

Jum'a, Luay, Alkalha, Ziad, Al Mandil, Karam and Alaraj, Maher (2023)
Exploring the influence of lean manufacturing and total quality management
practices on environmental sustainability: the moderating role of quality culture.
International Journal of Lean Six Sigma .

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/7131/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Exploring the influence of lean manufacturing and total quality management practices on environmental sustainability: the moderating role of quality culture

Abstract

Purpose: Organisations have released the importance of lean manufacturing practices (LMPs) and total quality management (TQM) in enhancing competitiveness. However, the implementation of LMPs and TQM becomes more complex when discerning the environmental sustainability position. The complexity stems from the fact that LMPs and TQM are more intricate due to cultural differences. Thus, this study tackles the aforementioned phenomenon by investigating the impact of LMPs and TQM on environmental sustainability moderated by quality culture.

Design/methodology/approach: A survey was distributed among small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Jordan; thus, 315 valid responses were received. Partial least square structural equation modelling was used to analyse the data and test hypotheses.

Findings: The findings showed that environmental sustainability was significantly impacted by all the LMPs practices except Kanban and all the TQM practices except statistical process control. Moreover, quality culture significantly and negatively moderated the relationship between TQM and environmental sustainability. However, the influence of LMPs on environmental sustainability was not significantly moderated by quality culture.

Practical implications: This study has implications for policymakers in SMEs, supply chain managers and academics regarding the importance of LMPs and TQM systems for implementing environmental sustainability and the role of quality culture.

Social implications: The study provides guidelines for decision-makers on the pathways that enable them to sustain the environment to safeguard the natural ecosystem and natural resources for upcoming generations.

Originality: The originality of this study stems from the alignment of LMPs and TQM in enhancing environmental sustainability, taking into consideration the role of quality culture in SMEs, where previous studies failed short to investigate this phenomenon.

Keywords: Lean manufacturing; total quality management; environmental sustainability; quality culture; SMEs.

1. Introduction

Stakeholder concerns about harmful production activities have compelled companies to incorporate environmental initiatives into their supply chains (Huo *et al.*, 2019; Akhavan and Zvezdov, 2019; Al-Odeh *et al.*, 2021). Customer's desire for environmentally sustainable goods and services has increased after the World Commission on Economic Development introduced the term "sustainability" to the public domain in the 1990s (Wilburn Green *et al.*, 2015). Since then, several concepts have been used to refer to management practices that respond to this well-known pattern. With recent technological, societal, political, and environmental developments, a company's ability to gain and maintain a competitive edge has become a major challenge. In addition, customers' increased understanding of diminishing natural resources, emissions, and natural climate change is pushing businesses to implement environmentally sustainable activities and reduce their dependence on non-renewable energy, including fossil fuels, which can lead to disturbance in the ecosystem (Li *et al.*, 2018; Jum'a *et al.*, 2021; Al-Odeh *et al.*, 2021). Furthermore, as competition has increased, various operating methodologies, actions, and procedures have been developed to boost product quality, efficiency, and delivery times while lowering costs. Among these systems which have received particular attention are lean manufacturing practices (LMPs), total quality management (TQM), and supply chain management (SCM) (Nugroho *et al.*, 2020). The two approaches of LMPs and TQM have been extensively developed and investigated to enhance companies' overall performance. This happens by eliminating waste from all operations, focusing on customer requirements, and serving them with quality products and services (Zelbst *et al.*, 2010; Shokri and Li, 2020; Damert *et al.*, 2021). According to Young (2009), efficient LMPs and TQM initiatives have enabled producers to adopt environmental sustainability practices.

Consequently, it is reasonable to suggest that, based on complementarity theory, when applied together, LMPs and TQM approaches can lead to a more favourable influence on environmental practices compared to the case when each approach is applied separately. In the 1960s and 1970s, the idea of LMPs emerged as a management technique aimed at adjusting needed inputs and production rates to market demand (Arjona Aroca *et al.*, 2020; Verma *et al.*, 2021). LMPs are the technique to eliminate all types of waste, enhance product quality, and maximize resource utilization (Khalfallah and Lakhal, 2020). LMPs manufacturing is considered a methodology that emphasizes minimizing/eliminating waste, constant quality improvement, and value maximization

1
2
3 strategies in the manufacturing operations (Dowlatshahi and Taham, 2009). Since LMPs
4 emphasize waste disposal while ensuring product consistency, it maintains the firm's
5 environmental obligation. The term TQM emphasizes performance development and process
6 control to produce a long-term, high-quality product that meets or exceeds consumer needs (Phan
7
8
9
10 *et al.*, 2019).

11
12 SMEs contribute to global economic development as they represent nearly 90 % of the businesses
13 and represent almost 40 % of the GDP in emerging countries (The World Bank, 2021). However,
14 SMEs are causing more than 50% of industrial pollution in different regions, such as the Asia-
15 Pacific region, leading to environmental damage and emission (Williamson *et al.*,2006; Dey *et al.*,
16 2020). Moreover, environmental destruction caused by SMEs will increase due to a lack of ability
17 to improve performance and weak internal capability (Dey and Cheffi, 2013). Thus, the successful
18 implementation of LMPs and TQM depends on employees' awareness of lean and TQM practices
19 (Iranmanesh *et al.*, 2019; Verma *et al.*, 2021). However, previous studies have concluded
20 inconsistent results of the impact of LMPs and TQM on environmental performance
21 (Hajmohammad *et al.*,2013; Iranmanesh *et al.*, 2019). For instance, Abbas (2020) demonstrated
22 that the TQM's components consisted of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award- saved
23 environment and natural resources (Abbas, 2020). Similarly, Green (2019) showed that TQM
24 supports the implementation of a green supply chain that supports environmental sustainability
25 (Green,2019). Nevertheless, the electronic industry in Thailand failed to implement TQM, and
26 therefore it does not impact sustainable performance (Jermstittiparsert *et al.*,2019). In addition,
27 Garza-Reyes *et al.* (2018) indicated that TQM practice such as Kaizen has a small impact on
28 environmental results. Likewise, in some cases, the implementation of LMPs does not impact
29 environmental sustainability because the environmental sustainability depends on a long term plan,
30 while some companies adapted DMAIC (a six sigma tool) in the short term (Sreedharan and
31 Sunder, 2018; McLean *et al.*,2017). Also, the absence of a proper system reduces the impact of
32 LMPs on environmental sustainability (Belhadi *et al.*,2020). Moreover, the current understanding
33 of the moderating role of quality culture on this phenomenon is limited in SMEs (Polyviou *et al.*,
34 2019; Arsawan *et al.*,2020). It is not clear which practices of TQM and LMPs impact sustaining
35 the environment, especially in SMEs. Also, the role of quality culture in moderating the impact of
36 TQM and LMPs on environmental sustainability in SMEs is not clear (Nader *et al.*,2022). Antony
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 barriers that contain developing the right culture. Psomas and Antony (2019, p.832) highlighted,
4 "It is also worth comparing and contrasting the LM practices in the West with those in the East
5 from cultural and leadership perspectives". Likewise, Jasti and Kodali (2015) encouraged LMPs
6 studies in developing countries to get culture-independent results. Consequently, both academics
7 and practitioners need empirical evidence on the importance of TQM and LMPs on environmental
8 performance and the mediating role of quality culture in SMEs in different countries (Hines *et*
9 *al.*,2020). Therefore, this study investigates the impact of LMPs and TQM on environmental
10 sustainability moderated by quality culture in SMEs. Therefore, this study tried to find the answer
11 to the following questions:

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 What is the impact of implementing both LMPs and TQM practices on environmental
20 sustainability?

21
22 Does the quality culture play a moderator role in the impact of LMPs and TQM practices on
23 environmental sustainability?

24
25
26 The result of this study is expected to provide empirical evidence- to academics and practitioners
27 in SMEs -of the main TQM and LMPs that have the most impact on sustaining the environment
28 and the role of quality culture in moderating this relationship. The paper has been organised into
29 different parts. A study of similar literature comes first, followed by the formulation of hypotheses
30 and a theoretical model. Then the research methodologies include data collection, study
31 measurement, demographic characteristics of the respondents. The explanations of the research
32 findings are then outlined. Discussion is the next part of the report, and it provides a
33 straightforward overview of current observations and how they apply to previous research. After
34 addressing the study's shortcomings and managerial implications, the study ends with a conclusion.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **2. Literature review**

45
46 The literature was divided into several sections. In section 2.1, the study demonstrated that there
47 are individual connections between one or more of the main constructs in the study. In sections
48 2.2-2.5, the study proposed the main components of each construct based on the reviewed studies.
49 Finally, in section 2.6, the study demonstrated the links between the main constructs to justify the
50 conceptual model.
51
52
53
54

55 **2.1 Previous research**

1
2
3 Previous studies in the field of LMPs, TQM, and sustainability were reviewed (e.g. Abbas, 2020;
4 Green *et al.*, 2019; Mohammad Mosadegh Rad, 2006; Phan *et al.*, 2019; Nguyen *et al.*, 2018;
5 Nugroho *et al.*, 2020; Iranmanesh *et al.*, 2019; Rupasinghe and Wijethilake, 2021; Sakakibara *et*
6 *al.*, 1997; Tasleem *et al.*, 2019; Verma *et al.*, 2021). Sakakibara *et al.* (1997) investigated how
7 LMPs practices and its infrastructure influenced manufacturing performance. The findings
8 revealed that LMPs and infrastructure were both significantly related to manufacturing
9 performance. Mohammad Mosadegh Rad (2006) assessed the effects and implementation of TQM
10 and found areas such as leadership and management, process management, performance results,
11 strategic planning and focus on customers, suppliers and material resources are influenced by
12 TQM. Nguyen *et al.* (2018) found that four quality management practices significantly influence
13 organisations' sustainability performance. These areas include product/service design, top
14 management support for quality management, quality data and reporting, and continuous
15 improvement. There was a significant relationship between LMPs, TQM, and practices pertaining
16 to the green supply chain, as well as their combined impact on environmental sustainability (Green
17 *et al.*, 2019). Besides, Green *et al.* (2019) found that the direct influence of LMPs on environmental
18 sustainability was not supported by practical evidence. The effect of TQM on firms' sustainability
19 was found to be significant in the literature (Abbas, 2020; Green *et al.*, 2019; Tasleem *et al.*, 2019).
20 Iranmanesh *et al.* (2019) examined the effects of quality culture on the link between lean
21 manufacturing practices and sustainability. The findings showed that quality culture positively
22 moderates the influence of process and equipment, as well as supplier relationships, on
23 sustainability. The significant influence of TQM and LMPs production practices on the flexibility
24 performance of manufacturing firms was also evident in prior research (Phan *et al.*, 2019).
25 Nugroho *et al.* (2020) observed that firm performance is significantly linked to the state of LMPs,
26 TQM, and supply chain management. Approaches like LMPs deliveries, employee engagement,
27 quality and environmental management are examples of lean practices that positively affect supply
28 chain sustainability (Rupasinghe and Wijethilake, 2021). Thus, the reviewed studies demonstrated
29 a connection between at least one or more of the main constructs of the study, including LMPs,
30 TQM, environmental sustainability, and quality culture.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 **2.2 Lean Manufacturing Practices (LMPs)**

