

An Empirical Study on Lean and Its Impact on Sustainability in Services

Fabiane Letícia Lizarelli¹ (fabiane@dep.ufscar.br)

Ayon Chakraborty² (a.chakraborty@federation.edu.au)*

Jiju Antony³ (jiju346@googlemail.com)

Sandy Furterer^{4*} (furterer.6@osu.edu)

Maher Maalouf⁵ (maher.maalouf@ku.ac.ae)

Matheus Borges Carneiro¹ (matheusborgescarneiro2011@gmail.com)

¹Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Department of Production Engineering, Rod. Washington Luís, Km. 235, 13560-905, Brazil

²Federation University, Institute of Innovation, Science, and Sustainability, Ballarat, VIC 3350, Australia

³Department of Marketing, Operations and Systems, Northumbria University, Newcastle, England, UK

⁴The Ohio State University, Department of Integrated Systems Engineering Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA

⁵Khalifa University, Industrial and Systems Engineering, Abu Dhabi, UAE

**Corresponding Author*

Abstract

Purpose: Lean implementation has become popular over the past three decades in the industry and is becoming more prevalent in, service organizations. The objective of this study is to evaluate the impact of social and technical Lean practices on sustainable performance (i.e., economic, environmental and social) in service organizations.

Design/methodology/approach: The methodology includes the analysis of global results obtained from 139 managers from the service sector.

Findings: The results demonstrate that Lean practices have a positive effect on the three perspectives of sustainable performance, regardless of the company size and duration of Lean implementation. Furthermore, both social and technical Lean practices have a similar impact on environmental and economic performance, but their impact on social performance differs, since social Lean practices have a stronger impact on social performance.

Originality: Majority of existing studies focused on the isolated impact of Lean on one of the triple bottom line performance aspects and with a scarcity of studies within the context of services. The intersection of these three strategic areas - Lean, sustainability, and services - has not been extensively addressed. There is also a lack of studies that observe sustainability in environmental, social and economic performance, mainly in the service sector.

Practical implications: This study has a significant contribution to Lean practitioners in service sectors, as it demonstrates that efforts to apply Lean practices can benefit economic results as well as environmental and social performance.

Keywords: Lean practices, socio-technical system, sustainability, performance.

1. Introduction

In recent years, academics and practitioners have widely recognized the benefits of implementing Lean for the service industry (Caiado et al., 2018). The Lean implementation in service organizations is mentioned as Lean service and the first reports on the theme date back to the late 1990s and early 2000s (Tortorella et al., 2021). Therefore, Lean service is a recent concept compared to Lean Manufacturing (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014; Gupta and Sharma, 2018), which has been the focus of interest of operations management for over four decades (Petrusch et al., 2019). Lean service, like

Lean Manufacturing, seeks to eliminate waste from service processes to improve value for the customer (Hadid et al., 2016; Hadid 2019).

The inherent differences between services and manufacturing make it important to study a phenomenon such as Lean in a specific context (Gupta and Sharma, 2018). Services permeate all aspects of a modern economy (Lins et al., 2019). In addition to its importance for the economy, service companies face customer demands for better quality service, and managerial demands for cost reduction (Lins et al., 2019). On the other hand, Lean has been increasingly used to improve efficiency and reduce waste in both service and production firms (Hussain et al., 2019). Furthermore, companies in the service sector are adopting Lean to achieve economic, social, and environmental aspects of sustainable performance (Morell-Santandreu et al., 2021).

Lean service can be understood as a socio-technical system (STS) and should be implemented as such (Hadid et al., 2016; Malik and Abdallah, 2020). STS assumes that organizations comprise two components: technical and social (Abdallah et al., 2019; Hadid and Mansouri, 2014; Hadid et al., 2016). The social aspects comprise training, reward and recognition, employee involvement, and continuous improvement, while the technical aspect includes continuous flow, work standardization, visual control and Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) (Alsmadi et al., 2012; Haddid et al., 2016). Past studies have failed to sufficiently address the importance of social factors for successful Lean implementations as the emphasis is mostly on the technical aspect (Malik and Abdallah, 2020).

However, research exploring the potential of Lean management in services in general and for specific service sectors is still scarce (Syltevik et al., 2018). Although there are several studies proposing models for Lean assessment in the manufacturing context, there is a lack of models implementing and assessing Lean in the service context (Carlborg et al.

2013; Danese et al., 2018). There is an even greater lack of research aimed at evaluating the impact of Lean on the sustainability of service companies and chains in terms of triple bottom line (economic, environmental and social) aspects (Caiado et al., 2018; Hussain et al., 2019; Awad et al., 2022). Today, achieving sustainability in terms of economic, environmental, and social performance is an important part of many service organizations' business goals and strategies (Lagrosen and Lagrosen, 2019; Hussain et al., 2019). To attain sustainability, it is clearly stressed that economic, social and environmental performance are needed to be equally utilized as metrics (Anuar et al., 2018, Hines et al., 2019). However, the majority of existing studies focused on the isolated impact of Lean on one of the triple bottom line performance aspects and with a scarcity of studies within the context of services (Hussain et al., 2019). The intersection of these three strategic areas - Lean, sustainability, and services - has not been extensively addressed (Caiado et al., 2018).

There is also a lack of studies that observe sustainability in environmental, social and economic performance, mainly in the service sector (Anuar et al., 2018; Hussain et al., 2019; Caiado et al., 2018; Lizarelli et al., 2022). Therefore, the objective of this paper is to assess the impacts of Lean's social and technical practices on economic, social and environmental performance and service companies around the world.

