to financial, customer, internal business process, and learning and growth perspectives. Only CSR perspective contains the low level ranking criteria, which is the necessary condition for an organization.

Further researches are recommended to extensively consider which criteria are significant for a specific context or area of industry. Then, identify the tangible Key Performance Index (KPIs), targets and initiative activities. And set as a framework for evaluating supplier for a particular condition.

Table V The Proposed BSC for supplier evaluation: IBP

INTERNAL-BUSINESS-PROCESS PERSPECTIVE (IBP)		
Criteria	Measures	
Cost (CST)	- Circumstantial cost change - Compliance with Cost Analysis system (CCA) - Compliance with sector price behavior	- Cost reduction activity - Cost structure - Cost consistency - Low initial cost - Reasonable cost
Delivery (DLV)	- Conformance receipts - Consistent delivery - Delivery speed	- On time delivery - Quantity compliance
Flexibility and reciprocal arrangement (FLX)	- Conflict resolution - Flexibility of production system - Order change response - Responsibility to volume change	- Short setup time
Innovation and R&D (INV)	- Design capability - Expenditure on new technology - Invention lead time	- Product development capability and time - Technological support
Management and Organization (MGT)	- Level of command and compatibility - Management attitude - Organization structure	- Vision, mission, and policy
Product reliability (PRT)	- Conformance functions - Product life	
Production facility and capacity (PFC)	- Capacity flexibility - Capacity planning - Development speed - Production planning	- Responsibility to market demand
Quality (QLT)	- Conformance quality - Incoming rejection - Prompt response - Rejection rate	- Remedy for quality problems - Quality philosophy - Quality staff capability
Quality system (QTS)	- Database and traceability - QC and QA system	- System Certification
Technical capacity and support (TCS)	- Future technology - Technology deployment - No. of technical staff	- Technological capacity - Technology utilization - Technical expertise

Table VI The Proposed BSC for supplier evaluation: LNG

LEARNING AND GROWTH PERSPECTIVE (LNG)		
Criteria	Measures	
Cultural congruence (CTC)	- Cultural difference	- Feeling of trust
Desire for business (DFB)	- Business growth - Goal attainment	- Development activity - Outlook for future
Domestic political stability (DPS)	- Government shift and term length	- Public policies
Information technology and communication system (ITC)	- Compatibility of system - Ease of communication	- Information sharing - Information technology
Labor relations record (LRR)	- Clarity of job definition - No. of employees	- Occupational education activity - Organization structure
Personnel training and development (PTD)	- Occupational test - Professional education	- Training activity - Training Expense
Safety awareness (SFT)	- Accident statistics - Emergency plans	- Safety equipment and prevention
Terrorism risk (TRR)	- Attacked likelihood	- Emergency plans - State reliance

Table VII The Proposed BSC for supplier evaluation: CSR

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PERSPECTIVE (CSR)		
Criteria	Measures	
Environmental and social responsibility (ENV)	- Design for environment - Environmental competency - Environmental policies	- Pollution discharge and management - Pollution reduction activity - Social expense and donation

REFERENCES

[1] O. Bayazit, B. Karpak, and A. Yagci, "A purchasing decision: Selecting a supplier for a construction company," *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering*, vol. 15, pp. 217-231, 2006.

[2] C. A. Weber, J. R. Current, and W. C. Benton, "Vendor selection criteria and methods," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 50, pp. 2-18, 1991.

[3] C. Droge, R. Germain, and J. R. Stock, "Dimensions Underlying Retail Logistics and Their Relationship to Supplier Evaluation Criteria," *International Journal of Logistics Management*, vol. 2, pp. 19-25, 1991.

[4] J. Sarkis and S. Talluri, "A Model for Strategic Supplier Selection," *The Journal of Supply Chain Management: A Global Review of Purchasing and Supply*, pp. 18-28, 2002.

[5] S. H. Ha and R. Krishnan, "A hybrid approach to supplier selection for the maintenance of a competitive supply chain," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 34, pp. 1303-11, 2008.