53
54 As a manufacturing management concept that originated in Japan, JIT manufacturing involves
55 making the right products and quantity, consistency, place, and time (Javadian Kootanaee *et al.*,
56
57
58
59
60

2013). The American and Inventory Control Society (APICS) views LMPs as a production concept and a management strategy that aims to detect and eliminate all wastes on the one hand and to emphasize the quality improvement of productivity on the other hand (Chen, 2015). The primary aim of the LMPs is to constantly minimize and eventually remove possible sources of waste (Kumar and Panneerselvam, 2007; Bader *et al.*, 2020; Verma *et al.*, 2021). In general, companies that operate according to LMPs focus on growth and ensure spotting non-value-added processes to be dropped to decrease costs and increase efficiency and execution (Chen and Tan, 2011; Bader *et al.*, 2020). However, the practical application of LMPs is dependent on cooperation with the vendor in terms of inventory handling to increase product consistency and delivery process efficiency (Nugroho *et al.*, 2020). Thus, LMPs consists of different tools; the most used tools in reviewed studies are summarized in Table (1). For instance, the kanban method is a modern ideology that plays a key role in the LMPs. The kanban system is an output management and inventory management system with several stages (Kumar and Panneerselvam, 2007). This method enables high production volume and power utilization with shortened processing time and work-in-process. Set up time reduction practice refers to the extent to which plants minimize startup time and lot sizes in production (Phan *et al.*, 2019). The problems of excess inventory and substantial lot sizes lead firms to lot size reduction practices that simplify firms' manufacturing processes. Lot size-reduction practices reduce the stock cycle time by reducing setup time and manufacturing design for smaller lots of stock (Green *et al.*, 2019; Bader *et al.*, 2020). Another term in LMPs is JIT scheduling. In JIT output scheduling, the manufacturer's main goal is to complete all required jobs as close to their due dates as possible, including assessing indicators, such as total weighted tardiness and total weighted earliness (Goldengorin and Romanuke, 2021). Existing evidence demonstrates that the careful implementation of JIT manufacturing leads to an increase in reliability and production, competitiveness, and a reduction in costs and waste (Javadian Kootanaee *et al.*, 2013; Bader *et al.*, 2020). As can be seen from the reviewed studies in Table (1), authors attempted to cover LMPs that are mostly related to direct internal operations of manufacturing activities, focusing on one or two LMPs and others attempting to include more LMPs. As many authors have suggested, this study focused on four LMPs.

-----Insert Table 1 Approximately Here-----

2.3 Total quality management (TQM)

1
2
3 The concept of quality management (QM) provides greater value to consumers by constantly
4 enhancing process performance is understood to share similar purposes with environmental
5 sustainability (Molina-Azorín *et al.*, 2009). QM consists of different tools; the most used tools in
6 reviewed studies are summarized in Table (2). TQM is a method of controlling a company's overall
7 effectiveness, performance, versatility, and competitiveness (Rad, 2006). It is a managerial
8 approach involving all organisation members to improve operations, products, resources and the
9 environment to promote greater customer and other stakeholder satisfaction (Yeng *et al.*, 2018).
10 After the 1980s, TQM has grown in popularity worldwide (Isaksson, 2006). TQM has become a
11 key method commonly embraced by both manufacturing companies and service firms to improve
12 company efficiency (Bajaj *et al.*, 2018; Chiarini, 2011). As a corporate management strategy, TQM
13 enhances the efficiency of corporate management, increases competition, brings value to the
14 customer, and provides companies with a competitive advantage (Lee *et al.*, 2010). Businesses can
15 incorporate a range of TQM constructs for effective quality management implementation.
16 Customer focus, product design, statistical process controls are the TQM constructs we used in
17 this study. Customer focus is expressed as the increasing interaction with the company and its
18 clients, recognizing their needs, evaluating their satisfaction, and promoting programs that
19 improve customer satisfaction (Anil and Satish, 2013). According to Goetsch and Davis (2014),
20 "The consumer is the driver in a total quality setting." Since it is the starting point of every quality
21 program, customer focus becomes a major factor in an organisation's performance (Pambreni *et*
22 *al.*, 2019). Product design in lean manufacturing leads to activities such as; multifunctional design
23 teams, built for manufacturability, component modularization, and element standardization are
24 also important considerations (Ahmad *et al.*, 2003). The goal of product design activities is to
25 make the product production process easier by reducing the quantity of content used in a product,
26 which will improve the optimization of the assembly and manufacturing processes and, as a result,
27 leads to better utilization of the company's resources (Iranmanesh *et al.*, 2019). According to Yusr
28 *et al.* (2017), process management entails maintaining a flawless product or service design, process
29 monitoring, and quality development by self-inspection and automation, as well as ensuring
30 transparent separation of process, ownership, and accountability. Thus, quality is a broad concept
31 that can be defined differently. From the customer's perspective, quality is the extent to which a
32 product performs its function and meets a customer's need. In contrast, from the producer's
33 perspective, quality is the extent to which a product or service is produced correctly or the absence
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of defects or errors (Goetsch & Davis, 2014). This study concentrated on three areas of QM proposed by many authors and contributed to both viewpoints, as shown in Table (2).

-----Insert Table 2 Approximately Here-----

2.4 Environmental sustainability

With rising stakeholder pressure for companies to be environmentally and socially conscious, businesses have recognized the strategic importance of sustainable performance in gaining a competitive edge (Wong and Wong, 2014; Jum'a *et al.*, 2021; Al-Odeh *et al.*, 2021). , In addition, businesses have been inspired to increase their environmental sustainability and productivity as a result of the transition toward cleaner production processes and products (Caldera *et al.*, 2017). Environmental sustainability refers to the process of promoting and conserving the natural environment and resources, controlling the waste, emphasizing cleaner processing, and rationalizing resource use (Hollingworth and Valentine, 2014; Jum'a *et al.*, 2021). Environmental sustainability is concerned with organisations' efforts to safeguard the natural ecosystem and natural resources for upcoming generations (Lucas, 2010; Al-Odeh *et al.*, 2021). Simultaneously, environmental sustainability is also a competitive priority for businesses and must be balanced with their conventional growth and quality goals (Dieste *et al.*, 2019). It also looks at the environmental effects of organisations' business operations, such as protecting the natural ecosystem from pollutants, effective use of natural resources, and natural heritage protection (Abbas, 2020). So, environmental considerations must be integrated into business culture and operational strategy at all stages by creating, manufacturing, handling, and disposing of products (Walker *et al.*, 2014).

2.5 Quality culture

Influenced by the management system within organisations, culture is one of the major determinants that affect how work is done and how relationships are built in a company (Mann, 2015). It is the way we perceive and behave daily. Culture represents a company's personality and reflects the norms and beliefs of its people as well as how they act. In addition, organisational culture serves as an organisational asset aiding the effective execution of strategies (Zailani *et al.*, 2015). Quality culture can be considered a corporate culture that contributes to workers' knowledge of lean processes and the actual work performed (Mann, 2015; Honarpour *et al.*, 2018). Building

1
2
3 and spreading a quality culture among employees and workers will facilitate the quick and efficient
4 adoption of LMPs to achieve lean manufacturing goals (Iranmanesh *et al.*, 2019). LMPs, as
5 opposed to conventional industrial manufacturing, strives for higher quality manufacturing by
6 eliminating waste products and reducing inputs (Nawanir *et al.*, 2020). According to Atkinson
7 (2010), it is difficult for lean practices to exist in a company where the organisational culture does
8 not support it, and company culture dictates the effectiveness of lean or some other reform
9 initiative. Cervantes (2006) analyzed organisations those adopted lean practices and found that
10 those with a strong quality culture in the enterprise were more successful at implementing lean
11 practices than those with a weak quality culture that only introduced lean practices on the factory
12 floor.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **2.6 Research Hypotheses and theoretical framework**

22 **2.6.1 LMPs and environmental sustainability**

23
24 LMPs are process management initiative that aims to remove waste from procurement,
25 manufacturing, and distribution processes while maximizing resource use (Inman *et al.*, 2011;
26 Verma *et al.*, 2021). It promotes the “zero concepts,” which means achieving zero errors, zero
27 queues, zero inventory levels, zero breakdown, and other similar aims (Kumar and Panneerselvam,
28 2007). In general, the LMPs are based on three basic principles: waste prevention, continual quality
29 management, and encouraging workplace engagement in operations preparation and execution
30 (Chan *et al.*, 2010). Previous studies have found that LMPs and environmental protection are not
31 only compatible but also complementary, resulting in a convergence that improves both
32 environmental and business efficiency (Ali *et al.*, 2020; Azevedo *et al.*, 2012; Vinodh *et al.*, 2011).
33 The existing evidence argues that careful implementation of LMPs manufacturing is expected to
34 increase production, competitiveness, and reliability and reduce costs and waste (Powell *et*
35 *al.*, 2017; Javadian Kootanaee *et al.*, 2013; Bader *et al.*, 2020). In his study on a consortium of
36 Australian organisations, Young (2009) found that successful leverage of internal LMPs
37 capabilities promoted environmental sustainability initiatives. The findings of Zhu and Sarkis
38 (2004) indicated that LMPs can enhance environmental efficiency. However, the association
39 between environmental performance and green practices was poorer in companies that frequently
40 used LMPs (Kalyar, 2020). Finally, Klassen (2000) discovered that investment in LMPs practices
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

is positively and substantially related to environmental efficiency. Based on the aforementioned discussion, the following can be hypothesized:

H1. Kanban positively influences environmental sustainability.