To achieve the proposed objective, this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a review of relevant literature on Lean service and on the relationship between Lean and the three dimensions of sustainability, as well as the study hypotheses. Section 3 presents the research method, while the results are presented in Section 4. Section 5 presents the conclusion of the work, implications, limitations and directions for future research.

2. Literature review and research hypotheses

2.1. Lean service

Lean has been primarily applied to improve manufacturing processes (Alsmadi et al., 2012; Gupta and Sharma, 2018), and the benefits through Lean for these organizations have led to the spread of its application to other industry sectors, such as the service sector (Suarez-Barraza et al., 2012; Caiado et al., 2018). Lean provides a framework with principles, tools, and practices to organize and improve processes, identify the value delivered to the customer and continuously increase efficiency and quality (Malmbrandt and Ahlstrom, 2013; Petrusch and Vaccaro, 2019). Service organizations are putting efforts to improve service quality, productivity, and profitability by incorporating Lean principles (Morales-Centreras et al., 2020; Vadivel et al., 2021).

The absence of adequate tools that accurately measure productivity and its improvement has led to the use of the Lean service, along with the emergence of topics such as service wastes into the service industry (Morales-Centreras et al., 2020). Lean service can assist in the identification of waste, by applying Lean production concepts to service operations (Sum et al., 2020). In this way, Lean Service can be seen as a strategic approach that places customers as a central focus and invests in mechanisms for employee engagement at the team and individual level (Caiado et al., 2018).

The idea of transferring production concepts from manufacturing to services is not new (Petrusch et al., 2019). When Womack and Jones (1996) formally introduced the concept of Lean thinking, through the five principles (value, value stream, flow, pull, and perfection), a bridge was established that enabled the transfer of concepts of manufacturing to non-manufacturing processes (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014; Petrusch et al., 2019). This expanded the applicability of the Lean system to the service sector, which later spread throughout to all types of service industries (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014; Petrusch et al., 2019; Hadid, 2019). Gradually, Lean implementation has shown its

popularity in healthcare, education, public services, hospitality, financial and information technology industries (Vadivel et al., 2021; Tortorella et al., 2021).

2.2.Social and technical Lean practices

For service organizations to achieve the best possible benefits through Lean implementation, it has to be seen as a socio-technical system (STS) (Hadid et al., 2016).

The STS model considers each organization to be composed of a social subsystem of people and structural components and a technical sub-system of technology and production process elements (Centauri et al., 2018).

The two distinctive sides of Lean, i.e., social and technical sides can work independently and together to improve the firm's performance (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014; Malik and Abdallah, 2020). Therefore, it is important for researchers to measure the level of adoption of social (soft) and technical (hard) practices to precisely capture the effectiveness of Lean service in advancing the firm's performance (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014).

On the Lean technical practices side, different practices play different roles in achieving the goal of increasing value-adding activities and decreasing non-value-adding ones in service companies (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014). A full understanding of the contribution of each set of practices, as well as their inter-relationship, is essential for managers to achieve the desired results (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014). Lean social practices emphasize human resources and refer to human-related activities such as employee engagement and employee involvement (Vadivel et al., 2021).

2.3 Lean and sustainability

Driving companies towards sustainability will require changes in their performance considering the triple bottom line (Elkington, 1997). The triple bottom line focuses on economic prosperity, environmental quality, and social equity (Elkington, 1997).

Sustainable operations integrate the profit and efficiency orientation with broader considerations of the company's internal and external stakeholders and its environmental impact (Kleindorfer et al., 2005). The environmental perspective concerns environmentally sustainable practices, which seek to minimize the environmental impact of human action, the ecological footprint, energy consumption and waste production. The social perspective deals with fair and beneficial practices for the community, in which the organization generates an interdependence between all parties involved. The economic perspective refers to economic value and financial performance (Pederneiras et al., 2023). A sustainable organization adopts practices which respond to the social, environment, and economic impact (Klein et al., 2021).

There is a premise about a causal relationship between the adoption of Lean practices and sustainability based on the triple bottom line concept, for both manufacturing and service companies (Kleindorfer et al., 2005; Klein et al., 2021). Lean application in services can lead to the reduction of waste, which can reduce the environmental impact, increase efficiency and reduce organizational costs, also impacting economic performance (Gupta and Sharma, 2018; Klein et al., 2021). Lean is related to social issues, such as workers' recognition and employee involvement, with a focus on safety, qualification and training (Klein et al., 2021). However, measuring sustainability is difficult in the service sector as well as grouping indicators in broad sustainability areas (economic, environmental, and social) is even more difficult (Lee et al., 2012; Marin-Garcia et al., 2021). Hence, it is a challenge to establish indicators and measure environmental and social aspects for services (Marin-Garcia et al., 2021).

Despite the importance and possible connections of Lean and its impact on sustainability perspectives (economic, social, environmental), there is a paucity of research on these relationships in the service sector (Caiado et al., 2018; Hussain et al., 2019). In addition,

this scarcity is even greater when Lean is observed as a socio-technical system, there is a scarcity of studies that observe the social and technical Lean systems and the triple bottom line perspectives (Anuar et al., 2018).

2.3.1 Lean and economic sustainability

Results highlighted the importance of implementing Lean practices such as STS and its capacity to improve performance (Hadid, 2019). There is evidence in several service sectors that Lean implementation positively impacts service organizations' performance (Tortorella et al., 2021). Since Lean objectives of efficiency and improvement are defined in terms of cost reduction (Zirar et al., 2021), then the use of Lean principles to improve the efficiency of services has a massive impact on economic performance (Gupta and Sharma, 2018).

