Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online, 2021; Vol 20 (Issue 5): pp. 7255-7272
http://ilkogretim-online.org
doi: 10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.819

# Impact of Digital Life Quality on the Development of Sustainable Security Development in Accordance with Applications of the European Quality Model

**Prof. Atta Hasan Abdulrahim,** Public Relations Prof, Al Qasimia University, ahassan@alqasimia.ac.ae
**Dr. Ayman Ramadan Zahran,** Assistant Professor, Aldar University College, ayman.zahran@aldar.ac.ae

**Abstract-** The current study aimed to verify the impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security development in light of EFQM. The study depended on the descriptive and analytical approach, study sample consisting of (124) university workers, researchers also prepared study tools which the digital life quality questionnaire, the sustainable security development questionnaire in light of the applications of the EFQM, and the validity and reliability of the study tools were verified. findings of the study found a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for the quality of digital life on the achievement of sustainable security development in light of the applications of the EFQM, and it was also evident that both the quality of digital life and sustainable security development have been provided to a large extent in light of the applications of EFQM.

**Keywords: EFQM, Digital Life Quality, Security Development**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Today's digital life occupies a special place after the increased demand for it in all fields, and those concerned have called for attention to the need to set standards for the uses of digital life, given the preoccupation of the majority of individuals and institutions today with what digital life contains, from here the so-called quality of digital life or digital well-being appeared, which calls for The use of technology and digital life is a safe use that achieves the benefit of the individual and society. Studies have agreed that achieving the quality of digital life contributes to achieving sustainable security development if the standards of the EFQM are followed. Therefore, experts advise the need to pay attention to the application of the EFQM for its importance in the areas of development. Sustainable security.

Therefore, it is not possible to achieve any form of development or sustainability without supporting the security side and achieving development and sustainability first, because without security development, no form of development or sustainability will be achieved, and this places great responsibilities on the security side towards achieving institutional excellence first through continuous development. In this sector and the sustainability of that development, in addition to keeping pace with digital life and its requirements and development at the same time.

### Study Problem

Security agencies and institutions face great challenges imposed by current circumstances, especially digital life in recent years, which have spread dangerously at all levels, which poses great challenges to the security services, in addition to the conditions of globalization, in which all institutions must maintain their institutional distinction in light of them. Security sustainability is a necessary requirement to achieve the requirements of sustainability in all sectors and other areas, while the EFQM has cast a shadow on institutions to maintain their excellence and the quality of the services provided by them. Therefore, all institutions in the public and private sectors have a great need to follow this model that they have recognized and applied. Major global institutions.

Suleiman 2019, Skripnuk, ET, AL. 2019, Khazali, 2019, Shatti, 2018, Al-Shorouqi, 2018, Granit, ET, AL. 2015, and Al Mazroua 2010, indicated that sustainable security development is of great importance in reaching sustainable development in general. Therefore, studies that review security efforts to achieve excellence and sustainability should be expanded in a world full of disasters and crises.

**Study Questions**

The main question of the study can be identified in the following question: What is the impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security development in light of the applications of the EFQM? The main question is divided into other sub-questions, as follows:

1- What is the availability of the quality of digital life in light of the applications of EFQM model from the point of view of the study sample?

2- What is the extent of the availability of sustainable security development in light of the EFQM from the viewpoint of the study sample?

3- Is there a statistically significant impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security development in light of applications of EFQM from the point of view of the study sample?

**Study Importance**

The importance of the current study can be determined by reviewing the impact of the quality of digital life on sustainable security development, and the study also deals with a number of important variables that researchers have not previously linked to in Arab or foreign studies, in addition to identifying the efforts of the security services in achieving sustainability in all fields The importance of the current study also stems from a review of the EFQM and its applications, which many major institutions seek

**Study Aims**

The main aim of the study is to verify the impact of the quality of digital life on achieving both sustainable security development in light of the applications of the EFQM and this goal has sub-objectives as follows:

- Learn how to improve the quality of life while dealing with digital devices

- Clarifying the role of the security services and their efforts to achieve sustainability in all areas of life

- Recognizing the importance of applying the EFQM for enterprises

- Learn about the efforts of the security services to achieve institutional excellence.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

From previous studies, the following is evident:

**First: the quality of digital life:** studies of both Ali. Et, al. 2020, Burr. Et, al.2020, Diefenbach, 2018, Cohn, et, al. 2017, AzizulHaq, 2012, that digital life greatly predicts the quality of life, so that the digital life of people should be enhanced, and policymakers should emphasize enhancing the digital skills of individuals, and encouraging them to enter the digital world, while the quality of digital life has become of interest to researchers and their discussions Due to the wide spread of technology and its uses in various walks of life, electronic luxury also contributed to individuals not feeling the problems and turmoil and feeling happy, and individuals connected digitally have indicators of quality of life compared to individuals who do not have access to digitally.

**Second: Institutional excellence in light of the European model of excellence:** studies of Nenadál and Jaroslav agreed. 2020 Turisova. Et, al.2020, Almekhlaf, 2018, Al-Ashqar and Al-Hindawi 2017, Qawasmeh & Al-Bourini, 2016, and Al-Tamimi 2012. When a mechanism must be provided to monitor the developments and results of the performance of institutions according to the EFQM, the establishment of an award for distinguished institutions, the establishment of media units that adopt the method of comparative measurement with best practices and the work of a guide to the standards of excellence in accordance with the model of excellence of the European Foundation for Quality Management, with the need to give and train workers on the standards of this model.

**Third: Sustainable Security Development:** studies of Solomon 2019, Skripnuk, ET, AL, indicated. 2019, Khazali, 2019, Shatti, 2018, Al-Shorouqi, 2018, Granit, ET, AL. 2015, and Al Mazroua 2010, to the role of good practices in achieving institutional security excellence, with the need to benefit from good security practices, in light of the increase in disasters and crises, while the main areas of development such as

economic, industrial, social, demographic, technological and environmental development, as agreed The results of previous studies cannot be achieved without achieving security development first, as any failures or crises in the financial and material dimension of security formation may be an obstacle in the sustainable security industry, and to explore a strong and sustainable security future must include understanding the social, economic and environmental context and developing participatory scenarios between the areas of sustainability and areas. the wish; Evaluate options for strong governance and development investment development.

**Study Method**

The current study depended on the descriptive and analytical approach by analyzing the opinions of the study sample on the impact of digital quality of life on sustainable security development in light of EFQM applications.

**Study Sample**

The study sample included (124) university workers in the United Arab Emirates from academics and administrators, with the aim of surveying their views on the quality of digital life on sustainable security development in light of EFQM applications.

**Study Terms**

**A- Digital Quality of Life:** the positive interaction between the human being and the computer by integrating the digital world (information and services) with the physical world (physical objects / environment), through specific skills to direct digital channels and incentives towards achieving goals and personal benefit from using digital life and directing it positively. Avoiding the overabundance of new digital media, given the abundance and accessibility of digital communications. (Gui, et.al. 2017: 158).