[6] G. W. Dickson, "An analysis of vendor selection systems and decisions," *Journal of Purchasing*, vol. 2, pp. 5-17, 1966.

[7] S. H. Ghodsypour and C. O'Brien, "A decision support system for supplier selection using an integrated AHP and LP," *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 56-57, pp. 199-212, 1998.

[8] R. M. Monczka, K. J. Petersen, R. B. Handfield, and G. L. Ragatz, "Success factors in strategic supplier alliances: The buying company perspective," *Decision Sciences*, vol. 29, pp. 553-573, 1998.

[9] J. Motwani, M. Youssef, Y. Kathawala, and E. Futch, "Supplier selection in developing countries: a model development," *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, vol. 10, pp. 154-161, 1999.

[10] R. Verma and M. E. Pullman, "An analysis of the supplier selection process," *Omega*, vol. 26, pp. 739-750, 1998.

[11] M. A. Vonderembse, M. Uppal, S. H. Huang, and J. P. Dismukes, "Designing supply chains Towards theory development," *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 100, pp. 223-238, 2006.

[12] M. A. Cusumano and T. A., "Supplier relations and management: a survey of Japanese, Japanese-transplant, U.S. auto plants," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 5-17, 1991.

[13] L. Benyoucef, H. Ding, and X. Xie, "Supplier selection problem: selection criteria and methods," INRIA Lorraine LORIA, Technopole de Nancy-Brabois, France, Rapport de recherche 2003.

[14] M. Sonmez, "A Review and Critique of Supplier Selection Process and Practices," *Occasional Papers Series*, Business School, Loughborough University, vol. 1, pp. 1-34, 2006.

[15] R. S. Kaplan and D. P. Norton, *The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press, 1996.

[16] P. K. Humphreys, Y. K. Wong, and F. T. S. Chan, "Integrating environmental criteria into the supplier selection process," *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, vol. 138, pp. 349-356, 2003.

[17] G. Noci, "Designing 'green' vendor rating systems for the assessment of a supplier's environmental performance," *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 3, pp. 103-114, 1997.

[18] Q. Zhu and Y. Geng, "Integrating environmental issues into supplier selection and management: A study of large and medium-sized state-owned enterprises in China," *Greener Management International*, pp. 27-40, 2001.

[19] F. T. S. Chan and N. Kumar, "Global supplier development considering risk factors using fuzzy extended AHP-based approach," *Omega*, vol. 35, pp. 417-431, 2007.

[20] J. M. Smith, "Item selection for global purchasing," *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management*, vol. 5, pp. 117-127, 1999.

[21] I. Thaver and A. Wilcock, "Identification of overseas vendor selection criteria used by Canadian apparel buyers," *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, vol. 10, pp. 56-70, 2006.

[22] F. T. S. Chan and H. K. Chan, "Development of the supplier selection model - A case study in the advanced technology industry," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, vol. 218, pp. 1807-1824, 2004.

[23] M. A. Youssef, "1996," *Benchmarking for Quality Management and Technology*, vol. 3, pp. 60-72, 1996.

[24] K. Shahadat, "Supplier choice criteria of executing agencies in developing country," *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 16, pp. 261-285, 2003.

[25] P. Pal and B. Kumar, "'16T': Toward a dynamic vendor evaluation model in integrated SCM processes," *Supply Chain Management*, vol. 13, pp. 391-397, 2008.

[26] A. N. Haq and G. Kannan, "Fuzzy analytical hierarchy process for evaluating and selecting a vendor in a supply chain model," *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 29, pp. 826-835, 2006.

[27] T. Y. Choi and J. L. Hartley, "An exploration of supplier selection practices across the supply chain," *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 14, pp. 333-343, 1996.

[28] K. G. Gulen, "Supplier Selection and Outsourcing Strategies in Supply Chain Management," *Journal of Aeronautics and Space Technologies*, vol. 3, pp. 1-6, 2007.

