



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Assessing ISO 18404 standard applicability in the service sector: a qualitative study
Author(s)	Cudney, Elizabeth; Sony, Michael; Ramadan, Mariam Ali; Antony, Jiju; Al Dhaheri, Maha Khalifa; McDermott, Olivia; Cudney, Elizabeth A.
Publication Date	2024-01-18
Publication Information	Sony, Michael, Ramadan, Mariam Ali, Antony, Jiju, Al Dhaheri, Maha Khalifa, McDermott, Olivia, & Cudney, Elizabeth A. (2024). Assessing ISO 18404 standard applicability in the service sector: a qualitative study. The TQM Journal, doi: 10.1108/TQM-12-2023-0403
Publisher	Emerald
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-12-2023-0403
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/18117
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/TQM-12-2023-0403

Downloaded 2024-05-20T07:35:35Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.





Assessing ISO 18404 standard applicability in the service sector: A qualitative study

Journal:	<i>The TQM Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	TQM-12-2023-0403.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	International standards, Six Sigma, Lean Six Sigma, Continuous Improvement, Quality Improvement

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Assessing ISO 18404 standard applicability in the service sector: A qualitative study

Abstract

Purpose – This research aims to establish the applicability of the ISO 18404 standard to the service sector, identify any required amendments, and identify the critical success factors and barriers to deploying the standard within the service sector.

Design/methodology/approach – The study used a qualitative approach by interviewing operational excellence (OPEX) professionals who work in the service sector.

Findings – The findings indicate a significant lack of knowledge about the existence of the standard and a general scepticism regarding the applicability of the current ISO 18404 standard to the service sector.

Research limitations/implications – Limited examples of the application of ISO 18404 in organisations exist, as only a few organisations have adopted the standard. Therefore, the research focused on the challenges and obstacles that experienced OPEX professionals perceived could be an issue.

Originality/value – The study will aid service sector organisations in understanding the standard and, subsequently, determine whether to pursue it as part of an OPEX program. This research is the first study on the application of ISO 18404 to the service sector.

Keywords: Service Sector, Lean Six Sigma, ISO Standards, ISO 18404

Introduction

Many organisations strive to improve market competitiveness and deliver an enhanced customer experience. Organisations have embraced OPEX methodologies to improve their productivity and quality of products and services (Antony *et al.*, 2017). In particular, organisations have continuously improved the quality and delivery of products and services at an affordable cost through Lean and Six Sigma (Snee and Hoerl, 2018). In recent years, the integration of Lean and Six Sigma became Lean Six Sigma (LSS) to optimise the reduction of variation achieved by Six Sigma with the decrease in waste achieved through Lean (George, 2002). Organisations have embraced a tiered certification or belt system to train personnel in LSS as an OPEX methodology

1
2
3 and ensure certain competency levels. These belt levels can start with a basic level (yellow or
4 white) to more advanced levels of competency and training, including Green Belts (GB), Black
5 Belts (BB), and Master Black Belts (MBB) (Antony and Snee, 2010). Employees may be certified
6 by their company as part of an internal training program or engage an external training body to
7 certify them. Alternatively, they may sign up for an external certification body training course and
8 exam (Antony *et al.*, 2021). Therefore, there has been a proliferation of certification bodies and
9 training consultants offering certifications for purchase in recent years with little or no governance
10 of these awards or the quality of training provided (Louzada *et al.*, 2022).

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 In many cases, the curricula of these belt courses may differ. They may not follow a body of
18 knowledge as offered by, for example, the American Society of Quality (ASQ) belt certification
19 system (Oudrhiri *et al.*, 2022). International Management Information Systems such as those
20 offered by the International Standards Organisation (ISO) have provided methods of ensuring that
21 organisations set up and are audited and certified to a level of competence in, for example, quality
22 management (ISO 9001), environmental management (ISO 14001), and other technical areas (Tari
23 *et al.*, 2012). The importance of integrating a continuous improvement programme with
24 organisational management systems and within an ISO 9001 certified Quality Management
25 System has been documented (Sá *et al.*, 2020). The ISO 18404 standard defines the competencies
26 for the attainment of specific levels of competency with regards to Six Sigma, Lean, and LSS in
27 individuals (e.g., MBB, BB, GB, and Lean practitioners) and their organisations (ISO 18404,
28 2015) to resolve the issue around a lack of standardisation within LSS training bodies and
29 consultants. However, this standard has not been widely embraced according to studies (Antony
30 *et al.*, 2021; Antony *et al.*, 2022a; Antony *et al.*, 2022b; McDermott *et al.*, 2023). Specific criticisms
31 of the standard included that Lean cannot be standardised as the approach in one organisation to
32 Lean may not suit another organisation (Antony *et al.*, 2021). There have also been concerns about
33 the suitability of the standard for small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Antony *et al.* (2022)
34 published a study about the unsuitability of the standard to SMEs. Further, Kazakova (2019)
35 researched the difficulties of applying the standard to SMEs in Russia. Equally, using the standard
36 to service type organisations has been a concern (Antony, McDermott, Sony, Cudney *et al.*, 2021).
37 This research aims to follow previous studies on applying ISO 18404 to manufacturing sectors and
38 SMEs and establish how applicable the ISO 18404 standard is to services. The research questions
39 (RQs) are as follows:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *RQ1: To what extent does the current version meet the requirements and challenges of the*
4 *service industry?*