Hadid and Mansouri (2014) investigated the impact of Lean services such as STS on the firm's performance and showed the impact of the different roles of each set of practices (social and technical) in improving firm performance. LTP and LSP were found to independently improve firm performance (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014). Vadivel et al. (2021) also confirmed that LTP and LSP are positively significant in operational performance and its effectiveness in postal service firms (Vadivel et al., 2021). Other studies also confirm the promising effect of Lean service on financial performance (Hadid, 2019). Two of the Lean service factors (process factor, physical structure factor) are found to positively influence profit per employee and return on capital employed (Hadid, 2019). However, Hadid et al. (2016) identified that social practices of Lean service had a positive impact on firm operational and financial performance, while technical practices had a positive effect on only the operational performance (Hadid et al., 2016). Sahoo (2020) shows that Lean social practices influence business performance by influencing LTPs, proving synergies exist between these factors.

Additionally, the application of Lean in service, specifically in healthcare, has been met with mixed results related to the impacts on financial performance (Dobrzykowski et al., 2016). Fewer studies have proven that Lean healthcare practices have a direct influence on operational performance (Anuar et al., 2018). The study conducted by Dobrzykowski et al. (2016) failed to demonstrate a relationship between Lean and financial performance, measured by net income, in hospitals. The inconsistency in research findings demonstrates the need to further examine factors that impact economic performance (Dobrzykowski et al., 2016). Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1a: Lean Technical Practices have a positive impact on the economic performance of service organizations

H1b: Lean Social Practices have a positive impact on the economic performance of service organizations

2.3.2 Lean and environmental sustainability

There is a potential relationship between Lean's waste elimination focus and environmental goals (Gupta and Sharma, 2018; Klein et al., 2021). The literature shows that operational Lean efficiency efforts can provide opportunities to balance both economic and environmental impacts (Zhu et al., 2018). The Lean focus of doing more with less are essential for leading to the reduction of their environmental impacts, conserving energy and natural resources, being safe for their employees, their communities and, lastly their consumers (Klein et al., 2022). Through a literature review, the authors identified that the majority of the research on the application of Lean and Green practices has talked about them as a complementary and integrated approach (Caiado et al., 2018). However, that may not always be the case, since there are conflicting results also observed in several studies (Zhu et al., 2018). Further it is observed

that studies on the application of Lean methodology and its relationship with sustainable performance in a service enterprise are missing (Caiado et al., 2018).

The relation of Lean with environmental performance in the context of services is a missing link in the published literature (Marin-Garcia et al., 2021). For example, Lean initiatives in a service setting such as in healthcare operations are more focused on internal efficiency than on internal or external environmental benefits (Zhu et al., 2018). In the context of healthcare, the Lean philosophy contributes greater value towards economic and social sustainability, with limited impact on environmental sustainability (Morell-Santandreu et al., 2021). Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H2a: Lean Technical Practices have a positive impact on the environmental performance of service organizations

H2b: Lean Social Practices have a positive impact on the environmental performance of service organizations

3. Lean and social sustainability

Previous studies highlighted the relationship between Lean implementation and financial performance in the healthcare setting. However, those studies did not report any relationship due to Lean implementation on social and environmental performance for service organizations (Anuar et al., 2018). There is a dearth of studies that observe social indicators and Lean tools in the service sector (Marin-Garcia et al., 2021). Managers of organizations adopting Lean need to give thoughtful attention to human resource practices, since employees are the assets who support the processes that provide value to customers (Zirar et al., 2021). Kaizen, quality and productive maintenance were found to be indirectly linked to social aspects (i.e., improving the image and work environment) (Hussain et al., 2019). The study by Hussain et al. (2019), suggests positively moderate impact of Lean practices on social sustainability in the hospitality sector (Hussain et al.,

2019). The applicability of the Lean methodology in healthcare makes it possible to achieve better social sustainability. This is due to better employee involvement and reduced work-related stress because of the adaptation and continuous change of protocols to suit the needs of the employees and their environment (Morell-Santandreu et al., 2021). Therefore, there is a possibility of a potential relationship between the implementation of Lean and the indicators of social sustainability. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H3a: Lean Technical Practices have a positive impact on the social performance of service organizations

H3b: Lean Social Practices have a positive impact on the social performance of service organizations

3.1 Size and implementation time

Previous studies have noted that company size was considered as an important variable that could influence the proposed relationships in service companies (Hadid and Mansouri, 2014; Dobrzykowski et al., 2016; Hadid, 2019) and was operationalized by the total number of employees of the company. Another variable was the Lean implementation time, which can also affect the goals of Lean projects and actions.

4. Research Method

A global survey of large, small, and medium-sized service enterprises was conducted in five continents. The service companies surveyed were located in Europe, Asia, North America, South America, Australia, and Oceania. As with similar previous studies in Lean (e.g., Antony 2020; Antony and Sony, 2021), the survey sought to observe companies on different continents to present a global view of the relationships studied. The sampling and data collection procedures are described in Section 4.1, the development of the research instrument and variables are presented in Section 4.2,

response bias and common method variance is discussed in Section 4.3 and, finally, the data analysis approach is outlined in Section 4.4.

4.1 Sampling and data collection

The target population of the study was those responsible for the Lean program or Lean consultants from service companies. Respondents were selected on corporate social media from professionals with experience in Lean and service companies. Many researchers are exploring data from social media platforms to investigate management practices (Secchi and Camuffo, 2019; Potter, 2021). One of the main social media platforms used was LinkedIn, where professionals from all over the world have accurate information about their experience and skills, including Lean manufacturing skills (Potter, 2021). Target respondents were contacted via LinkedIn and received a brief explanation about the study with the question about their interest in responding to the study voluntarily. After accepting to participate in the survey, the online questionnaire, developed on the Google Forms platform, was sent. The confirmation that the professional was dedicated part- or full-time to Lean and worked in a service company was made through the questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to 600 potential respondents, obtaining 139 completed valid responses.