H2. Lot size-reduction positively influences environmental sustainability.

H3. Setup time reduction positively influences environmental sustainability.

H4. JIT scheduling positively influences environmental sustainability.

2.6.2 TQM and environmental sustainability

TQM focuses on reducing waste by eliminating inefficiencies in processes, while an environmental protection scheme is efficient at reducing noise, air emissions, and hazardous waste (Tasleem *et al.*, 2018). The “zero defects” mission of quality management and the “waste reduction” philosophy of lean management goes hand in hand with the environmental management system's “no waste” goal (Molina-Azorín *et al.*, 2009). Klassen and McLaughlin (1993) argued that environmental efficiency could be enhanced by adopting TQM and environmental management strategies. These strategies incorporate issues like product design, production, distribution, delivery, usage, and disposal processes. Successful TQM implementation has a major impact on green innovation in businesses, which is crucial for long-term sustainability (Li *et al.*, 2018; Calic,2020).

Furthermore, as consumers continue to seek environmentally sustainable goods and services, TQM consumer focus would promote the inclusion of environmental protection as customer criteria, which can lead to the development of environmentally friendly goods and services (Green *et al.*, 2012). Golicic and Smith (2013) expressed that TQM efforts tend to yield good results when applied to environmental matters. In their analysis of total quality environmental management, Garza-Reyes *et al.* (2018) concluded that there is a high level of compatibility and a positive relationship between TQM on the one hand and environmental sustainability activities on the other hand. Thus, the following hypotheses can be suggested:

H5. Customer focus positively influences environmental sustainability.

H6. Product design positively influences environmental sustainability.

H7. Statistical process control positively influences environmental sustainability.

2.6.3 Moderating effects of quality culture

According to Zheng *et al.* (2010), corporate culture is closely linked to organisational success, and it highly influences the efficiency of policy execution in companies. A culture of quality development in a company will promote the implementation of environmental sustainability strategies and values (Soltero and Waldrip, 2002). According to Womack and Jones (1997), eliminating waste and improving the production environment is not only possible with the use of lean manufacturing, but also requires a company-wide philosophy of performance development and waste reduction. As a result, incorporating a quality culture into the business would encourage LMPs, resulting in appropriate environmental awareness. TQM systems' success depends on whether the prevailing corporate culture is consistent with the principles and fundamental concepts suggested by the TQM discipline (Kujala and Ullrank, 2004). Therefore, it can be argued that the organisational culture would heavily influence the effectiveness of TQM as a systematic reform. In TQM implementation programs, organisational culture is a significant variance-causing element that either delays or enables the program's performance (Rad, 2006). So, the hypotheses stated below are formed following the above discussion:

H8. Quality culture significantly moderates the relationship between LMPs and environmental sustainability.

H9. Quality culture significantly moderates the relationship between TQM and environmental sustainability.

2.7 Theoretical framework

-----Insert Figure 1 Approximately Here-----

3. Methodology

3.1 Data collection

SMEs sector is a pillar in low and middle-income countries where it plays a critical role in economic development and minimises poverty (Singh *et al.*, 2010). SMEs contributes to more than 50% of national income (GDP) and are a key sector in creating job opportunities; thus, the central bank of Jordan supports financing programme relating to renewable energy, industry, tourism, agriculture, and information technology (Central Bank of Jordan, 2017). Moreover, SMEs is more affected than large companies in crisis. For instance, SMEs in Jordan suffers more than large

companies during Covid -19 pandemic (Abu-Mater *et al.*,2021). Thus, this study collected evidence from SMEs sectors due to its importance and sensitivity.

The sampling strategy was a convenience sampling technique from SMEs in Jordan. The unit of analysis was the company level, where the general manager or the assistant general manager was the respondent from SMEs. Classifying companies as SMEs depends on Tewari *et al.*(2013), where small companies have employees from 10-49, and medium companies have employees from 50-249. A list of companies was received from the chamber of commerce; then, the SMEs companies were contacted through email to explain the aim of the study, followed by a phone call. Dörnyei (2007) highlighted convenience sampling used when there are specific criteria to select the sample. As a result, 1020 companies were contacted, while the questionnaire received was 350. The excluded questionnaires due to missing answers are 35, and the valid number of questionnaires is 315 (Table (3) shows the respondents' profiles). Thus, the actual return rate was nearly 31% which is higher than the suggested sample size, which was 200 or more (Hair *et al.*,2019). Moreover, the sample size of the study is sufficient, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), who recommended the following equation to identify the sample size:

$N > 50 + 8 M$, where:

N = Sample size
 M = number of independent variables

-----Insert Table 3 Approximately Here-----

3.2 Measurement instrument

The methodological choice of this study is a quantitative method to test hypotheses and generalize the research findings (Creswell, 2009; Hair *et al.*, 2019). To do so, a survey was used as a research strategy to measure the trend and relationships in the data and obtain a high response rate (Creswell,2002). The survey was sent to 10 academics and experts to check its content validity (Yaghmaei,2003). The feedback suggested reducing the number of questions and simplifying some terminologies.

Measurement items related to the study constructs were sourced from the relevant past studies (See Table 4)—the items of LMPs practices and TQM (adopted from Green *et al.* (2019). The environmental sustainability and quality culture items were adopted from Iranmanesh *et al.* (2019).

1
2
3 The questionnaire was divided into two sections, where the first part included the demographic
4 variables and the second part included the measurement items. The respondents were asked about
5 the degree of their agreement on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5=
6 strongly agree. The data was prepared for analysis by deleting the missing data and then entering
7 and coding the answers for analysis.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 -----Insert Table 4 Approximately Here-----
15

16 17 **4. Results**

18 This part includes findings from the analysis of 315 datapoints using SPSS version 25 and
19 SmartPLS version 3. This study utilized a partial least square approach to structural equation
20 modelling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS software (Ringle *et al.*, 2015). The measurement and
21 structural models were evaluated and validated as part of structural equation modelling.
22 Consequently, the proposed research hypotheses were tested using structural model analysis.
23 Smart-PLS uses graphical interfaces for variance-based structural equation modelling using the
24 partial least squares path (Wong, 2013). Smart-PLS is primarily used in business research and can
25 explain the relationships with few samples (Lu *et al.*,2010).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **4.1 Descriptive statistics**

34 As shown in Table (5), descriptive statistics display the mean, standard deviation, skewness,
35 kurtosis and standard error of the latent constructs of the research. There are four latent variables
36 in LMPs where lot size reduction had the highest mean score (M =4.21, SD = 1.017) and JIT
37 scheduling had the lowest mean score (M = 1.8857, SD = .43671). Among the three practices of
38 TQM, product design had the highest mean score (M =4.01, SD = .87451), and statistical process
39 control had the lowest mean score (M = 3.18, SD = .76642). Moreover, the data is considered
40 normal if the skewness is between -2 and +2 and the kurtosis is between -7 and +7. Table 5
41 demonstrates that skewness and kurtosis are within the range. As a result, the study's data is
42 normally distributed.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 -----Insert Table 5 Approximately Here-----
53

54 **4.2 Common method bias test**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The Harman factor test was used to check for potential common method bias in the data. According
4 to Podsakoff et al. (2003), if the covariance is greater than 50, the data contains common method
5 bias. Moreover, the covariance explained by a single factor in this data is 35%, indicating no
6 common method bias issue in the data, as shown in Table 6.
7
8
9

10 -----Insert Table 6 Approximately Here-----
11

12 13 14 **4.3 Test of Multicollinearity**

15
16 In order to check multicollinearity (see Table 7). The values of variance inflation factor (VIF) and
17 tolerance for latent variables were used. The values show that there is no multicollinearity since
18 all of the VIF values are below 5 (ranging from 1.023 to 1.935), and the tolerance is greater than
19 0.10 (ranging from 0.517 to 0.978) (Hair et al., 2019).
20
21
22

23 -----Insert Table 7 Approximately Here-----
24

25 26 **4.4 Regression analysis**

27
28 The heteroscedasticity test is part of the traditional assumption test in the regression model.
29 Detecting the presence or absence of heteroscedasticities in data can be accomplished in a variety
30 of ways, one of which is by inspecting the scatterplot graph on SPSS output. The Scatterplot graph
31 between the predictive value of the independent variable is the working principle of the
32 heteroscedasticity test with this method, as shown in Figure (2).
33
34
35
36

37 -----Insert Figure 2 Approximately Here-----
38

39
40 According to the Scatterplot output, the spots appear diffused and do not form a distinct pattern.
41 As a result, the regression model does not exhibit the heteroscedasticities problem. A popular
42 misunderstanding in linear regression is that the outcome must be normally distributed, but the
43 assumption is that the residuals are normally distributed. This assumption must be met for the p-
44 values and t-tests to be valid. The P-P plot compares the observed cumulative distribution function
45 (CDF) of the standardized residual to the expected CDF of the normal distribution to test residuals.
46 The residuals are normally distributed, as shown in Figure (3).
47
48
49
50
51

52 -----Insert Figure 3 Approximately Here-----
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 Regression demonstrates one-way causality and can only deal with observed variables, whereas
4 SEM is meant to deal with both latent constructs and observable variables. SEM may be used to
5 detect dual causation and bidirectional causality or effect. However, stepwise regression analysis
6 was performed to emphasize the SEM results. Stepwise regression is the iterative development of
7 a regression model step by step, which includes the selection of independent variables to be
8 included in the final model. It entails progressively adding or removing potential explanatory
9 variables and checking for statistical significance after each iteration.