**B- Sustainable Security Development:** The concept of sustainable security development refers to the continuous development of security agencies strategically, institutionally and operationally to deal effectively and efficiently with the security issues associated with the development process in any society, so that it is closely linked to a new and contemporary strategic vision in a way that suits the circumstances surrounding society, and includes Political, economic, social, environmental and cultural components. (Auskienė, & Vičienė. 2012: 288).

**C- European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM):** an integrated tool for institutional evaluation that helps organizations define a roadmap for their future towards excellence, and also allows the institution to evaluate all aspects of its strengths and weaknesses, and to identify opportunities for improvement compared to best international practices. And then start the development and improvement based on the plans that provide sustainable growth to improve performance and implement the future plans of the institution in order to reach sustainable institutional excellence. (Turisova, 2020: 551).

## III. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The theoretical framework is divided into several topics:

**Digital Quality of Life**

When developing a specific definition of quality of life, it should include two main dimensions for each of the two dimensions, indicators of its own, namely the objective dimension and the subjective dimension, while the majority of those concerned with the quality of life focused on the objective dimension, which includes a set of measurable and observable indicators such as income level, status Work with respect to the individual, the social position of the individual, the support that the individual receives through his network of relationships. However, the results of many studies and research indicate that objective indicators contribute only a small part of a person's quality of life in contrast to the subjective indicators that reflect an individual's personal happiness and satisfaction index. Life in general, which reflects the quality of real life (Buiting. 2020).

The quality of life can be viewed through the individual's sense of satisfaction with his life that he actually lives, the extent of his self-realization and realization of the values of his life that he lives, and

therefore the quality of life represents the individual's personal feeling about his life, if the quality of life depends on the extent of each person's awareness of his life, and its reflection on the style The life that he lives, so the subjective indicators here play the biggest role in determining the concept of the quality of life and therefore each person has criteria and determinants through which he can judge the quality of the life he lives, which differ from one person to another, and matters such as experience, environment, genetics, cultural, social, and other factors may interfere to affect In a person's perception of quality of life and happiness. (Ventegodt, 2013: 120).

A result of the tremendous revolution in digital life, IT has become the biggest source for improving the quality of our life. Illiteracy is no longer the inability to read or write, but rather that illiteracy has become the inability to read and write digitally and the difficulty of accessing digital tools. 75%) of American adults use the Internet constantly to accomplish their work, and when comparing that percentage with developing countries, it became clear that developing countries are much less than that percentage for many reasons that make the rate of use of digital life not comparable to the United States of America for reasons related to affordability Internet access, broadband communications, the state's general policy towards digital quality of life, and the lack of a developing country's orientation towards digital literacy. (Buckley & Monks, 2008: 152).

In order to achieve the quality of digital life in light of the excessive flow of information and social relationships through the web, the matter requires specific skills to direct digital channels and incentives towards goals and personal benefit from using digital life as a positive direction, in addition to avoiding the excessive multitasking of digital, the necessity of daily time fragmentation and excessive consumption. For new digital media, as these matters represent the other side of digital life that should be taken into account in light of the abundance of digital communications and accessibility, in order to avoid the so-called digital luxury. (Gui, et.al. 2017: 159).

Today, institutions are striving to adapt digitally not only to support digital goods and services that secure their economic future, but also to provide the environment to ensure the continuity of their humancapital, as digital leaders encourage employees to work more than non-digital leaders, as digital life brings more convenience and saves time and effort, Most of all, it is more efficient and effective, and in general, digital transformation contributes to achieving higher communication between individuals worldwide, and between company members at all job levels easily and easily. Today, rapid technological changes in society have had a great impact on its members and in all its institutions, whether governmental or Non-governmental organizations. (Atkinson & Castro, 2008: 13).

Researchers have occupied the issue of the impact of information technology on improving the quality of life for individuals, and after extensive studies it has become clear that the quality of information technology is the most important factor in our time that leads to improving life in many areas such as positive impact, happiness and positivity, and the researchers also focused on the basic principles. To benefit from the modern digital revolution, we mention, for example, looking at digital progress as the main driver to improve the quality of life today, the need to invest in digital progress, encourage widespread digital infrastructure, encourage the spread of digital literacy, move away from digitalizing problems, but use technology to find new solutions. For her, creating digital content and reusable applications, in such matters, technology can solve problems and improve the quality and quality of life for individuals, and this is what researchers have called digital quality of life. (AzizulHaq & Abdullah, 2012: 96).

The need for a digital lifestyle has emerged in light of crises, especially in light of the Covid-19 crisis, which highlighted the need to enhance the digital life of individuals, work and distance learning. The high unemployment rates in most societies also highlighted the need for digital life, which may be a solution to reduce this problem. Therefore, the digital life provided a field for people with skills, ideas and innovations opportunities to market their experiences through the Internet, and at the same time it provided the opportunity for employers and companies to employ competencies that improve their services and the quality and quality of the services they provide, which contributed to improving the quality of life for workers and employers, At the same time, they saved a lot of effort, time and money. Hence, it can be said that the term digital quality of life or electronic luxury refers to the effect of digital technologies on living a good life for a person without problems, whether in his electronic world or his external world. (Burr, et.al. 2020: 123).

What is more important is that the quality of life of the elderly has improved in recent years as a result of the use of information technology and their use of smart phones and computers, according to the study

(Damant, et.al. 2016: 3) that the elderly have increased their quality of life scores as a result of having acquired care. Better health remotely through the use of information technology represented in e-mail, contact pages and Skype, as this helped them to communicate with family and friends and restore relations with those who had lost their news, and this explains the fact that the best standard for measuring the impact of the quality of life in digital life is the experiences of the elderly in The digital age, therefore, encouraging the elderly to use information technology has received great attention from specialists, by providing them with technologies that contribute to the quality of their digital lives, which in turn will be reflected in the quality of their general life.

**Sustainable Security Development**

The new concept of security does not only focus on military forces, but it extends to include political and economic growth. Security is the basis and core of development. Without security, there is no development that requires a minimum level of stability and order, so the more development progresses, security will advance with it. So the terms are closely related to each other, and the relationship between them indicates an interest in social aspects along with economic and political aspects. The social dimensions of poverty, for example, reflect the nature of security and development in any country in the world. (Gilman, 2011).

Since international organizations and many countries linked development and sustainability with the end of the last century, there have been many attempts to detail the general goals of organizations and countries to link development and sustainability in general, and the main goal of those attempts was to make sustainable development a tangible reality, not just empty phrases and buzzing slogans that are raised.

In international and regional forums alike, attempts have ended in setting procedural goals that defined modernization over the following years, specifically in the year 2000, eight goals were set, which were called the new Millennium Development Goals, and at that time, 2015 was set as the maximum to achieve those goals. The extent to which these goals were achieved were discussed at the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development held in New York in September 2015 in the presence of more than 150 world leaders and leaders, and during that summit 17 goals and 169 sub-goals were identified that were agreed to be achieved by 2030, and these goals and objectives were set. Based on the general goals of sustainable development with the aim of achieving them. (Valadbigi & Shahab 2010).