Before data analysis, the 139 surveys were examined to check missing data, suspicious response patterns (straight lining or inconsistent answers), and outliers, to ensure data quality (Hair et al., 2017). There were no suspicious response patterns, nor missing data in the questions related to the variables and outliers. The outlier analysis was performed using the Mahalanobis distance, which is one of the most used approaches for outlier detection, mainly in multivariate data (Dai, 2020). Therefore, the final sample consisted of 139 responses from professionals from service companies from different sectors. The sample size complies with the main rules for determining the minimum sample size for

the PLS path model. Considering the 10 times rule, the sample is sufficient, since it has 10 times the number of independent variables in the structural model (minimum sample size of 20) (Hair et al., 2017). Considering the minimum R-squared method, which observes the maximum number of arrows pointing at a construct, significance level and minimum R^2 value, the minimum sample size should be 90 (two predictors, 5% significance level and $R^2=0.1$) (Kock and Hadaya, 2016; Hair et al., 2017). The inverse square root method was also observed, in which the minimum sample would be 128 (Kock and Hadaya, 2016).

Table 1 shows that most respondents (60%) are dedicated full-time to Lean. The respondents' position that occurred the most in the sample was senior manager (25%), Lean manager (22%) and continuous improvement or operational excellence manager (17%). The respondents' profiles show that they are qualified to answer the questions.

<<<<Table 1– Respondent description >>>>

As the purpose of the survey was to obtain a global view of the relationships studied, the sample is composed of companies from five continents (Table 2). The companies in the sample belong mainly to the following service sectors. Most of the sample has Lean implemented for more than 5 years (57%) while most of the organizations (64%) have more than 500 employees.

<<<<Table 2 – Characteristics of companies>>>>

4.2 Research instrument and variables

The research was divided into three sections: information for characterizing the company and respondent, use of Lean social and technical practices and, finally, sustainability performance. In the first section, information was collected about the respondent's position, dedication to Lean activities, organization location, sector, number of employees and Lean implementation time. Part two focused on the use of social and technical Lean

practices and part three focused on sustainability, social, economic, and environmental performance variables. The choice of scales for measurement, including the variables for each construct, were based on previously published data in the literature about scales and surveys on Lean practices and sustainability performance in service organizations. The constructs are multi-item, to capture the theoretical domain of the construct and thus demonstrate content validity (Hinkin, 1998; Malhotra; Grover, 1998; Hair et al., 2017).

The pretest was developed in two steps, the first was a content analysis, asking the experts if they agreed with the items in each construct, to ensure that the items represented the construct (Hinkin, 1998). In the second, following the recommendation of Forza (2002), the questionnaire was sent to four academic experts, who research Lean and are reviewers of renowned journals, seven experts with Lean experience in the service sector and three target respondents to verify the clarity of the questions, the questionnaire format and the scale of items. There was no need to make significant changes.

The themes of this study, social and technical Lean practices, and sustainability performance in service organizations are recent in the literature. To guarantee the construct validity, well-known constructs and variables found in the literature were used as the basis for the questionnaire. A conceptual model was made considering two second-order hierarchical constructs (social and technical Lean practices). The main references for social and technical practices were Alsmadi et al. (2012); Malmbrandt and Ahlstrom (2013); Hadid et al. (2016); Kundo and Manohar (2016). The second-order construct for technical Lean practices is effectively represented by seven first-order constructs: *customer involvement, continuous flow, pull, supplier feedback, TPM, visual control and work standardization*. The second-order construct for Social Lean practices is effectively represented by six first-order constructs: *continuous improvement culture, employee involvement, leadership, multifunctional employees, training and people development,*

reward and recognition. For sustainability performance, three reflective constructs were observed: economic, social and environmental performance, based on Maletič et al. (2020) and Fernando et al. (2019). For these sections, a seven-point Likert scale, varying from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”) was used (Malhotra, 2014; Hair *et al.*, 2017). Table 3 shows the second and first order constructs, the items and the literature consulted.

<<<<Table 3 – Constructs, variables, and references>>>>

4.3 Response and common method bias

Common method variance (CMV) is a potential problem, which may be associated to a bias in answering questions, causing the indicators to share a certain amount of common variation (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). The potential for CMV occurs in cross-functional survey design when a single informant is used to gather data about dependent and independent variables (Guide and Ketokivi, 2015). Nevertheless, some recommendations were applied to reduce CMV (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003): i) guarantee of anonymity of respondents; ii) indication that there are no right or wrong answers; iii) the respondent's knowledge of the research topics; iv) multi-item constructs to ensure the conceptual domain; and v) distinct format between the dependent and independent variables. Additionally, the Harman's Single Factor Test was performed to address CMV, the test consists of loading all the variables into an exploratory factor analysis and check the covariance among the measures in one factor, what should not be the majority to ensure there is no CMV (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). The test showed that less than 50% of all variance was explained by the single factor (39.9%), thus ensuring that CMV was not a major concern. To test for possible non-response bias was verified if the answers of the early and late respondents are similar, using Levene's test and a t-test to verify equality of variance and means, respectively (Armstrong and Overton, 1977; Gastwirth *et al.*,

2009). No difference was identified in the mean or variance of any variable considering a significance of 5%.