10
11
12 The results of stepwise regression were consistent with the results of SEM, which showed that five
13 out of seven variables significantly influenced environmental sustainability, including lot size
14 reduction, customer focus, setup time reduction, JIT scheduling, and product design, as shown in
15 Table 8.

16
17
18 -----Insert Table 8 Approximately Here-----
19

20
21
22 According to Kline (2011) and Tabachnick et al. (2007), the essential first step in conducting the
23 SEM model is confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). You should conduct this initially to ensure the
24 measurement quality of all latent constructs in your structural equation model. The first step is to
25 calculate the factor loadings of the latent construct's indicators (observed variables). Furthermore,
26 developing this CFA measurement model allows you to test the convergent validity of your
27 constructs. If your SEM model has more than one factor, conduct a CFA for all of the model's
28 latent constructs within one measurement model to assess discriminant validity. Running goodness
29 of fit statistics is one of the final procedures in analyzing the measurement model. Finally, the
30 structural model is assessed.

31 32 33 **4.5 Internal consistency and convergent validity**

34
35
36 Measurement model analysis included assessment of both convergent and discriminant types of
37 validity. In Table 9, convergent validity was ensured using the values of the factor loadings,
38 Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency, composite reliability (CR) and average variance
39 extracted (AVE). The findings showed that all the factor loading (>0.70) and AVE values (0.50)
40 were above the recommended level and, thus, acceptable (Hair et al., 2019). Besides, Cronbach's
41 alpha of internal consistency and composite reliability values also exceeded the recommended
42 threshold of 0.70 and thus, the latent variables were highly reliable for structural model analysis.

-----Insert Table 9 Approximately Here-----

4.6 Discriminant validity

When the square roots of the AVE are greater than the coefficients of correlation between all constructs, discriminant validity is achieved (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The square root of the AVE was expressed by the diagonal values, while the off-diagonal values represented inter-construct correlations. All of the square roots of AVE values were greater than the correlation coefficients between all constructs, as shown in Table (10). As a result, the latent factors' discriminating validity was established.

-----Insert Table 10 Approximately Here-----

4.7 Model fit

This study's model fit indices were checked using two fit measures: standardized root means square (SRM) and NFI. In order to determine model fit, criteria values should be within a certain range (the acceptable range for the SRMR index is between 0 and 0.08 and NFI values above 0.9 usually represent acceptable fit). Table (11) shows the SRMR and NFI values in relation to the criteria thresholds.

-----Insert Table 11 Approximately Here-----

4.8 Assessment of structural model

Because PLS-SEM does not assume that the data is normally distributed, parametric significance tests cannot be used to determine the significance of coefficients such as path coefficients. PLS-SEM, on the other hand, uses a nonparametric bootstrap procedure to test the significance of estimated path coefficients. After checking the measurement model's validity and reliability, a bootstrapping was performed with 1000 subsamples to estimate the structural model in SmartPLS (Ringle *et al.*, 2015). As illustrated in Figure (4), the arrows from the latent variables to environmental sustainability indicated the path coefficients. Besides, the r square value (0.479) inside the environmental sustainability suggests that the model explains around 47.9% variation in environmental sustainability.

-----Insert Figure 4 Approximately Here-----

As illustrated in Table (12), the results of the structural model analysis showed that five out of seven variables significantly influenced environmental sustainability. Lot size reduction, customer focus, and product design significantly affected environmental sustainability at $p < 0.01$. On the other hand, Setup time reduction and JIT scheduling had significant negative effects on environmental sustainability at $p < 0.05$. Therefore, hypotheses H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 were supported. Besides, customer focus had the largest effect on environmental sustainability ($\beta = 0.290$), indicating that when customer focus goes up by one standard deviation unit, environmental sustainability goes up by 0.290 standard deviation units.

-----Insert Table 12 Approximately Here-----

Table (13) shows the effects of the quality culture as a moderator. Results showed that the effect of LMPs on environmental sustainability was not significantly moderated by quality culture. However, the effect of TQM on environmental sustainability was significantly and negatively moderated by the quality culture at $p < 0.01$. Thus, hypothesis H9 was supported.

-----Insert Table 13 Approximately Here-----

Figure (5) shows that quality culture positively moderated the relationship between LMPs and environmental sustainability, but the effect was insignificant. In other words, firms with high-quality culture and LMPs perform well in environmental sustainability.

-----Insert Figure 5 Approximately Here-----

Figure (6) shows that quality culture negatively and significantly moderated the relationship between TQM and environmental sustainability. In other words, firms with low-quality culture but high TQM perform well in environmental sustainability.

-----Insert Figure 6 Approximately Here-----

5. Discussion

The study aims to investigate the effects of LMPs and TQM practices on environmental sustainability and investigate the moderation role of quality culture. Part of the results was consistent with previous studies; other results differed from previous studies, while the remaining extended the current literature. The result showed that the implementation of both LMPs and TQM

1
2
3 have a significant impact on environmental sustainability. The result further demonstrated that
4 some LMPs significantly influence environmental sustainability, which is a lot size reduction. This
5 result is partially consistent with recent studies that concluded the importance of LMPs such as
6 JIT, DMAIC tool, and setup time reduction in improving environmental sustainability through
7 minimizing raw material processing and packaging (Green et al.,2019; Abbas, 2020; Prakash and
8 Potoski,2014). On the other hand, the results showed the negative impact of both setup time
9 reductions and JIT scheduling due to lack of implementation among SMEs.

15
16 Unlike previous studies, the result of this study does not show any significant impact of Kanban
17 practices on environmental sustainability. For instance, many studies demonstrated the importance
18 of Kanban by reducing costs and avoiding overproduction, which enhances environmental
19 sustainability (Muñoz-Villamizar *et al.*,2019; Green *et al.*,2019; Gupta, 2016). The reason behind
20 the insignificant impact of Kanban on environmental sustainability in this study is due to the
21 traditional implication of Kanban or the informal implementation of LMPs, which need to be
22 modified in high variations situations and formalised to have an impact on environmental
23 sustainability. Some studies suggested Kanban modification and aligning the practices with
24 demand variation (Bai, 2019; Santos and Tontini; Gupta, 2016).

25
26 Furthermore, the result reveals that two TQM practices that are customer focus and product design,
27 have a significant impact on environmental sustainability. Nevertheless, statistical process control
28 does not significantly impact environmental sustainability. This is because of the weak link
29 between the control process and environmental sustainability procedures.

30
31 There is no sufficient evidence about the role of quality culture in moderating the impact of TQM
32 and LMPs on environmental sustainability in SMEs. The current study found significant negative
33 moderating effects of quality culture between TQM and environmental sustainability. However,
34 this finding is inconsistent with Iranmanesh et al. (2019), who found significant positive
35 moderating effects of quality culture between lean practices and sustainability. Therefore,
36 companies need to select a suitable leadership style, train their employees, engage and empower
37 them to build a quality culture (Tortorella *et al.*, 2020; Zheng *et al.*, 2010; Gao and Low, 2014).
38 The quality culture should have high-level collectivism, focus on humane orientation and a low
39 level of assertiveness (Bortolotti *et al.*,2015). The rationale behind the negative impact of the
40 quality culture is the weak quality awareness and implementation in SMEs as the sector depends
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on solving problems, not a systemised continuous improvement programme. Sawalha and Meaton
4 (2012) stated that Arabic culture is characterized by low cohesiveness and internal integration.
5
6 Therefore, there are no clear roles and responsibilities in some cases. Later, Alkalha et al.(2019)
7 highlighted the pharmaceutical industry's weak quality culture- which is considered one of the best
8 sectors in implementing quality management in Jordan- as the companies define quality as ‘good
9 manufacturing practices’ only.
10
11
12

13 14 **6. Conclusion**

15 16 **6.1 Brief overview of the research and findings**

17
18 There is a vulnerability about the impact of LMPs and TQM on environmental performance in the
19 extant literature, especially in the SMEs sector. Also, understanding the moderation role of quality
20 culture is not clear. Therefore, this study provides an initiative to help SMEs face environmental
21 sustainability challenges through LMPs and TQM practices moderated by quality culture while
22 remaining competitive in the marketplace. This study observes significant associations among
23 LMPs, TQM practices and environmental sustainability.
24
25
26
27

28
29 Moreover, a significant negative moderating role of quality culture has also been found between
30 TQM practices and environmental sustainability. In other words, the effects of TQM on
31 environmental sustainability are reduced in organisations with a quality culture. This is because of
32 the weak quality awareness and quality implementation.
33
34
35
36

37 **6.2 Implications for research**

38
39 The results of this study provided sufficient evidence of the impact of TQM practices and LMPs
40 on environmental sustainability in SMEs. The previous studies showed inconsistent results, and
41 few investigated the effect of TQM practices and LMPs on environmental sustainability in SMEs.
42 Moreover, this study highlighted pathways that lead to enhanced environmental sustainability by
43 identifying LMPs and TQM practices that positively and negatively influence environmental
44 sustainability.
45
46
47
48

49
50 This study shed light on building quality culture in SMEs as the results demonstrated the
51 insignificant quality culture role in moderating the impact of TQM and LMPs on environmental
52 sustainability. The reason behind the insignificant role of quality culture is the lack of quality
53 awareness in SMEs that focus on short term improvements.
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 Furthermore, in a research context, this study emphasizes the importance of performing additional
4 research that improve understanding of the role of quality culture in the implementation of LMPs
5 and TQM practices. Furthermore, replication of this study in different situations and countries
6 might contribute to improving environmental sustainability performance in SMEs and
7 demonstrating the most practicable strategies that can be used to preserve the environment.
8
9