The principle of sustainability is the main pillar for achieving sustainable security development, which is considered a national and community project, through which all segments of society are integrated into this project. Granit, et, al. 2015)) are:

**- Environmental Sustainability:** environmental sustainability is the most important axis for achieving sustainable security development, by reducing and rationalizing consumption of non-renewable natural resources, with the aim of ensuring a share for future generations, which represents the main axis of sustainability in general, along with some other pillars.

**- Economic Sustainability:** Economic sustainability is an essential axis of achieving sustainable security development. Establishing a strong, balanced economic system does not depend on religion and provides all the requirements needed by all current and future generations, thus providing development opportunities at all levels for the two generations.

**- Social sustainability:** This occurs through a fair distribution of wealth and capabilities within the state, which satisfies all sectors and individuals of society, thus providing with it the appropriate societal conditions to achieve sustainable security.

Sustainable security refers to the need to achieve human security continuously over time, in all human societies, which today are more interconnected than before thanks to the introduction of technology in all areas of life today, and the globalization of economy, trade and politics, as sustainable security seeks to deal in a new and different way with all Environmental, economic and social risks by relying on a prevention approach instead of a wait-and-see approach or an intervention and treatment approach, especially since the traditional security development was based on monitoring and the use of force, which is no longer able today to cope with all the economic, environmental and social risks and globalization that often contribute to destabilizing regional societal and international security. (Auskienė& Vičienė. 2012: 289).

Sustainable security is considered to stem from the logic of sustainable development, which came to amend the errors of the normal model so that it transcends its negative repercussions on both the environment and society, as there are several axes trying to approach sustainable security to reduce the risks that threaten the security of societies, and these axes can be clarified, according to Gilman, 2011) are as follows:

**First: Competition Over Non-Renewable and Scarce Resources:** The process of stopping competition over natural resources that may be depleted, especially in poor and insecure areas, is one of the priorities for achieving sustainable human security to reduce the manifestations of conflict and conflict within states.

**Second: Climate Change:** Those concerned with sustainable human security and sustainable development point out that climate change that results from environmental pollution, which occurred due to the traditional model of development, is one of the most important causes of threatening the stability and security of the international community.

**Third - Global Militarization:** The sustainable security development aims to focus on confronting the development and provision of weapons in a large and unprecedented manner in all parts of the world.

**Fourth: Social Marginalization and Exclusion:** In order to achieve sustainable security development, all forms of economic and social inequality, which are increasing day by day, must be addressed.

The issue of sustainable security remained an implicit and undeclared goal of development in general and sustainable development in particular, which focused on economic aspects while thinking about the issue of income for the individual, and the growing risks that threatened the development process for societies as a whole contributed to the need to seriously think about new methods and mechanisms to address these risks Which threatens development, and among the most prominent of these risks were unemployment, environmental pollution, migration, terrorism and social inequality, and therefore attention has begun to the importance of the security dimension as a central issue of development issues, as this justifies the new visions and the closely related interdependence between the development of societies and their security, and this interdependence has emerged. There are three levels as follows:

**First:** insecurity directly affects the production process, which is the basis of development. The individual's feeling of insecurity due to chaos reduces his motivation for achievement and work, and this perspective considers security as an essential means to achieve sustainable and comprehensive development.

**Second:** Sustainable development aims to achieve comprehensive and sustainable security in the first place, which leads to the provision of safe living conditions free from environmental, economic and social risks for the human being left by the traditional model of development, and this perspective can be considered that sustainable security development is a major goal of the sustainable development goals.

**Third:** Through the sustainable development model, it is possible to eliminate all forms of conflicts and conflicts by dealing in innovative ways with the causes of their occurrence, and this model considers that sustainable development is a tool through which sustainable community security can be achieved, and through which a set of new principles and values that enable Communities saving high environmental, economic and social costs.

If we look at the requirements for providing sustainable development, we will find that the first requirement for achieving it is the presence of a security apparatus at the highest level capable of confronting any internal or external confrontation or conflict, in addition to controlling the course of affairs internally and externally, and securing lives, freedoms and property from any prejudice to their security or threatening them, as well as This includes the application of legal punishment and punishment for anyone who deviates from the general framework of law and development, as well as achieving sustainable security development, providing an attractive and incubating security environment for development, and providing guarantees that ensure its continuity and the achievement of sustainability goals. Therefore, the role of the security services has the largest and pivotal role related to the application of laws. To achieve sustainable development, as there is a clear relationship between the levels of achieving security, there is the general macro level, which is related to the security of society and the state, and a partial level related to the security of institutions and establishments working in the field of development (Skripnuk. Et, al. 2019)

In order to achieve sustainable security, the geopolitical scene is of utmost importance to achieve this, by paying attention to security issues and issues related to human development, as the two matters are

closely related, in order to achieve a more secure and sustainable future, by placing political, economic and social factors in the place of countries' concerns, in addition to Attention to the development of human behavior, as the deterioration of human behavior may affect all development plans negatively, and the more comprehensive analysis from the point of view of researchers and interested parties indicates the need to link development and security to build a participatory scenario between security and development, which will inevitably achieve the transition towards sustainability on both sides, and this This also indicates development in its broadest sense, while achieving a strong and sustainable future for security and development. Granit, 2015: 23).

Talking about sustainable security development always needs to link the development process with the security process within the state. One of the most important conditions necessary for an attractive and incubator environment for development is the availability of the security part, which guarantees people the sense of security and reassurance necessary for that environment, and that ensures the continuation and sustainability of development, so the security services have a vital and central role. Fulfill the realization of all development plans in all areas, through the proper application of laws and the obligation of all members of society to abide by the laws in their behavior and not infringe on the rights of others, in addition to imposing sanctions on violators, this would keep any country achieving development plans in all areas of economic and environmental development. Political, social, etc., and contributes to achieving sustainable security distinction for the state. (Auskienė& Vičienė. 2012: 292).

**The European Foundation for Quality Model (EFQM)**

The European Foundation for Quality Management: EFQM was established in the Belgian capital Brussels in 1988, and the first version of the European Excellence Model was issued in 1991, and then the process of improving and developing this model continued until the fifth version of it was issued in 2013. This model is applied by most of the distinguished international organizations and institutions, all over the world in recent years. Its philosophy has been based on institutional excellence achieved after satisfying the demands of consumers and employees, and achieving the demands of society based on leadership that draws policies and sets a clear strategic direction for it, and improves and develops human resource capabilities. And it adopts different operating processes from other institutions in order to achieve the satisfaction and interest of the customers. Gašparík. 2013: 52)).

The European model for quality excellence was adopted in its final form in (1999) by the European Union for Quality Management and was based at its inception on the idea of total quality management, and the organization's performance was approved according to this model, which should meet the needs, expectations and demands of customers and stakeholders, while the model focused on development And the continuous improvement of the organization, and one of the features of this model is that it can be applied and used at all administrative levels within any institution or establishment regardless of its size and activities, whether it is within the public or private sector, so the model is suitable for all establishments.