4.4 Data analysis

There is a growing number of articles using Partial Least Squares - Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in business research, including different disciplines such as organization research and strategic management (Ringle et al., 2018). This choice stems from several factors, including the ability to handle very complex models as higher-order models with many indicators and constructs (Hair et al., 2017; Ringle et al., 2018). Additionally, PLS-SEM is suitable for non-parametric scaling (ordinal measurement) and handles small sample sizes with the required level of care (Hair et al., 2017; Ringle et al., 2018; Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019). To verify if the sample of 139 surveys was adequate for the analysis of the model, three rules for minimum suitable size were observed: (i) the ten times rule (minimum sample of 20 for the model), (ii) the minimum R-squared method (minimum sample of 88) and the inverse square root method (minimum sample of 128) (Hair *et al.*, 2017; Kock and Hadaya, 2016).

A conceptual model with second-order constructs was chosen because it allows complex and on a more abstract dimension (higher-order), constructs to be measured by their more concrete subdimensions (lower-order) (Sarstedt et al., 2019). In the case of the present research, the constructs of social and technical Lean practices can be evaluated by concrete practices used in companies, however, these are diverse, requiring different constructs. This type of model requires specific approaches to be analyzed in the PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2018; Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019). The disjoint two-stage approach was used to analyze the higher-order model (Hair et al., 2018; Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019). This approach consists of considering only the lower-order components of the higher-order construct in stage one, which will generate construct scores. These scores will be used in the second

stage to evaluate the structural model (Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019).

The research model is depicted in Figure 1

<<< Figure 1 – Research model >>>>

5 Results and Discussion of findings

5.1 Validation of measurement model and hypotheses

The measurement model assessment aims to verify if the model satisfies all relevant criteria for reflective constructs: (1) internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha (CA), composite reliability (CR), that must be above 0.70; (ii) convergent validity, evaluated by the indicator reliability, in which the outer loadings for all indicators should be statistically significant and higher than 0.708 and Average Variance Extracted – AVE, which should be higher than 0.5; (iii) and discriminant validity, assessed by heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), which should be less than 0.90 (Hair *et al.*, 2017, 2018; Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019).

The model assessment first focuses on the lower-order components, and in stage two, it used the latent variable scores of the lower-order components obtained from stage one to estimate the model's criteria (Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019). Some items in lower-order constructs (EINV4, CIC2, LEAD2 and MENP1) were removed because they did not meet the threshold for indicator reliability or discriminant validity. Table 4 shows the results of the model measurement for first and second-order constructs. All lower-order and higher-order constructs meet the composite reliability and convergent validity criteria (Table 4).

<<<<Table 4 – Convergent validity and reliability results>>>>

Discriminant validity measures the distinctiveness of a construct ensuring that a construct measure is empirically unique and can be accessed via the HTMT criterion, which is the ratio of the between-trait correlations to the within trait correlations (Henseler *et al.*,

2015). HTMT has a 0.90 cutoff score for interpreting the results (Hair *et al.*, 2017; 2018). The discriminant validity between the higher-order construct and the lower-order construct is not of concern as conceptual and empirical redundancies are expected (Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019), therefore these relations are given. The HTMT results are shown in Table 5.

<<<<Table 5 – HTMT results>>>>

After assessing the measurement model, the structural model, which displays the relationships between the constructs, was evaluated (Hair *et al.*, 2017). Latent variable scores for the lower-order constructs were used to estimate the structural model, which encompasses the collinearity between constructs (via the inner VIF values), significance and relevance of the path coefficients, the effect size (f^2) and explanatory (R^2) and predictive power (Hair *et al.*, 2018; 2020; Sarstedt *et al.*, 2019). Table 6 shows that the model has no collinearity problems, since the inner VIF values were less than 5.0 (Hair *et al.*, 2017). The bootstrapping procedure (5000 sub-samples) was used to verify path coefficient significance and relevance for hypothesis testing (Hair *et al.*, 2018; 2020).

<<<<Table 6 – Hypothesis testing (bootstrapping method - 5000 sub-samples)>>>>

The results in Table 6 show that all hypotheses were validated. The technical Lean practices have a positive and statistically significant impact on economic performance ($\beta = 0.413$; p -value = 0.001), environmental performance ($\beta = 0.411$; p -value = <0.001) and on social performance ($\beta = 0.219$; p -value = 0.036). Social Lean practices impacts directly and positively affects economic performance ($\beta = 0.422$; p -value = 0.001), environmental performance ($\beta = 0.413$; p -value = <0.001) and social performance ($\beta = 0.599$; p -value = <0.001). The PLS-SEM allows comparing the intensities of the relationships between the

constructs (Hair et al., 2017). Furthermore, the f^2 effect size measures the importance of a specific construct to explain other endogenous latent variables (Hair et al., 2018). f^2 values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, represent respectively small, medium, and large effects (Cohen, 1988). The results show that the impact of social and technical Lean practices has a similar effect on economic and environmental performance, observing both the magnitude of the path coefficient and f^2 . However, Table 6 shows that social Lean practices have a large effect ($f^2=0.337$; $\beta = 0.599$) on social performance, while technical Lean practices has a small effect on social performance ($f^2=0.045$; $\beta = 0.219$).

Producing generalizable findings requires assessing whether the results not only apply to in-sample data (data that have been used in the model estimation process), but also to out-of-sample data sets (Shmueli et al., 2019; Hair et al., 2020). The coefficient of determination (R^2) measures the in-sample predictive power and research context determines acceptable R^2 levels (Hair et al., 2017; Shmueli et al., 2019). Table III shows that the three endogenous constructs, economic performance, environmental performance, and social performance are highly explained by the exogenous constructs ($R^2 = >0.611$). To assess the statistical model's predictive power, was confirmed: i) the PLS-SEM Q^2_{predict} values are higher than 0 for all items; ii) the PLS-SEM values for the mean absolute error (MAE) was smaller than the values given by the linear regression model (LM) results for all items (Shmueli et al., 2019). This suggests that the model has high predictive power (Shmueli et al., 2019). Therefore, the structural model showed both in-sample and out-sample predictive power (Shmueli et al., 2019).