[29] C. T. Chen, C. T. Lin, and S. F. Huang, "A fuzzy approach for supplier evaluation and selection in supply chain management," *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 102, pp. 289-301, 2006.

[30] G. H. Hong, S. C. Park, D. S. Jang, and H. M. Rho, "An effective supplier selection method for constructing a competitive supply-relationship," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 28, 2005.

[31] S. Percin, "Use of fuzzy AHP for evaluating the benefits of information-sharing decisions in a supply chain," *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, vol. 21, pp. 263-284, 2008.

[32] I. L. Wu and Y. C. Shen, "A model for exploring the impact of purchasing strategies on user requirements determination of e-SRM," *Information and Management*, vol. 43, pp. 411-422, 2006.

[33] S. Sen, H. Basligil, C. G. Sen, and H. Barali, "A framework for defining both qualitative and quantitative supplier selection criteria considering the buyer-supplier integration strategies," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 46, pp. 1825-1845, 2008.

[34] V. R. Kannan and K. C. Tan, "Buyer-supplier relationships: The impact of supplier selection and buyer-supplier engagement on relationship and firm performance," *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, vol. 36, pp. 755-775, 2006.

[35] C. Masella and A. Rangone, "A contingent approach to the design of vendor selection systems for different types of co-operative customer/supplier relationships," *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, vol. 20, pp. 70-84, 2000.

[36] S. E. Chick, T. L. Olsen, and e. al, "A descriptive multi-attribute model for reconfigurable machining system selection examining buyer-supplier relationship," *International Journal of Agile Manufacturing Systems*, vol. 2, p. 2000, 2000.

[37] J. W. Schmitz and K. W. KPlatts, "Roles of supplier performance measurement: indication from a study in the automotive industry," *Management Decision*, vol. 41, pp. 711-721, 2003.

[38] C. M. Wei and C. Y. Chen, "An empirical study of purchasing strategy in automotive industry," *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, vol. 108, pp. 973-987, 2008.