10 11 12 **6.3 Implications for practice** 13

14
15 The results of this study can be used in an economic and commercial contexts. Improving
16 environmental sustainability in SMEs requires an initial investment, but they will be able to save
17 money over time by prioritizing LMPs and TQM practices that achieve economic and commercial
18 objectives. According to the findings of this study, LMPs and TQM practices such as lot size
19 reduction, setup time reduction, JIT scheduling, customer focus, and product design should be
20 integrated into the strategic plans of SMEs in order to increase operational efficiency and minimize
21 costs.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Furthermore, in a teaching context, this research proposes that courses related to quality operations
28 in connection to environmental sustainability should be incorporated in university programs,
29 particularly for all engineering and management degrees. This will increase knowledge of quality
30 culture and environmental sustainability practices, which will serve dual purposes in saving money
31 and the environment for SMEs, and will eventually impact governmental policy addressing
32 greening programs in SMEs.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Hence, the findings help SMEs' decision-makers plan the implementation of LMPs and TQM to
40 enhance environmental sustainability. Moreover, this study focuses on the critical role of building
41 a quality culture to facilitate LMPs and TQM practices.
42
43

44
45 Moreover, this study has implications for managers, practitioners and policymakers in various
46 ways. Among the three significant practices of LMP, setup time reduction and JIT scheduling are
47 negatively related to environmental sustainability. Therefore, supply chain managers and
48 policymakers should be conscious of the negative effects of these two practices while building
49 environmental sustainability. On the other hand, lot size reduction practices highly and positively
50 influence environmental sustainability. Thus, practitioners should prioritise reducing lot size to
51 improve environmental sustainability. The results of TQM practices also have implications for
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

managers. As customer focus has the highest effect on environmental sustainability compared to the other practices of TQM, supply chain specialists should emphasize customer focus practices across the organisation to ensure environmental sustainability through TQM. Finally, the result showed a negative moderation impact of quality culture due to weak awareness of good quality and lean implementation. Therefore, decision-makers need to focus on building a suitable culture that supports quality and lean implementation to sustain the environment.

Finally, this study may have an impact on society by increasing public and government pressure on SMEs to adopt LMPs and TQM practices that lead to improved environmental sustainability performance. As long as LMPs and TQM practices can be implemented in a feasible manner by SMEs, public attitudes toward environmental sustainability implementation should be stronger and more effective, which will eventually reflect on the country's standards of quality of life in terms of products, environment, and health issues.

6.4 Limitations and future studies

Despite the theoretical and practical contribution, this study has some limitations that can open opportunities for future studies. Firstly, this study measured the impact of LMPs and TQM on environmental sustainability moderated by quality culture in SMEs in Jordan. Thus, this might impact the result's generalizability to other companies' sizes and in other countries. However, we are confident that results can be extrapolated to other SMEs. Therefore, future studies are advised to conduct this study on other companies sizes, such as large companies and other countries. Secondly, this study measured LMPs and TQM using certain constructs.

Consequently, future studies can consider LMPs and TQM practices with other constructs not considered in this study, such as agile manufacturing, operational performance, and customer satisfaction. Thirdly, the study showed some negative results, such as the negative impact of setup time reduction and JIT scheduling on the environment statistically sustainably and the negative moderation impact of quality culture. Therefore, future studies may qualitatively investigate the reasons behind these negative results. Fourthly, this study collected cross-sectional data, limiting measuring respondents' answers over time. Thus, future studies are suggested to collect longitudinal data.

Reference

- Abbas, J., (2020). Impact of total quality management on corporate green performance through the mediating role of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 242, p.118458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118806>.
- Abu-Mater, W., Afifa, M.A. and Alghazzawi, M., (2021). The Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Small and Medium Enterprises in Jordan. *Journal of Accounting, Finance & Management Strategy*, 16(1), pp.129-149.
- Ahmad, S., Schroeder, R.G. and Sinha, K. K. (2003). The role of infrastructure practices in the effectiveness of JIT practices: Implications for plant competitiveness. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 20(3), pp. 161–191.
- Akhavan, R.M. and Zvezdov, D., 2019. Addressing sustainability information needs along supply chains. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 12(4), pp 643-666.
- Ali, Y., Younus, A., Khan, A.U. and 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), pp. 2294-2318
- Alkalha, Z., I. Reid, and B. Dehe. (2019). "The Role of Absorptive Capacity within Supply Chain Quality Integration." *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 24 (6), pp.805–820.
- Al-Odeh, M., Smallwood, J., & Badar, M. A. (2021). A framework for implementing sustainable supply chain management. *International Journal of Advanced Operations Management*, 13(3), pp.212-233.
- Anil, A.P. and Satish, K.P. (2013). Empirical research on TQM practices of organizations—development and validation of critical factors. *International Journal of Engineering Development and Research*, 8(3), pp. 7–13.
- Antony, J., Psomas, E., Garza-Reyes, J.A. and Hines, P., 2021. Practical implications and future research agenda of lean manufacturing: a systematic literature review. *Production planning & control*, 32(11), pp.889-925.
- Arjona Aroca, J., Giménez Maldonado, J.A., Ferrús Clari, G., Alonso i García, N., Calabria, L. and Lara, J. (2020). Enabling a green just-in-time navigation through stakeholder collaboration. *European Transport Research Review*, 12(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12544-020-00417-7>
- Arsawan, I.W.E., Koval, V., Rajiani, I., Rustiarini, N.W., Supartha, W.G. and Suryantini, N.P.S., (2020). Leveraging knowledge sharing and innovation culture into SMEs sustainable competitive advantage. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(2), pp 405--428.
- Atkinson, P. (2010). Lean is a cultural issue. *Management Services*, 54(2), pp. 35–41.
- Azevedo, S. G., Carvalho, H., Duarte, S. and Cruz-Machado, V. (2012). Influence of green and lean upstream supply chain management practices on business sustainability. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 59(4), pp. 753–765.
- Bader, B.H., Badar, M.A., Rodehua, S. and McLeod, A. (2020), "A study of the balancing of lean thinking and stakeholder salience in decision-making", *The TQM Journal*, 32(3), pp. 441-460.
- Bai, C., Satir, A. and Sarkis, J., (2019). Investing in lean manufacturing practices: an environmental and operational perspective. *International Journal of Production Research*, 57(4), pp.1037-1051.
- Bajaj, S., Garg, R. and Sethi, M. (2018). Total quality management: A critical literature review using Pareto analysis. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67(1), pp. 128–154. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-07-2016-0146>

- 1
2
3 Belhadi, A., Kamble, S.S., Zkik, K., Cherrafi, A. and Touriki, F.E., 2020. The integrated effect of Big Data
4 Analytics, Lean Six Sigma and Green Manufacturing on the environmental performance of
5 manufacturing companies: The case of North Africa. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 252,
6 p.119903.
7
8 Bortolotti, T., Boscari, S. and Danese, P., 2015. Successful lean implementation: Organizational culture
9 and soft lean practices. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 160, pp.182-201.
10
11 Caldera, H. T. S., Desha, C. and Dawes, L. (2017). Exploring the role of lean thinking in sustainable
12 business practice: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 167, pp.1546–
13 1565.
14
15 Calic, G., Shevchenko, A., Ghasemaghaei, M., Bontis, N. and Tokcan, Z.O., 2020. From sustainability
16 constraints to innovation: enhancing innovation by simultaneously attending to sustainability and
17 commercial imperatives. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(4),
18 pp.695-715.
19
20 Central Bank of Jordan, (2017). Fifty Third Annual Report-Research Department. Available at
21 [https://www.cbj.gov.jo/EchoBusV3.0/SystemAssets/1f339c1c-8792-4828-9121-](https://www.cbj.gov.jo/EchoBusV3.0/SystemAssets/1f339c1c-8792-4828-9121-a23353bbe1c3.pdf)
22 [a23353bbe1c3.pdf](https://www.cbj.gov.jo/EchoBusV3.0/SystemAssets/1f339c1c-8792-4828-9121-a23353bbe1c3.pdf). Accessed: 06/07/2021.
23
24 Cervantes, M. J. (n.d.). *The Lean Benchmark Report: Closing the Reality Gap*. Retrieved April 20, (2021),
25 from
26 https://www.academia.edu/20230515/The_Lean_Benchmark_Report_Closing_the_Reality_Gap
27
28 Chan, H. K., Yin, S. and Chan, F. T. S. (2010). Implementing just-in-time philosophy to reverse logistics
29 systems: A review. *International Journal of Production Research*, 48(21), pp.6293–6313.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540903225213>
31
32 Chen, Z. (2015). The relationships among JIT, TQM and production operations performance: An empirical
33 study from Chinese manufacturing firms. *Business Process Management Journal*, 21(5), pp. 1015–
34 1039. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-09-2014-0084>
35
36 Chen, Z.-X. and Tan, K. H. (2011). The perceived impact of JIT implementation on operations performance.
37 *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 8(2), pp.213-235.
38
39 Chiarini, A., 2011. Japanese total quality control, TQM, Deming's system of profound knowledge, BPR,
40 Lean and Six Sigma: Comparison and discussion. *International journal of lean six sigma*, 2(4),
41 pp.332-355
42
43 Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Third
44 Edition). Sage publications.
45
46 Creswell, J.W., 2002. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative* (p. 676).
47 Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
48
49 Damert, M., Koep, L., Guenther, E. and Morris, J., 2020. Stakeholders and socially responsible supply
50 chain management: the moderating role of internationalization. *Sustainability Accounting,*
51 *Management and Policy Journal*, 12(4), pp 667-694.
52
53 Dey, P.K. and Cheffi, W., (2013). Green supply chain performance measurement using the analytic
54 hierarchy process: a comparative analysis of manufacturing organisations. *Production Planning &*
55 *Control*, 24(8-9), pp.702-720.
56
57 Dey, P.K., Malesios, C., De, D., Chowdhury, S. and Abdelaziz, F.B.,(2020). The impact of lean
58 management practices and sustainably-oriented innovation on sustainability performance of small
59 and medium-sized enterprises: Empirical evidence from the UK. *British Journal of*
60 *Management*, 31(1), pp.141-161.