The vision of the EFQM is that excellence and quality are the reason and basis for the continuation of institutions and their presence in the market, and the mission of the European Foundation for Quality Management is to continuously promote quality and excellence in European institutions by providing basic requirements and standards with the aim of achieving excellence and quality in the performance of organizations and measuring The extent of its success in achieving its goals, as EFQM provided a model for achieving the highest levels of quality, including all aspects of institutional performance. (Sheffield. 2003: 352).

EFQM model included nine criteria, which were divided into two groups. The first group included the so-called Enablers, which included five dimensions: leadership, individuals, policies and strategies, relationships, resources and operations, and the second group, which was called Results, included four dimensions: the results of individuals, the results of operations, Key performance results and community outcomes, and the goal is for institutions, whether local or global, to reach institutional excellence according to the model criteria, including the evaluation of all institution or organization operations in accordance with the standards set by the European Union for Quality Management (EFQM). (Turisova. Et, al. 2020).

The European Foundation for Quality Management Excellence Model is an integrated self-assessment tool that helps organizations define a roadmap for their future towards excellence, and allows the organization to evaluate all aspects of its strengths and weaknesses, and to identify opportunities for

improvement compared to international best practices. And then start improvement and development through plans that provide sustainable growth to improve performance and implement plans, as all institutions that aim to achieve excellence today are required to take measures that help them develop and improve their services in order to achieve excellence by keeping pace with global changes and achieving continuity in development and meeting the needs of consumers and achieving Their expectations. (Almekhlaf. 2018: 163).

The European Model for Quality Management constitutes a practical framework to enable the institution and its departments to assess its position during the process of institutional excellence, in addition to understanding its points of excellence and filling the gaps in its performance regarding its vision and objectives, as this model consists of three main pillars represented in the basic concepts of excellence, which represent the basic basis of excellence, And the logic of the radar, in addition to the availability of a dynamic framework and an effective administrative and organizational tool that represents the basis on which any organization builds its confrontation with the challenges it faces and wants to overcome in order to achieve its aspirations of sustainable excellence and finally the standards of the Excellence Model, and this represents the practical framework to help the administration to transform the basic concepts and logic Radar to practice. (Turisova, ET.AL. 2020).

The mechanism of action of the European Model of Excellence is based on the causal relationship between the main criteria included in the quality model by dividing the model criteria into two main parts, namely empowerment, which includes several main criteria represented in leadership, policy and strategy, individuals, partnership and resources, processes, and results criteria, which include Main criteria represented in consumer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and influence in society, and through that, excellence occurs, which stimulates learning and innovation within the organization and encourages continuous improvement, and each of the sub-criteria has a relative weight that is calculated for the purposes of evaluation.( Luburić. 2015: 49).

In this way, a set of basic concepts of excellence, which are considered the main pillars for achieving institutional excellence, can be used as a pillar to develop the distinctive organizational culture features within any organization, which express a common language for senior management within any organization or facility. This can clarify the main concepts of the European model of excellence according to what It was reported by Carmeli and Sheaffer (Carmeli, & Sheaffer. 2008) as follows:

**- Adding value to the consumer (the target group):** distinguished organizations and establishments that always aspire for excellence are always working to add value to the target group or the so-called customers and consumers.

**- Developing the organizational capacity of the institution:** as strengthening the capabilities of distinguished organizations and institutions occurs through strengthening their organizational capabilities and through effective management of change within and outside its administrative and organizational boundaries.

**- Harnessing creativity and innovation:** This occurs after the existence of value for distinguished institutions and increasing levels of performance in them through continuous improvement and systematic innovation and harnessing creativity, continuous encouragement and motivation for all workers to creativity and innovation.

**- Leadership and integrity:** a distinguished institution always has leadership that is aware of the future and works to achieve shaping the future by describing leadership as an example for all workers within any institution.

**- Administrative flexibility:** Organizations recognized for their institutional excellence have the capabilities and capabilities to respond to the requirements and needs of the public, continuous renewal, and the efficiency of exploiting opportunities, and facing administrative and organizational challenges.

**- The talents of employees:** success in institutions that seek institutional excellence holds individuals in them a great value, and here the conversation is not at the level of leadership, but rather for all members of the organization.

**- Maintaining distinguished results:** organizations that want to excel must achieve the expected results and not be less than them, by meeting the needs of employees and the public in the short and long term.

**- A clear and developed future vision:** distinguished organizations always have a positive impact on everyone around them, which occurs through enhancing performance and creating a societal renaissance.

The EFQM Management was based on several principles that must be implemented by organizations interested in accessing sustainable institutional work, and these principles are considered a common pillar for senior management within any facility. Norich & Frank. 2017)).

The European Union for Quality has also adopted an annual award for quality that is presented to institutions around the world to spread the culture of excellence and encourage organizations and establishments to strive for excellence through self-evaluation that each institution must conduct to identify its level of excellence, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and the areas that It needs to intervene, improve or modify, according to the aforementioned nine criteria, or based on the institutional evaluation carried out by the body that sponsors the award, and the idea of evaluation was based on measuring the performance of the organization through five stages identified in the results, entry, implementation, evaluation and review, which refer to In English to (Results-Approach-Deployment-Assessment-Review), where these stages are summarized in the word (RADAR). (Ruben & Gigliotti. 2019: 34).

The RADAR logic is a dynamic framework for evaluation and a powerful tool for the organization that provides a structured approach to evaluating the organization's performance. In general, the RADAR logic expresses the organizations 'need for several points as follows:

- Planning and preparing for integrated curricula that achieve the desired results now and in the future.

- Applying the curricula in an organized and appropriate manner to ensure their implementation.

- Defining results as part of any institution's strategy.

- To perform structured analysis, RADAR logic elements are divided into a series of steps

- Curricula evaluation, development and improvement based on monitoring the results achieved and analyzing activities

The European Organization for Quality and Excellence (EFQM) has stated that institutions that adhere to excellence and quality can be classified according to the ladder of excellence based on the European model of excellence as follows:

- Committed to Excellence: 200 - 399 points.

- Recognized for Excellence: 400-599 points.

- World Excellent: 600-1000 points.

**Study Procedures**

This part includes several things, which are as follows:

**Study Limits:** The study included several limits that can be clarified as follows:

Human Limits: The study included human borders that included a sample of university workers.

Spatial Limits: The study was applied in the United Arab Emirates.

**Study Tools:** To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers prepared three questionnaires: Quality of digital life, sustainable security development in light of the EFQM, as follows:

**First: The Digital Quality of Life Questionnaire:** The digital quality of life questionnaire was prepared so that it initially included (45) statements. The questionnaire is confirmed by presenting it to a group of arbitrators so that the terms adopted by the arbitrators were agreed upon, the expressions that were not agreed upon were excluded, and the content of a number of other phrases amended, in addition to calculating the validity of the questionnaire through the internal consistency of the terms of the questionnaire, and the correlation coefficient was verified. Between the terms and the total degree of the questionnaire, so that all the expressions were significant at the 0.05 level, and the alpha coefficient of the expressions was also calculated, which was also significant.