5
6
7 *RQ2: What amendments should be made further to the current version?*

8
9 *RQ3: What are the critical success factors and barriers to using this standard in the service*
10 *sector?*

11
12 The following section outlines the literature review. The next section describes the methodology
13 for the study. The results are then presented and discussed, while the study concludes in the final
14 section.
15
16

17 18 19 **Literature Review**

20 *Background to ISO 18404:2015*

21
22 The Royal Statistical Society (RSS) developed the standard in association with the British
23 Standards Institute (BSI) and Professor Tony Bendell, a prolific advocate of the standard.
24 *Professor Bendell* was chair of the committee in BSI that had oversight for that standard
25 development. He also chairs the RSI quality improvement section (Oudrhiri *et al.*, 2022). The
26 standard was reviewed and confirmed in 2021 as part of the ISO systematic review process, which
27 involves a close review of the standard and any requests to upgrade it or edit it every five years
28 (ISO, 2019). During the systematic review process, members of the ISO Technical Committee
29 (TC) 69/SC 7 for “Applications of statistical and related techniques for the implementation of Six
30 Sigma” highlighted several concerns with the standard and referenced a study by Antony *et al.*
31 (2021) as evidence of a need for revision of the standard (Antony *et al.*, 2022; McDermott *et al.*,
32 2023). However, the TC decided to confirm the standard and work on a revision separately. The
33 TC placed this initial revision on hold. A new work order to revise the standard has been put to the
34 ISO TC involved, citing a lack of resources to work on the revision of the standard, and an expected
35 ISO 18404: 2023 revision will now not take place until at least 2026 based on timelines put forward
36 by the project leads (ISO TC 69, 2023).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *ISO Standard*

51
52 There are sparse mentions of ISO 18404:2015 in peer-reviewed studies, conference papers, or on
53 general internet or blog searches for the standard (Antony *et al.*, 2022; Antony, McDermott, Sony,
54 Cudney *et al.*, 2021; Antony, McDermott, Sony, Powell, *et al.*, 2021). Ward and Caklais (2019)
55
56
57
58
59
60

discussed the advantage of having an LSS standard in theory. They discussed the ISO 18404 standard, referencing its first in-the-world implementation in a UK construction company in 2018. There are practically no case studies of the practical deployment of the standard (Ward and Caklais, 2019; Herrera and Van Hillegersberg, 2019; Antony *et al.*, 2021). There are some references to organisations with ISO 18404 on internet searches via Google, but still no evidence of implementing the standard as a case study publication in refereed journals. For example, the Dubai Electricity and Water Authority (DEWA) in Saudi Arabia became the first government authority to gain ISO 18404 certification in 2019 (Alqahtani *et al.*, 2015; BSI, 2019). Sobhra Facades, a construction company in the Gulf, obtained ISO 18404 certification in 2022 (Illankoon, 2022), and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Centre hospital group are certified to the standard (UPMC Whitfield, 2021). Many have referenced the standard (Herrera and van Hillegersberg, 2019; Kikuchi and Suzuki, 2018; Artamonova *et al.*, 2022), but very few authors have discussed the standard in more detail. Table 1 summarises the published studies related to the standard and their main findings. Limited studies specifically discuss ISO 18404 and its application; therefore, it is possible to summarise the studies most applicable to the standard here.

Table 1. Literature related to ISO 18404 - the requirement for a standard and its pros and cons

Studies	Findings
A study into the pros and cons of ISO 18404: viewpoints from leading academics and practitioners (Antony, McDermott, Sony, Cudney, <i>et al.</i> , 2021)	The qualitative study identified mixed opinions about the standard's necessity but generally agreed on the need for its enhancement, offering suggestions for improving the standard.
A global study on the applicability of ISO 18404: 2015 for SMEs: An exploratory qualitative study (Antony <i>et al.</i> , 2022)	This study shows that the ISO 18404:2015 standard is unsuitable for SMEs using LSS. It has shortcomings that need fixing or a tailored LSS standard for SMEs.