- 1
2
3 Dieste, M., Panizzolo, R., Garza-Reyes, J. A. and Anosike, A. (2019). The relationship between lean and
4 environmental performance: Practices and measures. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 224, 120–
5 131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.243>
6
7 Dornyei, Z., 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* Oxford University Press. New York, 748.
8 Dowlatshahi, S. and Taham, F. (2009). The development of a conceptual framework for Just-In-Time
9 implementation in SMEs. *Production Planning and Control*, 20(7), pp.611–621.
10
11 Fornell, C. and Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and
12 Measurement Error: Algebra and Statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 382–388.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800313>
14
15 Gao, S. and Low, S.P., 2014. The Toyota Way model: an alternative framework for lean construction. *Total*
16 *Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 25(5-6), pp.664-682.
17
18 Garza-Reyes, J. A., Yu, M., Kumar, V. and Upadhyay, A. (2018). Total quality environmental management:
19 Adoption status in the Chinese manufacturing sector. *The TQM Journal*, 30(1), pp.2-19.
20
21 Garza-Reyes, J.A., Kumar, V., Chaikittisilp, S. and Tan, K.H., 2018. The effect of lean methods and tools
22 on the environmental performance of manufacturing organisations. *International Journal of*
23 *Production Economics*, 200, pp.170-180.
24
25 Goetsch, D. L. and Davis, S. B. (2014). *Quality management for organizational excellence*. pearson Upper
26 Saddle River, NJ.
27
28 Goetsch, D. L., & Davis, S. B. (2014). *Quality management for organizational excellence*. Upper Saddle
29 River, NJ: Pearson.
30
31 Goldengorin, B. and Romanuke, V. (2021). Experimental Analysis of Tardiness in Preemptive Single
32 Machine Scheduling. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 186, 114947.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2021.114947>
34
35 Golicic, S. L. and Smith, C. D. (2013). A meta-analysis of environmentally sustainable supply chain
36 management practices and firm performance. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 49(2), 78–95.
37
38 Green, K. W., Inman, R. A., Sower, V. E. and Zelbst, P. J. (2019). Impact of JIT, TQM and green supply
39 chain practices on environmental sustainability. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology*
40 *Management*, 30(1), pp. 26–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-01-2018-0015>
41
42 Green, K. W., Zelbst, P. J., Meacham, J. and Bhadauria, V. S. (2012). Green supply chain management
43 practices: Impact on performance. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 17(3),
44 pp.290-305.
45
46 Gupta, S.M., 2016. Lean manufacturing, green manufacturing and sustainability. *Journal of Japan*
47 *Industrial Management Association*, 67(2E), pp.102-105.
48
49 Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. y J. and Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (Eighth
50 edition). Cengage.
51
52 Hajmohammad, S., Vachon, S., Klassen, R.D. and Gavronski, I., (2013). Reprint of Lean management and
53 supply management: their role in green practices and performance. *Journal of cleaner*
54 *production*, 56, pp.86-93.
55
56 Hines, P., Taylor, D. and Walsh, A., 2020. The Lean journey: have we got it wrong?. *Total quality*
57 *management & business excellence*, 31(3-4), pp.389-406.
58
59 Hollingworth, D. and Valentine, S. (2014). Corporate social responsibility, continuous process
60 improvement orientation, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *International*
Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 31(6), pp.629-651.

- 1
2
3 Honarpour, A., Jusoh, A. and Md Nor, K., (2018). Total quality management, knowledge management, and
4 innovation: an empirical study in R&D units. *Total Quality Management & Business*
5 *Excellence*, 29(7-8), pp.798-816
6
7 Huo, B., Gu, M. and Wang, Z. (2019). Green or lean? A supply chain approach to sustainable performance.
8 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 216, pp.152–166.
9
10 Inman, R. A., Sale, R. S., Green Jr, K. W. and Whitten, D. (2011). Agile manufacturing: Relation to total-
11 system JIT, supply chain performance, and organizational performance. *Journal of Operations*
12 *Management*, 29(4), pp. 343–355.
13
14 Iranmanesh, M., Zailani, S., Hyun, S., Ali, M. and Kim, K. (2019). Impact of Lean Manufacturing Practices
15 on Firms' Sustainable Performance: Lean Culture as a Moderator. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1112.
16 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041112>
17
18 Isaksson, R. (2006). Total quality management for sustainable development: Process based system
19 models. *Business Process Management Journal*, 12(5), 632–645.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150610691046>
21 **Jasti, N.V.K. and Kodali, R., 2015. Lean production: literature review and trends. *International Journal of***
22 ***Production Research*, 53(3), pp.867-885.**
23
24 Javadian Kootanaee, A., Babu, K. N. and Talari, H. F. (2013). Just-In-Time Manufacturing System: From
25 Introduction to Implement. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2253243>
26
27 Jermittiparsert, K., Namdej, P. and Somjai, S., 2019. Green supply chain practices and sustainable
28 performance: moderating role of total quality management practices in electronic industry of
29 Thailand. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 8(3), pp.33-46.
30
31 Jum'a L, Zimon D, Ikram M. (2021). A Relationship between Supply Chain Practices, Environmental
32 Sustainability and Financial Performance: Evidence from Manufacturing Companies in Jordan.
33 *Sustainability*, 13, 2152. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042152>
34
35 Kalyar, M.N., Shoukat, A. and Shafique, I., 2019. Enhancing firms' environmental performance and
36 financial performance through green supply chain management practices and institutional
37 pressures. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(2), pp.451-476
38
39 Khalfallah, M. and Lakhal, L. (2020). The impact of lean manufacturing practices on operational and
40 financial performance: The mediating role of agile manufacturing. *International Journal of Quality*
41 *& Reliability Management*, 38(1), pp. 147–168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-07-2019-0244>
42
43 Klassen, R. D. (2000). Just-in-time manufacturing and pollution prevention generate mutual benefits in the
44 furniture industry. *Interfaces*, 30(3), pp. 95–106.
45
46 Klassen, R. D. and McLaughlin, C. P. (1993). TQM and environmental excellence in manufacturing.
47 *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 93(6), pp.14-22.
48 **Kline, R.B. (2011). Principles and Practices of Structural Equation Modelling. The Guilford Press, New**
49 **York.**
50
51 Kujala, J. and Ullrank, P. (2004). Total quality management as a cultural phenomenon. *Quality*
52 *Management Journal*, 11(4), pp. 43–55.
53
54 Kumar, C. and Panneerselvam, R. (2007). Literature review of JIT-KANBAN system. *International*
55 *Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 32, 393–408. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-005-0340-2)
56 [005-0340-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-005-0340-2)
57
58 Lee, V.-H., Ooi, K.-B., Tan, B.-I. and Chong, A. Y.-L. (2010). A structural analysis of the relationship
59 between TQM practices and product innovation. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 18(1),
60 73–96.

- 1
2
3 Li, D., Zhao, Y., Zhang, L., Chen, X. and Cao, C. (2018). Impact of quality management on green
4 innovation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 170, pp. 462–470.
- 5
6 Lu, X., Liu, H. and Ye, W., 2010, April. Analysis failure factors for small & medium software projects
7 based on PLS method. In 2010 2nd IEEE International Conference on Information Management
8 and Engineering pp. 676-680. IEEE.
- 9
10 Lucas, M. T. (2010). Understanding environmental management practices: Integrating views from strategic
11 management and ecological economics. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 19(8), pp. 543–
12 556.
- 13
14 Mann, D. (2015). *Creating a lean culture: Tools to sustain lean conversions* (Third edition). CRC Press,
15 Taylor & Francis Group.
- 16
17 McLean, R.S., Antony, J. and Dahlgaard, J.J., 2017. Failure of Continuous Improvement initiatives in
18 manufacturing environments: a systematic review of the evidence. *Total Quality Management &
19 Business Excellence*, 28(3-4), pp.219-237.
- 20
21 Mohammad Mosadegh Rad, A. (2006). The impact of organizational culture on the successful
22 implementation of total quality management. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(6), pp.606–625.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1108/09544780610707101>
- 24
25 Molina-Azorin, J. F., Tari, J. J., Claver-Cortés, E. and López-Gamero, M. D. (2009). Quality management,
26 environmental management and firm performance: A review of empirical studies and issues of
27 integration. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(2), pp.197–222.
- 28
29 Muñoz-Villamizar, A., Santos, J., Garcia-Sabater, J.J., Lleo, A. and Grau, P., 2019. Green value stream
30 mapping approach to improving productivity and environmental performance. *International
31 Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(3), pp. 608-625.
- 32
33 Nader, J., El-Khalil, R., Nassar, E. and Hong, P., 2022. Pandemic planning, sustainability practices, and
34 organizational performance: An empirical investigation of global manufacturing
35 firms. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 246, p.108419.
- 36
37 Nawanir, G., Lim, K. T., Lee, K. L., Moshood, T. D. and Ahmad, A. N. A. (2020). Less for more: The
38 structural effects of lean manufacturing practices on sustainability of manufacturing SMEs in
39 Malaysia. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 2(2), pp.961–975.
- 40
41 Nguyen, M., Phan, A. and Matsui, Y. (2018). Contribution of Quality Management Practices to
42 Sustainability Performance of Vietnamese Firms. *Sustainability*, 10(2), 375.
43 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10020375>
- 44
45 Nugroho, A., Christiananta, B., Wulani, F. and Pratama, I. (2020). Exploring the Association among Just
46 in Time, Total Quality and Supply Chain Management Influence on Firm Performance: Evidence
47 from Indonesia. *Int. J Sup. Chain. Mgt*, 9(2), 920.
- 48
49 Pambreni, Y., Khatibi, A., Azam, S. and Tham, J. (2019). The influence of total quality management toward
50 organization performance. *Management Science Letters*, 9(9), pp.1397–1406.
- 51
52 Phan, A.C., Nguyen, H.T., Nguyen, H.A. and Matsui, Y., (2019). Effect of total quality management
53 practices and JIT production practices on flexibility performance: Empirical evidence from
54 international manufacturing plants. *Sustainability*, 11(11), p.3093.
55 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11113093>
- 56
57 Podsakoff, N.P., 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature
58 and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 885(879), pp.10-1037.
- 59
60