**Second: The Sustainable Security Development Questionnaire:** The Sustainable Security Development Questionnaire was prepared in light of the EFQM, so that (9) sub-factors representing EFQM were included, and each factors included (5) phrases that measure it. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire was verified by presenting it to a group of arbitrators so that the terms adopted by the arbitrators were agreed upon, the expressions that had not been agreed upon were excluded, and the content of a number of other expressions was amended, in addition to calculating the validity of the questionnaire through the internal consistency of the terms of the questionnaire. Checking the correlation coefficient between the expressions and the total degree of the resolution, so that all the expressions were significant at the level of 0.05, and the alpha coefficient was calculated for the expressions, which was also significant.

## IV. FINDINGS

Study findings will be explained first; Then, a discussion of these results will follow in light of previous studies and the theoretical background of the research, where the results of the study questions will be clarified as follows:

**1- Findings of the First Question:** which was: What is the availability of the quality of digital life in light of the applications of EFQM model from the point of view of the study sample? The table shows findings of this question as follows:

**Table (1) means, standard deviations, T-values, and the level of significance for the digital quality of life questionnaire**

| Item Nu | Mean | St.dv | T. Test | Item Arrangement | Importance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.56 | 0.94 | *12.01 | 21 | High |
| 2 | 3.65 | 0.81 | *14.35 | 18 | High |
| 3 | 3.47 | 0.85 | *10.35 | 26 | High |
| 4 | 3.52 | 0.82 | *12.00 | 23 | High |
| 5 | 3.67 | 0.91 | *14.88 | 17 | High |
| 6 | 3.45 | 0.81 | *10.80 | 27 | High |
| 7 | 3.51 | 0.86 | *12.30 | 24 | High |
| 8 | 4.15 | 0.83 | *22.31 | 3 | High |
| 9 | 3.91 | 0.92 | *16.32 | 10 | High |
| 10 | 3.49 | 0.84 | *12.01 | 25 | High |
| 11 | 3.29 | 0.85 | *10.89 | 28 | High |
| 12 | 4.10 | 0.86 | *20.11 | 5 | High |
| 13 | 3.68 | 0.91 | *14.38 | 16 | High |
| 14 | 3.72 | 0.79 | *16.34 | 14 | High |
| 15 | 4.09 | 0.77 | *22.03 | 7 | High |
| 16 | 3.19 | 0.86 | *10.12 | 30 | High |
| 17 | 4.67 | 0.83 | *24.33 | 1 | High |
| 18 | 3.69 | 0.89 | *17.87 | 15 | High |
| 19 | 3.14 | 0.91 | *10.77 | 29 | High |
| 20 | 3.58 | 0.94 | *14.09 | 20 | High |
| 21 | 4.11 | 0.81 | *22.45 | 6 | High |
| 22 | 3.76 | 0.84 | *14.97 | 13 | High |
| 23 | 3.98 | 0.86 | *18.48 | 8 | High |
| 24 | 3.61 | 0.81 | *14.55 | 19 | High |
| 25 | 4.50 | 0.80 | *22.10 | 2 | High |
| 26 | 3.87 | 0.90 | *16.58 | 11 | High |
| 27 | 3.54 | 0.88 | *14.87 | 22 | High |
| 28 | 4.12 | 0.87 | *19.44 | 4 | High |
| 29 | 3.81 | 0.94 | *16.14 | 12 | High |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 3.94 | 0.91 | *18.81 | 9 | High |
| **General Mean** | 3.76 | 0.83 | | | |

*** Tabular (T) value at (0.05≥α) (1.669)**

Findings of table number (1) refer to the mean opinions of the study sample on the atmosphere of digital life, where the means ranged between (3.19) and (4.67), where the statement No. (17) came in the first place: "Information technology eased the suffering of people of determination today" with an means of (4.67) It is higher than the general arithmetic mean, which reached (3.76) and a standard deviation (0.83), while the statement No. (16) "We must communicate with bodies concerned with the quality of digital life" ranked last with an arithmetic mean (3.19), with a standard deviation (0.86), The table shows the low dispersion between the responses of the sample members about the quality of digital life, which reflects the convergence in the views of the sample members about the importance of the quality of digital life, and the table also indicates the convergence between the values of the arithmetic means of the expressions, where it is noticed through the levels of significance that there are no differences Statistical significance inthe views on all statements, as all the levels of significance were less than (0.05) for all paragraphs of the Digital Life Quality of Life Questionnaire, which shows, in general, the importance of the quality of digital life from the viewpoint of the sample members.

**2- Findings of the Second Question:** which was: What is the extent of the availability of sustainable security development in light of the EFQM from the viewpoint of the study sample? Table (2) shows findings of this question as follows:

**Table (2) means, standard deviations, T-values, and the level of significance for the questionnaire for sustainable security development**

| Item Nu | Mean | St.dv | T. Test | Item Arrangement | Importance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.01 | 0.81 | *20.14 | 8 | High |
| 2 | 3.91 | 0.90 | *16.44 | 10 | High |
| 3 | 3.55 | 0.85 | *10.33 | 21 | High |
| 4 | 3.67 | 0.88 | *14.88 | 18 | High |
| 5 | 4.31 | 0.92 | *21.50 | 5 | High |
| 6 | 3.84 | 0.89 | *16.88 | 13 | High |
| 7 | 3.79 | 0.82 | *18.10 | 15 | High |
| 8 | 3.99 | 0.91 | *21.51 | 9 | High |
| 9 | 4.03 | 0.93 | *22.40 | 7 | High |
| 10 | 3.81 | 0.88 | *18.61 | 12 | High |
| 11 | 3.28 | 0.77 | *10.89 | 25 | High |
| 12 | 4.10 | 0.86 | *20.11 | 5 | High |
| 13 | 3.77 | 0.89 | *15.30 | 16 | High |
| 14 | 3.54 | 0.76 | *14.22 | 22 | High |
| 15 | 4.44 | 0.93 | *23.00 | 3 | High |
| 16 | 3.69 | 0.82 | *14.47 | 17 | High |
| 17 | 3.80 | 0.89 | *20.33 | 14 | High |
| 18 | 4.79 | 0.94 | *24.91 | 1 | High |
| 19 | 3.44 | 0.80 | *10.15 | 24 | High |
| 20 | 3.66 | 0.84 | *14.12 | 19 | High |
| 21 | 4.38 | 0.92 | *20.44 | 4 | High |
| 22 | 3.89 | 0.89 | *19.68 | 11 | High |
| 23 | 4.03 | 0.92 | *20.08 | 6 | High |
| 24 | 3.51 | 0.82 | *14.50 | 23 | High |
| 25 | 4.56 | 0.88 | *22.18 | 2 | High |
| **General Mean** | 3.91 | 0.90 | | | |

*** Tabular (T) value at (0.05≥α) (1.669)**

Findings of the second question shows the mean opinions of the study sample on sustainable security development, as the means ranged between (3.28) and (4.79), where the phrase No. (18) came in the first place: "The security establishment provides services in excess of the expectations of the customers" with an average of (4.79), which is higher. From the general arithmetic mean of (3.91) and a standard deviation (0.90), while the statement No. (11) "security institutions allocate time to public complaints" came in last place with an arithmetic mean (3.28), with a standard deviation (0.77), as the table shows the low dispersion. Between the responses of the sample members about their views on sustainable security development, which reflects the convergence of views on the importance of sustainable security development, and the table also indicates the convergence between the values of the arithmetic averages of the expressions, as it is noticed through the levels of significance that there are no statistically significant differences in the points of view. Considering all the statements, all the significance levels were less than (0.05) for all the paragraphs of the sustainable security development questionnaire.