- [39] M. E. Gonzalez, G. Quesada, and C. A. M. Monge, "Determining the importance of the supplier selection process in manufacturing: a case study," *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, vol. 34, pp. 492-504, 2004.
- [40] G. Micheli, "A decision-maker-centred supplier selection approach for critical supplies," *Management Decision*, vol. 46, pp. 918-932, 2008.
- [41] N. O. Ndubisi, M. Jantan, L. C. Hing, and M. S. Ayub, "Supplier selection and management strategies and manufacturing flexibility," *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, vol. 18, pp. 330, 2005.
- [42] F. Roodhooft and J. Konings, "Vendor selection and evaluation an activity based costing approach," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 96, pp. 97-102, 1997.
- [43] I. Dogan, "Supplier selection using activity-based costing and fuzzy present-worth technique," *Logistics Information Management*, vol. 16, pp. 420-6, 2003.
- [44] S. C. Ting and D. I. Cho, "An integrated approach for supplier selection and purchasing decisions," *Supply Chain Management*, vol. 13, 2008.
- [45] W. Y. Wu, B. M. Sukoco, C. Y. Li, and S. H. Chen, "An integrated multi-objective decision-making process for supplier selection with bundling problem," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 36, 2009.
- [46] A. Amid, S. H. Ghodspour, and C. O'Brien, "Fuzzy multiobjective linear model for supplier selection in a supply chain," *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 104, pp. 394-407, 2006.
- [47] J. L. Yang, H. N. Chiu, G. H. Tzeng, and R. H. Yeh, "Vendor selection by integrated fuzzy MCDM techniques with independent and interdependent relationships," *Information Sciences*, vol. 178, 2008.
- [48] C. Kubat and B. Yuce, "Supplier Selection with Genetic Algorithm and Fuzzy AHP," in *Proceedings of 5th International Symposium on Intelligent Manufacturing Systems*, Sakarya university, Turkey, 2006.
- [49] R. Narasimhan, S. Talluri, and S. K. Mahapatra, "Multiproduct, multicriteria model for supplier selection with product life-cycle considerations," *Decision Sciences*, vol. 37, pp. 577-603, 2006.
- [50] G. Barbarosoglu and T. Yazgac, "An application of the analytic hierarchy process to the supplier selection problem," *Production and Inventory Management Journal*, vol. 38, pp. 14-21, 1997.
- [51] M. C. Y. Tam and V. M. R. Tummala, "An application of the AHP in vendor selection of a telecommunications system," *Omega*, 2001.
- [52] A. H. I. Lee, "A fuzzy supplier selection model with the consideration of benefits, opportunities, costs and risks," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 36, pp. 2879-93, 2009.
- [53] M. Sevkli, S. C. L. Koh, S. Zaim, M. Demirbag, and E. Tatoglu, "Hybrid analytical hierarchy process model for supplier selection," *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, vol. 108, pp. 122-142, 2008.
- [54] M. Sevkli, S. C. L. Koh, S. Zaim, M. Demirbag, and E. Tatoglu, "An application of data envelopment analytic hierarchy process for supplier selection: A case study of BEKO in Turkey," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 45, pp. 1973-2003, 2007.
- [55] F. Cebi and D. Bayraktar, "An integrated approach for supplier selection," *Logistics Information Management*, vol. 16, pp. 395, 2003.
- [56] L. Mikhailov, "Fuzzy analytic approach to partnership selection in formation of virtual enterprises," *Omega The International Journal of Management Science*, vol. 30, pp. 393-401, 2002.
- [57] C. Kahraman, U. Cebeci, and Z. Ulukan, "Multi-criteria supplier selection using fuzzy AHP," *Logistics Information Management*, vol. 16, pp. 382-394, 2003.
- [58] O. Bayazit, "Use of analytic network process in vendor selection decisions," *Benchmarking*, vol. 13, pp. 566-579, 2006.
- [59] R. Dulmin and V. Mininno, "Supplier selection using a multi-criteria decision aid method," *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 9, pp. 177-187, 2003.
- [60] H. Min, "International Supplier Selection: A Multi-attribute Utility Approach," *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, vol. 24, pp. 24-33, 1993.
- [61] A. Sanayei, S. F. Mousavi, M. R. Abdi, and A. Mohaghar, "An integrated group decision-making process for supplier selection and order allocation using MAUT and LP," *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, vol. 345, pp. 731-747, 2008.
- [62] M. Bevilacqua, F. E. Ciarapica, and G. Giacchetta, "A fuzzy-QFD approach to supplier selection," *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 12, pp. 14-27, 2006.
- [63] J. W. Wang, C. H. Cheng, and K. C. Huang, "Fuzzy hierarchical TOPSIS for supplier selection," *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, vol. 9, pp. 377-386, 2009.
- [64] W. Li, Y. Wang, and A. Chen, "Grey relational evaluation on vendor selection based on e-business," pp. 509-513, 2008.
- [65] J. Rezaei and M. Davoodi, "A deterministic, multi-item inventory model with supplier selection and imperfect quality," *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, vol. 32, pp. 2106-16, 2008.