- 1
2
3 Polyviou, M., Croxton, K.L. and Knemeyer, A.M., (2019). Resilience of medium-sized firms to supply
4 chain disruptions: the role of internal social capital. *International Journal of Operations &*
5 *Production Management*, 40(1), pp 68-91.
- 6
7 Powell, D., Lundebj, S., Chabada, L. and Dreyer, H., 2017. Lean Six Sigma and environmental
8 sustainability: the case of a Norwegian dairy producer. *International Journal of Lean Six*
9 *Sigma*, 8(1), pp.53-64.
- 10
11 Prakash, A. and Potoski, M., 2014. Global private regimes, domestic public law: ISO 14001 and pollution
12 reduction. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(3), pp.369-394.
- 13 Psomas, E. and Antony, J. (2019), "Research gaps in Lean manufacturing: a systematic literature review",
14 *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 36(5), pp. 815-839
- 15
16 Rad, A. M. M. (2006). The impact of organizational culture on the successful implementation of total
17 quality management. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(6), pp.606-625.
- 18 Ringle, C. M., Wende, S. and Becker, J.-M. (2015). *SmartPLS 3* (Version 3) [Computer software].
19 SmartPLS GmbH. <http://www.smartpls.com>
- 20 Rupasinghe, H. D. and Wijethilake, C. (2021). The impact of leanness on supply chain sustainability:
21 Examining the role of sustainability control systems. *Corporate Governance: The International*
22 *Journal of Business in Society*, 21(3), pp.410-432. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-06-2020-0217>
- 23 Sakakibara, S., Flynn, B. B., Schroeder, R. G. and Morris, W. T. (1997). The Impact of Just-in-Time
24 Manufacturing and Its Infrastructure on Manufacturing Performance. *Management Science*, 43(9),
25 1246–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.43.9.1246>
- 26
27 Santos Bento, G.D. and Tontini, G., 2018. Developing an instrument to measure lean manufacturing
28 maturity and its relationship with operational performance. *Total Quality Management & Business*
29 *Excellence*, 29(9-10), pp.977-995.
- 30
31 Sawalha, I. and Meaton, J., 2012. The Arabic culture of Jordan and its impacts on a wider Jordanian
32 adoption of business continuity management. *Journal of business continuity & emergency*
33 *planning*, 6(1), pp.84-95.
- 34
35 Shah, R. and Ward, P.T., 2003. Lean manufacturing: context, practice bundles, and performance. *Journal*
36 *of operations management*, 21(2), pp.129-149.
- 37
38 Shokri, A. and Li, G., 2020. Green implementation of Lean Six Sigma projects in the manufacturing
39 sector. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 11(4), pp.771-729.
- 40
41 Singh, R.K., Garg, S.K. and Deshmukh, S.G., (2010). The competitiveness of SMEs in a globalized
42 economy: Observations from China and India. *Management research review*, 33(1), pp 54-65
- 43
44 Soltero, C. and Waldrip, G. (2002). Using Kaizen to reduce waste and prevent pollution. *Environmental*
45 *Quality Management*, 11(3), pp.23–23.
- 46
47 Sreedharan V, R. and Sunder M, V., 2018. A novel approach to lean six sigma project management: a
48 conceptual framework and empirical application. *Production Planning & Control*, 29(11), pp.895-
49 907.
- 50
51 Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). Multivariate analysis of variance and covariance. Using multivariate
52 statistics, 3, 402-407.
- 53
54 Tasleem, M., Khan, N. and Nisar, A. (2018). Impact of total quality management and environmental
55 management system on sustainable performance of selected industries in Pakistan. *Journal of*
56 *Environmental Science and Management*, 21(2).
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tasleem, M., Khan, N. and Nisar, A. (2019). Impact of technology management on corporate sustainability
4 performance: The mediating role of TQM. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability*
5 *Management*, 36(9), 1574–1599. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-01-2018-0017>
6
7 Tewari, P. S., D. Skilling, P. Kumar, and Z. Wu. (2013). Competitive small and medium enterprises: a
8 diagnostic to help design smart SME policy (English). Washington, D. C.: World Bank Group, 1–
9 34. Accessed 30 March 2021. [http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/
10 534521468331785470/Competitive-small-and-medium-
11 enterprises-a-diagnostic-to-help-design-
12 smart-SME-policy](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/534521468331785470/Competitive-small-and-medium-enterprises-a-diagnostic-to-help-design-smart-SME-policy)
13 The World Bank, (2021). Small and Medium enterprises (SMES) finance improving SMEs' access to
14 finance and finding innovative solutions to unlock sources of capital. Available at
15 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/sme/finance>. Accessed 30/06/2021.
16
17 Tortorella, G.L., Fettermann, D., Fogliatto, F.S., Kumar, M. and Jurburg, D., 2020. Analysing the influence
18 of organisational culture and leadership styles on the implementation of lean
19 manufacturing. *Production planning & control*, 32(15), pp.1-13.
20 Verma, N., Sharma, V., & Badar, M. A. (2021). Entropy-based lean, energy and six sigma approach to
21 achieve sustainability in manufacturing system. *Arabian Journal for Science and*
22 *Engineering*, 46(8), pp. 8105-8117.
23
24 Vinodh, S., Arvind, K. R. and Somanaathan, M. (2011). Tools and techniques for enabling sustainability
25 through lean initiatives. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 13(3), pp.469–479.
26 Walker, H., Seuring, S., Sarkis, J., Klassen, R., Fabbe-Costes, N., Roussat, C., Taylor, M. and Taylor, A.
27 (2014). Sustainable supply chains: A framework for environmental scanning practices.
28 *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 34(5), pp.664–694.
29
30 Wilburn Green, K., Toms, L. C. and Clark, J. (2015). Impact of market orientation on environmental
31 sustainability strategy. *Management Research Review*, 38(2), pp.217–238.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-10-2013-0240>
33
34 Williamson, D., Lynch-Wood, G. and Ramsay, J., (2006). Drivers of environmental behaviour in
35 manufacturing SMEs and the implications for CSR. *Journal of business ethics*, 67(3), pp.317-330.
36 Womack, J. P. and Jones, D. T. (1997). Lean thinking—Banish waste and create wealth in your corporation.
37 *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 48(11), pp.1148–1148.
38
39 Wong, K.K.K., 2013. Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques using
40 SmartPLS. *Marketing Bulletin*, 24(1), pp.1-32.
41
42 Wong, W. P. and Wong, K. Y. (2014). Synergizing an ecosphere of lean for sustainable operations. *Journal*
43 *of Cleaner Production*, 85, pp.51–66.
44
45 Yaghmaei, F., 2003. Content validity and its estimation.
46
47 Yeng, S. K., Jusoh, M. S. and Ishak, N. A. (2018). The impact of total quality management (TQM) on
48 competitive advantage: A conceptual mixed method study in the Malaysia luxury hotel industries.
49 *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(2), pp.1–9.
50
51 Young, I. (2009). Beyond lean towards green: Linking manufacturing excellence with environmental
52 sustainability. *Manufacturers' Monthly*, 25(3), pp.14–15.
53
54 Yusr, M. M., Mokhtar, S. S. M., Othman, A. R. and Sulaiman, Y. (2017). Does interaction between TQM
55 practices and knowledge management processes enhance the innovation performance?
56 *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 34(7), pp.955-974.
57
58 Zailani, S. H., Subaramaniam, K. S., Iranmanesh, M. and Shaharudin, M. R. (2015). The impact of supply
59 chain security practices on security operational performance among logistics service providers in
60

1
2
3 an emerging economy. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics*
4 *Management*,45(7), pp.652-673.

5
6 Zelbst, P. J., Green, K. W., Abshire, R. D. and Sower, V. E. (2010). Relationships among market
7 orientation, JIT, TQM, and agility. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*,110(5),pp.637-658.

8
9 Zheng, W., Yang, B. and McLean, G. N. (2010). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and
10 organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management. *Journal of Business*
11 *Research*, 63(7), pp.763–771.

12
13 Zhu, Q. and Sarkis, J. (2004). Relationships between operational practices and performance among early
14 adopters of green supply chain management practices in Chinese manufacturing enterprises.
15 *Journal of Operations Management*, 22(3), pp.265–289.

Table 1 The main LMPs components

Reference	Kanban	Lot size-reduction practices	Setup time reduction practices	JIT scheduling
Buer et al.(2021)	X		X	
Ong et al.(2021)		X	X	
Shahin et al.(2020)	X			
Sancha et al.(2020)				X
Kamble et al.(2020)	X	X	X	X
Braglia et al.(2019)	X			X
Bai et al.(2019)	X	X	X	X
Marodin et al (2018)	X	X	X	X
Sundar et al.(2014)	X	X	X	X
Rahman et al.(2013)	X			
Yang et al.(2011)	X	X	X	X
Shah and Ward (2003)		X		X

Table 2 The main components of QM

Reference	Customer focus	Product design	Statistical process
AlShehail et al.(2021)	X	X	
Oji and Oke (2020)			X
Bhaskar (2020)	X	X	X
Abbas (2020)	X		X
Al-Dhaafri and Alosani (2020)	X	X	X
Sangode and Hedao (2019)	X		X
Phan et al.(2019)	X		
Honarpour et al.(2018)	X		X
Sahoo and Yadav (2018)	X	X	X
Psomas and Jaca (2016)	X	X	
Al-Dhaafri et al.(2016)	X	X	X

Table 3 Respondents profile

Industry	Number of respondents
Textile manufacturing	23
Food manufacturing	170
Plastic manufacturing	54
Carton manufacturing	26
Chemical manufacturing	42