**3- Findings of the Third Question:** which was: Is there a statistically significant impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security development in light of applications of EFQM model from the point of view of the study sample?

To answer this question, simple regression analysis was used to investigate the impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security development in light of the EFQM as follows:

**First: Leadership Standard:** table (3) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the leadership standard in the EFQM Model as follows:

**Table (3) the regression regarding the impact of sustainable security development on the leadership standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leadership | 0.33 | 0.11 | 38.12 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 1.44 | 4.3 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.61 | 5.7 | 0.01 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

The previous table refers to the effect of the quality of digital life on the Leadership standard in the EFQM, where the regression results show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the leadership standard, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.33), at the level of (α 0.05≥), and the coefficient determination ($R^2$) (0.11), which means that its value (0.11) of changes in leadership results from the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient is (1.44), which means that an increase of one degree in the quality of digital life leads to Leadership increased by (1.44), this also confirms the calculated F value, which amounted to (38.12), and that value is a function of (0.05αα), which ultimately indicates the existence of a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for digital quality of life on the Leadership standard in EFQM.

**Second: Policy and Strategy Standard:** table (4) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the policy and strategy standard in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (4) the regression regarding the impact of sustainable security development on the Policy and Strategy standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Policy and Strategy | 0.59 | 0.34 | 119.91 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 1.6 | 6.1 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.71 | 9.9 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

The previous table shows the effect of the quality of digital life on the policy and strategy standard in the EFQM, where the results of the regression show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the policy and strategy standard, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.59), at the level of (α 0.05≥), The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was (0.34), which means that its value (0.34) of changes in policy and strategy resulted from the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient was (0.71), which means that the increase of one degree in the quality of life numeric leads to the increase in the policy and strategy standard by the value of (0.71), and this also confirms the calculated value of F, which amounted to (119.91), and that value is a function of (0.05≥ α), which ultimately indicates the existence of

a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for quality Digital Life is based on the policy and strategy standard of the EFQM.

**Third: Human Resources Standard:** table (5) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the human resources standard in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (5) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the human resources standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Human Resources | 0.62 | 0.38 | 150.5 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 1.7 | 9.2 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.60 | 12.3 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

Findings of table (5) shows the effect of the quality of digital life on the human resources standard in the EFQM, where the regression findings show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the human resources standard, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.62), at the level of (α 0.05≥), It reached ($R^2$) (0.38), which means that its value (0.38) of changes in human resources resulted from the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient was (0.60), which means that an increase of one degree in the quality of digital life leads this indicates the increase in the human resources standard with a value of (0.60), and this also confirms the calculated value of F, which amounted to (150.5), and that value is a function of (0.05≥ α), which indicates the existence of a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for the digital quality of life on the standard Human resources in the EFQM.

**Fourth: Partnership and Resources Standard:** table (6) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the human resources standard in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (6) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the Partnership and Resources standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Partnership& Resources | 0.56 | 0.31 | 86.5 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 1.9 | 8.5 | 0.02 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.53 | 8.8 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

Findings of table (5) shows the effect of the quality of digital life on the standard of partnership and resources in the EFQM, where the results of the regression show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the standard of partnership and resources, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.56), at the level of (α 0.05≥), It reached ($R^2$) (0.31), which means that its value (0.31) of changes in the criteria for partnership and resources resulted from the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient was (0.53), which means that the increase of one degree in the quality of digital life It leads to the increase in the standard of partnership and resources by a value of (0.53), and this also confirms the value of the calculated F, which amounted to (86.5), and that value is a function of (0.05α α), which indicates the existence of a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for the quality of digital life on Partnership and resource standard in the EFQM.

**Fifth: Operations Standard:** table No. (7) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the standard of operations in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (7) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the Operations standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Operations | 0.53 | 0.28 | 122.1 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 1.2 | 4.4 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.63 | 9.5 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

The previous table shows the effect of the quality of digital life on the standard of operations in the EFQM, where the regression results show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the

standard of operations, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.53), at the level of (α 0.05≥), and reached ( $R^2$) (0.28), and this means that its value (0.28) of changes in the standard of operations is a result of the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient is (0.63), which means that an increase of one degree in the quality of digital life leads to an increase In the operations standard with a value of (0.63), this also confirms the calculated value of F, which amounted to (122.1), and that value is a function at the level of (0.05≥ α), which indicates the existence of a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for the quality of digital life on the standard of operations.

**Sixth: Customer Results Standard:** table (8) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the customer outcome standard in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (8) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the Customer Results standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Customer Results | 0.64 | 0.41 | 158.4 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 2.6 | 11.5 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.84 | 14.6 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

The table shows the effect of the quality of digital life on the customer outcome standard, as it is evident that there is a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the customer outcome standard, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.54), at the level of (α 0.05≥), and reached ($R^2$) (0.41), This means that the value (0.41) of the changes in the customer outcome standard is the result of the change in the quality of digital life, and the regression coefficient was (0.84), and this means that an increase of one degree in the quality of digital life leads to an increase in the customer results standard by the value of ( 0.84), and this confirms the calculated F value which was (158.4) which is a function at (0.05≥ α) level, indicating that there is a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for digital quality of life on the customer outcome standard in the EFQM.

**Seventh: Individuals Results Standard:** table (9) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the individual results standard in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (9) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the Individuals Results standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individuals Results | 0.55 | 0.30 | 68.5 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 2.1 | 8.5 | 0.01 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.78 | 10.1 | 0.01 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

Findings of table (9) indicate the effect of the quality of digital life on the outcome standard of individuals in the EFQM and it reached ($R^2$) (0.30), which means that its value (0.30) of changes in the individuals' outcome standard resulted from the change in the quality of digital life, and the regression coefficient was (0.78), which means that an increase of one degree in the quality of life Numeric leads to the increase in the individuals' outcome standard by the value of (0.78), and this confirms the value of the calculated F, which amounted to (68.5), which is a function of (0.05≥ α), indicating a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for the quality of digital life on the individuals results.