- [66] Y. Yu, "Research on vendor selection under fuzzy situation," in *Proceedings - 2nd Asia International Conference on Modelling and Simulation*, AMS 2008, 2008, pp. 744-8.
- [67] W. L. Ng, "An efficient and simple model for multiple criteria supplier selection problem," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 186, pp. 1059-67, 2008.
- [68] S. Y. Chou and Y. H. Chang, "A decision support system for supplier selection based on a strategy-aligned fuzzy SMART approach," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 34, pp. 2241-53, 2008.
- [69] M. A. Hasan, R. Shankar, and J. Sarkis, "Supplier selection in an agile manufacturing environment using Data Envelopment Analysis and Analytical Network Process," *International Journal of Logistics Systems and Management*, vol. 4, pp. 523-550, 2008.
- [70] N. Aissaoui, M. Haouari, and E. Hassini, "Supplier selection and order lot sizing modeling: A review," *Computers and Operations Research*, vol. 34, pp. 3516-40, 2007.
- [71] L. De Boer, E. Labro, and P. Morlacchi, "A review of methods supporting supplier selection," *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 7, pp. 75-89, 2001.
- [72] L. De Boer, L. Van Der Wegen, and J. Telgen, "Outranking methods in support of supplier selection," *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 4, pp. 109-118, 1998.
- [73] L. De Boer and L. L. M. Van Der Wegen, "Practice and promise of formal supplier selection: A study of four empirical cases," *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 9, pp. 109-118, 2003.
- [74] S. H. Cheraghi, et al "Critical Success Factors for Supplier Selection: An Update," *Journal of Applied Business Research*, vol. 20, 2004.
- [75] S. B. Barla, "A case study of supplier selection for lean supply by using a mathematical model," *Logistics Information Management*, vol. 16, pp. 451-9, 2003.
- [76] M. Braglia and A. Petroni, "A quality assurance-oriented methodology for handling trade-offs in supplier selection," *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, pp. 96-111, 2000.
- [77] J. Liu, F. Y. Ding, and V. Lall, "Using data envelopment analysis to compare suppliers for supplier selection and performance improvement," *Supply Chain Management*, vol. 5, pp. 143-150, 2000.
- [78] R. Lasch and C. G. Janker, "Supplier selection and controlling using multivariate analysis," *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, vol. 35, pp. 409-425, 2005.
- [79] F. A. Frost and F. Long, "Quality Management Standards Their Importance In Supplier Selection Criteria," in *ANZMAC 2000 Visionary Marketing for the 21st Century: Facing the Challenge*, 2000.
- [80] J. H. van Mossel and A. Straub, "Procurement of Dutch housing associations' technical management services: A decision framework," *Property Management*, vol. 25, pp. 487-501, 2007.
- [81] M. Tracey and C. L. Tan, "Empirical analysis of supplier selection and involvement, customer satisfaction, and firm performance," *Supply Chain Management*, vol. 6, pp. 174-188, 2001.
- [82] C. A. Weber, "A data envelopment analysis approach to measuring vendor performance," *Supply Chain Management*, pp. 28-39, 1996.
- [83] B. van der Rhee, R. Verma, and G. Plaschka, "Understanding trade-offs in the supplier selection process: The role of flexibility, delivery, and value-added services/support," *International Journal of Production Economics*, 2008.
- [84] J. Seydel, "Supporting the paradigm shift in vendor selection: Multicriteria methods for sole sourcing," *Managerial Finance*, vol. 31, pp. 49-64, 2005.
- [85] C. C. Yang and B. S. Chen, "Supplier selection using combined analytical hierarchy process and grey relational analysis," *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, vol. 17, pp. 926-941, 2006.
- [86] D. Zhang, J. Zhang, K. K. Lai, and Y. Lu, "An novel approach to supplier selection based on vague sets group decision," *Expert Systems with Applications*, 2008.
- [87] R. S. Kaplan and D. P. Norton, *Focusing Your Organization on Strategy with the Balanced Scorecard*: H B R Press, 2004.
- [88] A. H. I. Lee, W. C. Chen, and C. J. Chang, "A fuzzy AHP and BSC approach for evaluating performance of IT department in the manufacturing industry in Taiwan," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 34, pp. 96-107, 2008.
- [89] H. C. Huang, "Designing a knowledge-based system for strategic planning: A balanced scorecard perspective," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 36, pp. 209-218, 2009.
- [90] F. C. Yuan and C. Chui, "A hierarchical design of case-based reasoning in the balanced scorecard application," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 36, pp. 333-342, 2009.
- [91] P. Humphreys, R. McIvor, and F. Chan, "Using case-based reasoning to evaluate supplier environmental management performance," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 25, pp. 141-153, 2003.