Table 4. Constructs and measurement items

Constructs	Measurement items
Kanban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suppliers fill the kanban containers instead of purchase orders. • Your suppliers deliver the raw materials to your company using kanban containers without using the different packaging. • Your company uses a kanban pull system for production control. • Your company uses kanban squares containers to control the production.
Lot size-reduction practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your company has a small lot sizes in your factory. • Your company tends to have small lot sizes in your master schedule. • Your company aggressively works to reduce lot sizes in your factory.
Setup time reduction practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your employees practice setups to minimize the time required for production. • Your company aggressively works to reduce setup times in your factory. • Your company has low setup times of equipment in your factory compared with competitors.
JIT scheduling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your company usually meets the production schedule. • In your company, there are breakdowns or production stoppages. • The schedule in your company is designed to allow time for catching up because of production stoppages resulting from quality problems.
Customer focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your company is frequently in close contact with the customers. • Your key customers usually visit your factory. • Your key customers give you feedback on the quality and delivery performance.
Product design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is considerable involvement in manufacturing and quality people in your company in the early stages of products design before they reach the company. • Your company designs for producibility. • Your company makes an effort when designing for the process to list the needed specifications. • Your company emphasizes in part design is on minimizing the part count. • Your company concerns about the number of parts in an end item. • Your company reviews the designs of the new products before the product is produced and sold. • In your company, the manufacturing engineers are involved to a large extent before the introduction of new products.
Statistical process control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your company, a huge number of the processes are under statistical control. • Your company makes extensive use of statistical techniques to minimize variance in processes. • Your company posts charts on the shop floor showing defect rates
Environmental sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your company makes efforts to minimize the emission of hazardous waste • Your company works to minimize the consumption of energy • Your company makes efforts to minimize the consumption of direct or indirect usage of material • Your company works to minimize the consumption of dangerous materials • Your company is keen to improve its overall environmental situation • Your company works to improve compliance in alignment with environmental regulations and standards

Quality Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your company provides meaningful incentives that reward LMPs • Your company follows a policy of non-blaming, performance-oriented, process-driven organizational atmosphere • Senior management in your company directly involved with operating employees in LMPs implementation • Your company provides employees with required training on LMPs • In your company, managers encourage their employees to apply continuous improvement knowledge and skills • In your company, the senior managers lead the deployment of LMPs • In your company, quality progress targets are defined and have been effectively communicated
-----------------	---

Table 5. Descriptive analysis of survey data (n = 315)

Latent variables	*M	*SD	Skewness	*SE	Kurtosis	*SE
Kanban	2.26	.93859	1.176	.137	.458	.274
Lot size reduction	4.21	1.0171	-1.854	.137	2.275	.274
Setup time reduction	3.93	.92308	-1.654	.137	2.899	.274
JIT scheduling	1.88	.43671	.688	.137	6.035	.274
Customer focus	3.85	.95823	-1.512	.137	2.348	.274
Product design	4.01	.87451	-2.098	.137	4.292	.274
Statistical process control	3.18	.76642	-.963	.137	.622	.274
Environmental sustainability	4.03	.82605	-2.343	.137	5.017	.274
Quality Culture	3.83	.86939	-1.686	.137	2.885	.274
*M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, SE=Standard Error						

Table 6. Common Method Biasness

Factor	Total Variance Explained					
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14.302	36.672	36.672	13.767	35.301	35.301
2	3.797	9.736	46.408			
3	3.414	8.754	55.162			
4	2.940	7.539	62.701			
5	2.479	6.357	69.059			
6	2.269	5.818	74.877			
7	1.486	3.811	78.688			
8	1.241	3.183	81.871			
9	.923	2.368	84.239			
10	.707	1.814	86.053			
11	.578	1.482	87.535			
12	.535	1.371	88.906			
13	.447	1.147	90.053			
14	.379	.972	91.024			
15	.367	.940	91.964			
16	.282	.722	92.686			
17	.276	.708	93.395			
18	.258	.663	94.057			
19	.248	.636	94.693			
20	.209	.537	95.230			
21	.193	.496	95.726			
22	.184	.471	96.197			
23	.157	.403	96.600			
24	.152	.389	96.989			
25	.142	.363	97.352			
26	.132	.338	97.691			
27	.127	.326	98.017			
28	.123	.315	98.331			
29	.119	.304	98.636			
30	.104	.266	98.901			
31	.099	.254	99.155			
32	.073	.186	99.342			
33	.064	.163	99.505			
34	.058	.149	99.653			
35	.046	.117	99.770			
36	.045	.115	99.885			
37	.037	.094	99.979			
38	.006	.015	99.994			
39	.002	.006	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Table 7. Collinearity statistics

Latent variables	Environmental sustainability	
	Tolerance	VIF
Kanban	.963	1.039
Lot size reduction	.710	1.408
Setup time reduction	.701	1.427
JIT scheduling	.978	1.023
Customer focus	.517	1.935
Product design	.723	1.382
Statistical process control	.566	1.766

Table 8. Results of stepwise regression analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.169	.167		12.994	.000
	Lot size reduction	.443	.038	.545	11.504	.000
2	(Constant)	1.503	.180		8.355	.000
	Lot size reduction	.324	.039	.399	8.269	.000
	Customer focus	.302	.042	.351	7.260	.000
3	(Constant)	1.005	.191		5.260	.000
	Lot size reduction	.245	.040	.302	6.172	.000
	Customer focus	.240	.041	.278	5.846	.000
	Product design	.267	.046	.283	5.832	.000
4	(Constant)	1.289	.238		5.410	.000
	Lot size reduction	.246	.040	.302	6.218	.000
	Customer focus	.242	.041	.281	5.931	.000
	Product design	.266	.046	.282	5.843	.000
	JIT scheduling	-.155	.079	-.082	-1.976	.049
5	(Constant)	1.476	.255		5.798	.000
	Lot size reduction	.240	.039	.296	6.090	.000
	Customer focus	.284	.046	.329	6.230	.000
	Product design	.274	.046	.290	6.021	.000
	JIT scheduling	-.162	.078	-.086	-2.074	.039
	Setup time reduction	-.087	.043	-.097	-2.018	.044

a. Dependent Variable: Env. sustainability

Table 9. Analysis of measurement model

Latent variables	Items	Factor loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Kanban	Kanban.1	0.946	0.945	0.958	0.850
	Kanban.2	0.948			
	Kanban.3	0.928			
	Kanban.4	0.863			
Lot size reduction	LSR.1	0.951	0.942	0.963	0.896
	LSR.2	0.940			
	LSR.3	0.949			
Setup time reduction	STR.1	0.948	0.947	0.966	0.903
	STR.2	0.952			
	STR.3	0.951			
JIT scheduling	JITS.1	0.828	0.901	0.924	0.802
	JITS.2	0.901			
	JITS.3	0.953			
Customer focus	CF.1	0.964	0.961	0.975	0.927
	CF.2	0.951			
	CF.3	0.974			
Product design	PDes.1	0.923	0.966	0.972	0.832
	PDes.2	0.900			
	PDes.3	0.905			
	PDes.4	0.927			
	PDes.5	0.903			
	PDes.6	0.915			
	PDes.7	0.913			
Statistical process control	SPC1	0.866	0.847	0.907	0.765
	SPC2	0.882			
	SPC3	0.876			
Quality culture	QualityCult.1	0.905	0.960	0.967	0.806
	QualityCult.2	0.911			
	QualityCult.3	0.910			
	QualityCult.4	0.897			
	QualityCult.5	0.873			
	QualityCult.6	0.902			
	QualityCult.7	0.884			
Environmental sustainability	EnvSus.1	0.884	0.945	0.956	0.786
	EnvSus.2	0.887			
	EnvSus.3	0.895			
	EnvSus.4	0.913			
	EnvSus.5	0.887			
	EnvSus.6	0.852			

Table 10. Discriminant validity test (Fornell-Larcker Criterion)

Latent variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Customer focus	0.963								
2. Environmental sustainability	0.517	0.886							
3. JIT scheduling	0.027	-0.081	0.896						
4. Kanban	0.035	-0.030	0.173	0.922					
5. Quality culture	0.469	0.528	-0.073	0.038	0.898				
6. Lot size reduction	0.415	0.548	-0.001	-0.016	0.506	0.947			
7. Product design	0.400	0.531	-0.005	-0.016	0.523	0.456	0.912		
8. Setup time reduction	0.499	0.193	-0.009	0.106	0.155	0.173	0.249	0.950	
9. Statistical process control	0.609	0.438	-0.015	-0.030	0.331	0.389	0.389	0.441	0.875

Table 11: Model Fit indices

Fit Measure	Estimated Model
SRMR	0.069
NFI	0.928

Table 12. Analysis of structural model

Hypotheses	Path coefficients (β)	T-value	P-value	Test result
H1. Kanban -> Env. sustainability	-0.002	0.034	0.973	Rejected
H2. Lot size reduction -> Env. sustainability	0.285	3.935	0.000**	Accepted
H3. Setup time reduction -> Env. sustainability	-0.110	2.204	0.028*	Accepted
H4. JIT scheduling -> Env. sustainability	-0.087	2.101	0.036*	Accepted
H5. Customer focus -> Env. sustainability	0.290	5.510	0.000**	Accepted
H6. Product design -> Env. sustainability	0.277	4.025	0.000**	Accepted
H7. Statistical process control -> Env. sustainability	0.089	1.828	0.068	Rejected

Note: ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, based on two-tailed test; $t = 1.96$

Table 13. Results of moderation analysis

Hypotheses	Path coefficients (β)	T-value	P-value	Test result
H8. Quality culture* LMPs -> Environmental sustainability	0.024	0.349	0.727	Rejected
H9. Quality culture*TQM -> Environmental sustainability	-0.177	3.104	0.002**	Accepted

Note: ** $p < 0.01$, based on two-tailed test; $t = 1.96$




Figure 1. Theoretical framework

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2. PLS Modelling results. LSR = Lot size reduction, STR = Setup time reduction, JITS = Just in time scheduling, CF = Customer focus, PDes = Product design, SPC = Statistical process control, EnvSus = Environmental sustainability

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Interaction plot for LMPs

International Journal of Lean Six Sigma




Figure 4. Interaction plot for TQM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5. Heteroscedasticity scatterplot

Lean Six Sigma

Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual

Dependent Variable: EnvSus.Aver




Figure 6. Residuals P-P plot

Lean Six Sigma

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60