**Eighth: Community Results Standard:** table (10) shows the impact of the quality of digital life on the community outcome standard in the EFQM as follows:

**Table (10) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the Community Results standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Community Results | 0.58 | 0.32 | 120.8 | 0.00 | 1 | Constant | 1.6 | 7.6 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | 250 | QDL | 0.61 | 10.8 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

The previous table shows the effect of the quality of digital life on the community outcome standard in the EFQM, where the regression results show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on

the community outcome standard, as the correlation coefficient reached R (0.58), at the level of (α 0.05≥), ($R^2$) reached (0.32), which means that its value (0.32) of changes in the community outcome standard resulted from the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient was (0.61), which means that an increase of one degree in the quality of digital life It leads to an increase in the community outcome standard by a value of (0.61), and this also confirms the calculated value of F, which amounted to (120.8), and that value is a function of (0.05α α), which indicates the existence of a statistically significant effect at the level of (0.05) for the quality of digital life on community outcome standard.

**Ninth: KPI Results Standard:** table (11) shows the impact of digital quality of life on the EFQM of the KPI results standard as follows:

**Table (11) the regression of the impact of sustainable security development on the KPI standard**

| Standard | (R) | ($R^2$) | F | Sig* | DF | β | | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KPI | | | | | 1 | Constant | 1.6 | 7.6 | 0.00 |
| | 0.58 | 0.32 | 120.8 | 0.00 | 250 | QDL | 0.61 | 10.8 | 0.00 |

**F-tabular = 8.02 function at (0.05≥ α) level; Tabular t = 1.6 at (0.05≥ α)**

Findings of table (11) refer to the effect of the quality of digital life on the KPI results standard in the EFQM, where the regression results show a statistically significant effect of the quality of digital life on the KPI results standard, as the correlation coefficient was R (0.33), when A level of (0.05 0.0 α), and ($R^2$) reached (0.11), which means that its value (0.11) of changes in the KPI score results from the change in the quality of digital life, while the regression coefficient is β (0.41), and this It means that an increase of one degree in the quality of digital life leads to an increase in the KPI score of (0.41). This also confirms the calculated F value, which amounted to (33.4), and that value is a function of (0.05≥ α), which indicates an impact Statistically significant at a level (0.05) for the quality of digital life on the KPI score standard in the EFQM.

## V. DISCUSSION

Findings of the current study reached the impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security development in the light of the applications of the EFQM, as it became clear that the quality of digital life is widely available in light of the applications of the EFQM. the findings also indicated that there is a statistically significant impact of the quality of digital life on achieving sustainable security in light of the applications of the EFQM from the viewpoint of the study sample, which were represented in leadership, policy and strategy, human resources, partnership and resources, operations, customer results, personnel results, results of Community, and KPI results.

The findings of the study agree with those indicated by the studies of Ali. Et, al. 2020, Burr. Et, al.2020, Diefenbach, 2018, Cohn, et, al. 2017, AzizulHaq, 2012, as these studies indicated the importance of the quality of digital life so that the digital life of individuals must be enhanced, and the digital skills of individuals must be strengthened and encouraged to enter the digital world, as digital life has indicated in various areas of life, which requires individuals to pay attention. More in their digital life and achieving its quality, while digital life reduced individuals' feelings of psychological and social problems and disorders, which contributed to achieving the so-called electronic well-being and increasing their sense of happiness, and this is confirmed by the current study that the quality of life has become today an important variable and is widely available to individuals.

The results of the present study also confirmed the findings of the studies of Nenadál and Jaroslav. 2020 Turisova. Et, al.2020, Almekhlaf, 2018, Al-Ashqar and Al-Hindawi 2017, Qawasmeh & Al-Bourini, 2016, and Al-Tamimi 2012, which illustrated the role and importance of organizational excellence in light of the EFQM.

The findings are also in agreement with the results of the studies of Solomon 2019, Skripnuk, ET, AL. 2019, Khazali, 2019, Shatti, 2018, Al-Shorouqi, 2018, Granit, ET, AL. 2015, and Al Mazroui 2010, regarding the importance of achieving sustainable security development in any society, and the role of security development in achieving sustainability in general, and good practices have a great role in achieving institutional security excellence, and good security practices should be taken advantage of, as achieving

sustainable security is a requirement. Mainly, in light of the increase in disasters and crises, no form of development can be achieved without achieving security development first.

It is clear from the results of the study that the quality of digital life has a significant impact on achieving sustainable security development by taking advantage of the EFQM, while the quality of digital life can also be achieved if the applications of the EFQM in institutions are adhered to, as well as security development. Sustainable can be achieved when adhering to the applications of the EFQM.

## REFERENCES


1. Al-Ashqar, Ahmad Muhammad Abd al-Salam; And Al-Hindawi, Ahmed Abdel Fattah. 2017. A proposed vision to achieve the institutional excellence of the faculties of Al-Azhar University in light of the European Foundation for Quality Management model. Medlu College of Education, Al-Azhar University, p. 175, pp. 529-611.
2. Al Mazroua, Badr bin Suleiman bin Abdullah 2010. Building a model to achieve excellence in the performance of the security services. PhD Thesis, College of Graduate Studies, Naif University for Security Sciences.
3. Ali, Mohammad Afsharp; Alam, Khorshed& Taylor, Brad. 2020. Does digital inclusion affect quality of life? Evidence from Australian household panel data. Journal of Telematics and Informatics. Vo51.
4. Almekhlaf, Sultan Saeed Abduh. 2018. The Degree of Applying the Criteria of Excellence Management in the Light of the EFQM Excellence Model by the Leadership of King Khalid University from the Point of View of Faculty Members. International Journal for Research in Education, UAEU Vol. 42, issue (3) August, P.P: 155-195.
5. Al-Shatti, Al-Shazly b. 2018. Sustainable development and sustainable security. Journal of Management and Development for Research and Studies. Issue Fourteenth, pp. 118-126.
6. Al-Shorooqi, Khalifa Ali. 2018. The Impact of Human Resources Management Practices on Institutional Excellence in the Ministry of Interior, Kingdom of Bahrain. Master Thesis, Officers Training College, Royal Police Academy, Bahrain.
7. Al-Tamimi, Haitham Atiyah Ismail. 2012. The relationship between the application of the European Excellence Model and institutional performance in the Palestinian Office of Financial and Administrative Control. Master Thesis, Al-Quds University.
8. Atkinson, Robert D.& Castro, Daniel. 2008. Digital Quality of Life: Understanding the Personal and Social Benefits of the Information Technology Revolution (October Available at:
9. Auskienė, Toma, Lank. & Vičienė, Manuela, Tvarona. 2012. security and sustainable development: approaches and dimensions in the globalization context, journal of security and sustainability Issues,1(4): 287–297.
10. AzizulHaq, Nakhat Nasreen& Abdullah, Gamal Ahmed Ahmed. 2012. Impact of Information Technology on Quality of Life and Well – Being of Secondary School Children. International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences, 2(4): 94-102.
11. Batt, R., & Colvin, A. J. 2011. An employment systems approach to turnover: Human resources practices, quits, dismissals, and performance. Academy of management Journal, 54(4), 695-717.
12. Buckley, Finian & Monks, Kathy. 2008. Responding to Managers Learning Needs in an Edge – of-Chaos Environment: Insights from Ireland" Journal of Management Education, Vol. 32, No. 2: 146-163.
13. Buiting. Hilde M. 2020. Importance of Quality-of-Life Measurement Throughout the Disease Course. Jama Network Open. 3(3):e200388. Doi: 10.1001/ jamanetworkopen.2020.0388
14. Burr, Christopher; Tadde, Mariarosaria& Floridi, Luciano. 2020. The Ethics of Digital Well-Being: A Thematic Review Science and Engineering Ethics. 13 Jan, p.p: 117-131.
15. Carmeli, Abraham & Sheaffer, Zachary. 2008. "How Learning Leadership and Organizational Learning from Failures Enhance Perceived Organizational Capacity to Adapt to the Task Environment" The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 44, No. 4: 468-489.
16. Cohn,Jason; Bancilhon, Jean-Marie & Grace Thomas. 2017. Digitally connected living and quality of life: An analysis of the Gauteng City-Region, South Africa. John Wiley & Sons Ltd. Available at:
17. Damant, Jacqueline; Knapp, Martin, Freddolino, Paul P.& Lombard, Daniel. 2016. Effects of Digital Engagement on the Quality of Life of Older people. Health & Social Care in the Community, 6 John Wiley & Sons Ltd, ISSN 0966-0410, DOI: 10.1111/hsc.12335.