5.2 Multigroup analysis

We considered the Lean implementation time and company size variables that could imply heterogeneity and differences in the model. Both variables were transformed to binary for this test. Lean implementation time was considered from 0 to 5 years and more

than 5 years. Company size considered the number of employees, less than 250 was considered small or medium and companies with more than 250 employees were considered large. A multigroup analysis test was applied to verify the moderating effect results for all relationships (Sarstedt et al., 2011; Hair et al., 2018). The multigroup test was applied via permutation, and the first step was to verify the configural and compositional invariance assessed using the Measurement Invariance of Composite Models (MICOM) procedure (Henseler *et al.*, 2016; Hair *et al.*, 2018). The MICOM procedure must guarantee configural invariance (identical indicators, data treatment and identical algorithm settings across groups) and compositional invariance (the composite scores do not significantly differ across groups) so that multigroup analysis is applied (Hair *et al.*, 2018). The second step was to verify differences in the path coefficients in the permutation test (Hair *et al.*, 2018) considering the groups for time and size. There were no statistical differences in the path coefficients either for the two different Lean implementation time groups or for the two groups of company sizes (all p-values>0.05) (Table 7). Therefore, the results indicate that the hypotheses are confirmed and consistent regardless of the Lean implementation time and the size of the service company.

<<<<Table 7 – Multigroup analysis (Permutation)>>>>

6. Conclusion, Implications, Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Identifying the gap in the present body of work, this study through a global survey presents insights on Lean implementation and its effect on sustainable performance from different service organizations.

Our analyses show that both technical and social Lean practices have a positive impact on sustainable performance and its indicators such as environmental, economic and social performance. While comparing the effects it is observed that both technical and social Lean practices have a similar effect on environmental and economic performance, but

their effect varies for social performance. Social Lean practices have a greater effect on social performance, which shows the importance of focus on continuous change in the system to align well with employees and their well-being (Morell-Santandreu et al., 2021). We also analysed the model from the perspectives of Lean implementation duration and company size. A multigroup analysis test was conducted to understand the moderating effect of the relationships and it is observed that the model is not affected either by implementation duration or by company size.

6.1 Implications

The study fills the gap of empirical studies in the field as mentioned by several authors such as Hadid and Mansouri (2014) and Hadid et al. (2016). They highlighted the lack of empirical studies in the Lean services research area. The study helped in understanding the effect of technical and social Lean practices on environmental, economic, and social performance. Thus, it provides an understanding of technical and social Lean practices and their impact in this sector, which has its own characteristics and dynamics (Alsmadi et al., 2012; Gupta et al., 2016). This study advances the current body of work by providing an empirical model showing how sustainable performance indicators are affected by technical and social Lean practices and thus making the findings relevant for both theory and practice (Moisescu, 2018; Ali et al., 2020). As we have observed from the literature that the discussion is still limited on the relation between sustainable performance and Lean practices. Thus, our research provides an indication for future researchers to start focusing on individual performance, i.e., environmental, economic, and social and their relationship with technical and social Lean practices. Analysis also highlights that technical Lean practices have more effect on economic performance whereas Social Lean practices have more effect on social performance. This is useful information for practicing managers to focus both on technical and social side of Lean to enhance both economic and social performance. Further our study shows that there is no effect of company size and implementation time on achieving sustainable performance through the two Lean practices.

An earlier study by Lizarelli, et al. (2022) suggests, awareness of managers towards technical and social Lean practices as they are complementary and further focusing on social practices strengthen all the dimensions of sustainability. The current research is also helpful for service managers who are adopting or wanting to implement Lean service. As company size and implementation time does not affect sustainable performance so, managers can focus more on developing a system for better employee involvement. This is also observed from our analyses where we found that social Lean practices have a better effect on social performance. Thus, this study is valuable for organizational leaders and managers alike as they can confidently implement both Lean practices for achieving triple bottom line while simultaneously satisfying customers.

6.2 Limitations and future studies

Very few empirical studies have focused on linking Lean practices with sustainable performance in the service sector. Thus, the literature addressing the link between technical and social Lean practices with sustainable performance is limited. The survey conducted provides a cross-sectional data, which has its inherent limitations such as lack of dimension of time, recall bias, and difficulty in inferring causality due to issues in establishing time related sequence (Connelly, 2016). Hence in the future the focus will be to have longitudinal studies to gain deeper insights in understanding how Lean practices are implemented and their impact on environmental, economic, and social performance. Finally, future studies can include a multi-methods study such as a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods to provide deeper insights and allow for a greater level of generalizability of the study results.

References

- Abdallah, A. B., Dahiyat, S. E., & Matsui, Y. (2019). Lean management and innovation performance: Evidence from international manufacturing companies. *Management Research Review, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 239-262.*
- Ali, Y., Younus, A., Khan, A. U., & Pervez, H. (2020). Impact of Lean, Six Sigma and environmental sustainability on the performance of SMEs. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 70(8), 2294-2318.*

- Alsmadi, M., Almani, A., & Jerisat, R. (2012). A comparative analysis of Lean practices and performance in the UK manufacturing and service sector firms. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 23(3-4), 381-396.
- Antony, J., & Sony, M. (2021). An empirical study into qualifications and skills of quality management practitioners in contemporary organizations: results from a global survey and agenda for future research. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*.
- Antony, J., Lizarelli, F. L., & Fernandes, M. M. (2020). A global study into the reasons for lean six sigma project failures: Key findings and directions for further research. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*.
- Anuar, A., Saad, R., & Yusoff, R. Z. (2018). Sustainability through lean healthcare and operational performance in the private hospitals: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management (IJSCM)*, 7(5), 221-227.
- Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S., 1977. Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of marketing research*, 14(3), 396-402.
- Awad, M.M., Hashem, A.E. and Naguib, H.M., 2022. The Impact of Lean Management Practices on Economic Sustainability in Services Sector. *Sustainability*, 14(15), p.9323.
- Bortolotti, T., Boscari, S., & Danese, P. (2015). Successful lean implementation: Organizational culture and soft lean practices. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 160, 182-201.
- Caiado, R., Nascimento, D., Quelhas, O., Tortorella, G., & Rangel, L. (2018). Towards sustainability through green, lean and six sigma integration at service industry: Review and framework. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 24(4), 1659–1678.
- Carlborg, P., Kindström, D. and Kowalkowski, C., 2013. A lean approach for service productivity improvements: synergy or oxymoron?. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 23(4), pp.291-304.
- Centauri, F., Mazzocato, P., Villa, S., & Marsilio, M. (2018). System-wide lean implementation in health care: a multiple case study. *Health Services Management Research*, 31(2), 60-73.
- Connelly, L. M. (2016). Cross-sectional survey research. *Medsurg nursing*, 25(5), 369.
- Danese, P., Manfè, V., & Romano, P. (2018). A systematic literature review on recent lean research: state-of-the-art and future directions. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(2), 579-605.

- Dai, D., 2020. Mahalanobis distances on factor model-based estimation. *Econometrics*, v. 8, n. 1, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/econometrics8010010>
- Dobrzykowski, D. D., McFadden, K. L., & Vonderembse, M. A. (2016). Examining pathways to safety and financial performance in hospitals: A study of lean in professional service operations. *Journal of operations management*, 42(1), 39-51.
- Elkington, J. (1998). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business*. Capstone Publishing Limited, Oxford, OX.
- Gastwirth, J. L., Gel, Y. R., & Miao, W. (2009). The impact of Levene's test of equality of variances on statistical theory and practice. *Statistical Science*, 24(3), 343-360.
- Gupta, S., & Sharma, M. (2018). Empirical analysis of existing lean service frameworks in a developing economy. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp.482-505.
- Hadid, W. (2019). Lean service, business strategy and ABC and their impact on firm performance. *Production Planning & Control*, 30(14), 1203-1219.
- Hadid, W., & Mansouri, S. A. (2014). The lean-performance relationship in services: a theoretical model. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*. Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 750-785.
- Hadid, W., Mansouri, S. A., & Gallear, D. (2016). Is lean service promising? A socio-technical perspective. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 36, No. 6, pp. 618-642.
- Hair Jr., J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L. and Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014), "Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research". *European Business Review*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 106-121.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M. and Sarstedt, M (2017), *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS – SEM)*, Sage, Los Angeles.
- Hair, J., Hollingsworth, C. L., Randolph, A. B. and Chong, A. Y. L. (2017) "An updated and expanded assessment of PLS-SEM in information systems research", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 117 No. 3, pp. 442-458.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M. and Gudergan, S. P. (2018), *Advanced issues in partial least squares structural equation modeling*, Sage, Los Angeles.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Howard, M. C. and Nitzl, C. (2020), "Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis". *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 109, pp. 101-110, doi: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069)

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 115-135.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M. and Sarstedt, M. (2016), "Testing measurement invariance of composites using partial least squares". *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 405-431, doi: [10.1108/IMR-09-2014-0304](https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-09-2014-0304)

Hines, P., Taylor, D. and Walsh, A., 2020. The Lean journey: have we got it wrong?. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 31(3-4), pp.389-406.

Hinkin, T. R. (1998), "A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires". *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 1 No. 1, doi: [10.1177/109442819800100106](https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819800100106)

Hussain, M., Al-Aomar, R., & Melhem, H. (2019). Assessment of lean-green practices on the sustainable performance of hotel supply chains. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(6), 2448-2467.

Kleindorfer, P. R., Singhal, K., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2005). Sustainable operations management. *Production and operations management*, 14(4), 482-492.

Klein, L. L., De Guimarães, J. C. F., Severo, E. A., Dorion, E. C. H., & Feltrin, T. S. (2021). Lean practices toward a balanced sustainability in higher education institutions: A Brazilian experience. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-10-2020-0406>

Klein, L. L., Alves, A. C., Abreu, M. F., & Feltrin, T. S. (2022). Lean management and sustainable practices in Higher Education Institutions of Brazil and Portugal: A cross country perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 342, 130868.

Kock, N. and Hadaya, P. (2016), "Minimum sample size estimation in PLS – SEM: the inverse square root and gamma-exponential methods". *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 227-261, doi: [10.1111/isj.12131](https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12131)

Koeijer, R., Strating, M., Paauwe, J., & Huijsman, R. (2022). A balanced approach involving hard and soft factors for internalizing Lean Management and Six Sigma in hospitals. *The TQM Journal*, (ahead-of-print).

Lagrosen, Y. and Lagrosen, S., 2019. Creating a culture for sustainability and quality—a lean-inspired way of working. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, pp.1-15. doi: [10.1080/14783363.2019.1575199](https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2019.1575199)

Lins, M. G., Zotes, L. P., & Caiado, R. (2021). Critical factors for lean and innovation in services: from a systematic review to an empirical investigation. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(5-6), 606-631.