18. Diefenbach, Sarah. 2018. The Potential and Challenges of Digital Well-Being Interventions: Positive Technology Research and Design in Light of the Bitter-Sweet Ambivalence of Change. Frontiers in Psychology. Vo 9, p.p: 1- 16.
19. Dubai Police General Headquarters. 2007. Comprehensive quality standards in the field of police work. Dubai, Dubai Police General Headquarters, United Arab Emirates.
20. Gašparík J. & Gašparíková V. 2013. Improvement of Quality Management Level in Construction Company by using EFQM Model, International Journal of Management and Innovation, Vol. 5 Issue 1, p. 47.
21. General Command of Abu Dhabi Police. 2008. Award of His Highness the Minister of Interior for the best position and distinguished officer. Quality and Excellence Team, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.
22. Gilman, Nils. 2011. Climate Change and 'Security. In the Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society, Oxford University Press.
23. Granit, Jakob; Carlsen, Henrik, Marcus Carson, Karl Hallding, Oliver Johnson, Kevin Rosner and Nina Weitz. 2015. Integrating sustainable development and security: An analytical approach with examples from the Middle East and North Africa, the Arctic and Central Asia. Renewable Energy for Development, Stockholm Environment Institute Working Paper No,14.
24. Gui, Marco; Fasoli, Marco& Carradore, Roberto. 2017. "Digital Well-Being". Developing a New Theoretical Tool For Media Literacy Research. Italian Journal of Sociology Of Education, 9 (1), p.p: 155-173).
25. Huffstutler, C. D. & Thomsen, D. 2015. A Framework for Performance Excellence and Success. Frontiers of health services management, 32(1), 45.
26. International Organization for Standardization 2015. ISO 9001: Quality management systems – Requirements. Genève, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization.
27. Khazali, Aqeel Mahmoud 2019. The Sustainable Security Industry: Principles and Foundations. Available at:
28. Luburić, Radoica. 2015. Quality Management Principles and Benefits of their Implementation in Central Banks. Journal of Central Banking Theory and Practice, 2015, 3, pp. 91-121.
29. Menezes, P. H. B., Martins, H. C., & Oliveira, R. R. 2018. The excellence baldrige criteria in the effectiveness of higher education institutions management. Brazilian Business Review, 15(1), 47-67.
30. Meske, Christian; Kissmer, Tobias& Stieglitz. 2018. Global Adoption of Unified Communication Technologies as Part of Digital Transformation in Organizations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Multikonferenz Wirtschaftsinformatik, Lüneburg, Germany.
31. Nenadál, Jaroslav. 2020. The New EFQM Model: What is Really New and Could Be Considered as a Suitable Tool with Respect to Quality 4.0 Concept?. Quality Innovation Prosperity 24(1):17, DOI: 10.12776/qip.v24i1.1415
32. Norich, Kakanie& Frank Biermann. 2017. Governing Through Goals: Sustainable Development Goals as Governance Innovation, London, MIT Press.
33. Ottawa Police Service. 2012. Ensuring Policing Excellence in the City of Ottawa. Ottawa Police Service.
34. Pénard, T. Poussing, N.& Suire, R. 2013. Does the Internet make people happier?. Journal of Socio-Economics, Elsevier, 46, 105-116.
35. Qawasmeh, Farid Mohammad.& Al-Bourini, Faisal A. 2016. Assessing University Excellence Management Practices by using the European Excellence Model according to Students' and Employees' Perspectives in Jadara University. Arab Economic and Business Journal, 11, p.p: 93-104.
36. Rizo, María Antonia Parra& Sanchis, Gema Sanchis-Soler. 2020. Satisfaction with Life, Subjective Well-Being and Functional Skills in Active Older Adults Based on Their Level of Physical Activity Practice. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, , 17, 1299.
37. Ruben, B. D., & Gigliotti, R. A. 2019. The excellence in higher education model: A Baldrige-based tool for organizational assessment and improvement for colleges and universities. Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 38(4), 26-37.
38. Sheffield Hallam .2003. EFQM Excellence Model Higher Education Version 2003, pp. 28-35.
39. South Yorkshire Police. 2015. South Yorkshire Strategy Policing Plan. United Kingdom. South Yorkshire Police Authority.
40. Suleiman, Medhat Abu Bakr Muhammad. 2019. The role of good practices in achieving security institutional excellence. Police Thought, Sharjah Police General Command, Police Research Center., Volume 28, No. 111, P.O.: 157: 200.

41. Turisova, Renata; Sinay, Juraj; Pacaiova, Hana; Kotianova, Zuzana&Glatz, Juraj 2020. Application of the EFQM Model to Assess the Readiness and Sustainability of the Implementation of I4.0 in Slovakian Companies. Sustainability, 12, 5591; doi:10.3390/su12145591
42. UAE Government website, 2020: The National Strategy for Wellbeing 2031. Available at the following link: https://cutt.us/7MuyZ
43. Ventegodt, Soren. 2013. Quality of working life research: I. Quality of life, happiness and meaning of life. International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 7(2):117-125.
44. World Health Organization (WHO). 2012. IPAQ. Quality of Life e (Versión 2.0. Español). 2012. Available online:
45. http://www.who.int/chp/steps/instrument/es/index/htm
46. https://cutt.us/4Gw6u
47. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/isd2.12010
48. SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1278185 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1278185
49. -Valadbigi, Akbar& Shahab Ghobadi. 2010. Sustainable Development and Environmental Challenges. European journal of social sciences, vol13, N04.