Lizarelli, F. L., Chakraborty, A., Antony, J., Jayaraman, R., Carneiro, M. B., & Furterer, S. (2022). Lean and its impact on sustainability performance in service companies: results from a pilot study. *The TQM Journal*. Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-03-2022-0094>

MacKenzie, S. B.; Podsakoff, P. M.; Podsakoff, N. P. (2011), "Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research: Integrating New and Existing Techniques". *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 293-334, doi: [10.2307/23044045](https://doi.org/10.2307/23044045)

Malhotra N. (2014). *Basic Marketing Research (4th edn)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Malhotra, M. K. and Grover, V. (1998), "An assessment of survey research in POM: from constructs to theory", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 407-425, doi: [10.1016/S0272-6963\(98\)00021-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-6963(98)00021-7)

Malik, M., & Abdallah, S. (2020). The relationship between organizational attitude and lean practices: an organizational sense-making perspective. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 120(9), 1715-1731.

Malmbrandt, M., & Åhlström, P. (2013). An instrument for assessing lean service adoption. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*. Vol. 33 No. 9, pp. 1131-1165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-05-2011-0175>

Malik, M., & Abdallah, S. (2020). The relationship between organizational attitude and lean practices: an organizational sense-making perspective. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 120, p.9, pp. 1715-1731.

Marin-Garcia, J. A., Vidal-Carreras, P. I., & Garcia-Sabater, J. J. (2021). The role of value stream mapping in healthcare services: A scoping review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(3), 951.

Morell-Santandreu, O., Santandreu-Mascarell, C., & Garcia-Sabater, J. J. (2021). A Model for the Implementation of Lean Improvements in Healthcare Environments as Applied in a Primary Care Center. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(6), 2876.

Pederneiras, Y. M., Pereira, M. A., & Figueira, J. R. (2021). Are the Portuguese public hospitals sustainable? A triple bottom line hybrid data envelopment analysis approach. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, Vol. 30, pp. 453-475.

- Petrusch, A., & Vaccaro, G. L. R. (2019). Attributes valued by students in higher education services: a lean perspective. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*. Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 862-882. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLSS-07-2018-0062>
- Petrusch, A., Vaccaro, G. L. R., & Luchese, J. (2018). They teach, but do they apply? An exploratory survey about the use of Lean thinking in Brazilian higher education institutions. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, Vol.10, No. 3, pp. 743-766.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
- Potter, A. (2021). Exploring the role of lean managers within the Toyota supply network: evidence from a social media platform. *Production Planning & Control*, 1-18. Doi:10.1080/09537287.2020.1831643
- Saleeshya, P. G., & Harikumar, P. (2022). An empirical investigation of performance assessment of Indian healthcare industry. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. Doi:10.1108/IJPPM-05-2021-0263
- Sarstedt, M., Henseler, J. and Ringle, C. M. (2011), "Multigroup analysis in partial least squares (PLS) path modeling: Alternative methods and empirical results". *Advances in International Marketing*, Vol. 22, 195–218.
- Sarstedt, M., Hair Jr, J. F., Cheah, J. H., Becker, J. M. and Ringle, C. M. (2019), "How to specify, estimate, and validate higher-order constructs in PLS-SEM". *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 197-211, doi: [10.1016/j.ausmj.2019.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2019.05.003)
- Shah, R., & Ward, P. T. (2007). Defining and developing measures of lean production. *Journal of operations management*, 25(4), 785-805.
- Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S. and Ringle, C. M. (2019), "Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: guidelines for using PLSpredict". *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 53 No. 11, pp. 2322-2347, doi: [10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189).
- Sahoo, S. (2019). Lean manufacturing practices and performance: the role of social and technical factors. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 37, No. 5, 732-754.
- Sony, M., Naik, S., & Antony, J. (2020). Lean Six Sigma and social performance: A review and synthesis of current evidence. *Quality Management Journal*, 27(1), 21-36.

- Suárez-Barraza, M. F., Smith, T., & Dahlgaard-Park, S. M. (2012). Lean Service: A literature analysis and classification. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 23(3-4), 359-380.
- Syltevik, S., Karamperidis, S., Antony, J., & Taheri, B. (2018). Lean for airport services: a systematic literature review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 35, No. 1, 34-49.
- Sum, F. F., de Paula, I. C., Tortorella, G., Pontes, A. T., & Facó, R. T. (2019). Analysis of the implementation of a lean service in a shared service center: a study of stability and capacity. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 67(2), 334-346.
- Tortorella, G., Narayanamurthy, G., Godinho Filho, M., Staudacher, A. P., & Mac Cawley, A. F. (2021). Pandemic's effect on the relationship between lean implementation and service performance. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*. Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 203-224.
- Vadivel, S. M., Sequeira, A. H., Sakkariyas, R. R., & Boobalan, K. (2022). Impact of lean service, workplace environment, and social practices on the operational performance of India post service industry. *Annals of Operations Research*, 315(2), 2219-2244.
- Womack, J.P. and Jones, D.T. (1996), *Lean Thinking: Banish Waste and Create Wealth in Your Corporation*, Vol. 2, Simon and Schuster, New York, NY.
- Zhu, Q., Johnson, S., & Sarkis, J. (2018, January). Lean six sigma and environmental sustainability: a hospital perspective. *In Supply Chain Forum: An International Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 25-41.
- Zirar, A., Trusson, C., & Choudhary, A. (2020). Towards a high-performance HR bundle process for lean service operations. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 25-45.