<p>The place of ISO 18404:2015 in organisational improvement (Oudhriri et al., 2022)</p>	<p>This paper was a rebuttal of a study on ISO 18404 by Antony et al. (2021) and cited the standard's many benefits.</p>
<p>The misplacement of ISO 18404:2015 in organisational improvement: A point-counterpoint article (McDermott <i>et al.</i>, 2023)</p>	<p>This point-counterpoint paper refuted the Oudhriri et al. (2022) work, defended the study by Antony et al. (2021), and cited the standard's shortcomings as written.</p>
<p>A global study into the pros and cons of ISO 18404: A convergent mixed method study and recommendations for further research (Antony, McDermott, Sony, Powell, <i>et al.</i>, 2021)</p>	<p>This study revealed conflicting OPEX professional views on ISO 18404. Qualitative findings showed support for Lean Sigma but concerns about audibility and suitability, suggesting a need for revisions. In the quantitative survey, 42% had not heard of it, and 90% of those who had read it. Only 10% planned to apply it. Less than 50% found it fit for purpose, hinting at potential future refinements.</p>
<p>Piloting the deployment of ISO 18404 in the construction sector, an approach to organisational transformation (Ward and Caklais, 2019)</p>	<p>The authors discussed the importance of the standard and its benefits while providing an example of its application to the construction sector.</p>
<p>Problems of implementation of ISO 18404: 2015 in the enterprise in Russia (Kazakova, 2019)</p>	<p>This study discussed the difficulties of implementing the standard in SMEs in Russia.</p>
<p>Kaizen and Standardization (Kikuchi and Suzuki, 2018)</p>	<p>The authors discussed the background of the ISO 18404 standard and concluded that</p>

	African organisations, particularly SMEs, would not embrace such a standard due to resource issues and costs involved.
--	--

Benefits of a Lean Six Sigma Standard and ISO 18404

Many studies related to ISO 18404 have mixed viewpoints on the benefits of the requirement for a Lean and Six Sigma standard (Antony, McDermott, Sony, Cudney, *et al.*, 2021). Industry practitioners and academics in qualitative studies by Antony *et al.* (2021, 2022a, 2022b) cited that having a standard could eliminate some “rogue” trainers and consultants who certify individuals as BBs with little training required, in turn, in exchange for a fee, a faster certification time, and a framed certificate. The value of a certification attached to the ISO was deemed valuable. The importance of having competencies that an individual could be certified to is also an advantage of ISO 18404, as the certification could move from one employer to another with the individual (Antony, McDermott, Sony, Powell *et al.*, 2021; McDermott *et al.*, 2023).

Critique of a Lean Six Sigma standard and ISO 18404

Many of the studies on ISO 18404 available spoke of the “lack of fitness for use” as currently written (Antony *et al.*, 2021). Qualitative studies conducted by Antony *et al.* (2022) and practitioners in LSS discussed that Lean could not be standardised or measured and that the standard itself has several shortcomings. For example, the standard refers to Lean and Six Sigma but not LSS. The standard does not include the YB level and Design for Six Sigma or Design for LSS. Many commentators have stated that a continuous improvement program without inclusivity of an operator or basic level belt makes the program more exclusive and goes against an ethos of involving everyone, employee respect, and total engagement of the workforce for an OPEX journey (Antony, McDermott, Sony, Cudney, *et al.*, 2021; Kikuchi and Suzuki, 2018; Roser, 2016). Others stated that ISO 9001 certification is sufficient as a base standard for continuous improvement and that another standard is not required (Antony., 2021). In their 2021 study, Antony *et al.* put forward a series of recommendations for improving the standard. The participants overwhelmingly repeated these recommendations in subsequent qualitative and quantitative

1
2
3 analyses by Antony's research team. The Oudhriri et al. (2022) study also reflected that the
4 standard needed to be updated to reflect the shortcomings.
5
6
7

8 *ISO 18404 and Services*

9

10 Traditionally, LSS has proliferated more in manufacturing than in service sectors (Sunder M. *et*
11 *al.*, 2018). However, in recent years, continuous improvement methods have been embraced
12 increasingly in the financial, healthcare, and retail sectors. Some of the criticisms of employing
13 LSS in services are that, for example, many are customer or public-facing and subject to surges in
14 capacity. For instance, in healthcare and other public sector organisations, surges occur during
15 pandemics and other capacity challenges (McDermott *et al.*, 2022a). Quality improvement can
16 take longer to implement in such sectors, particularly in public organisations with administrative
17 processes and cultural issues causing constraints (Bhat *et al.*, 2019). The ever-changing nature of
18 the services environment and variability in services required can restrict the process of
19 improvement initiatives (McDermott *et al.*, 2022b). Therefore, the complexity and diversity of the
20 service sector can lead to different approaches and practices in the deployment of LSS, which does
21 not fit with a standard (Antony *et al.*, 2021). Many service sector organisations have many support
22 personnel (e.g., retail employees, call centre support employees) who need to be involved in
23 continuous improvement to improve processes; having no YB or white belt (WB) level in the ISO
24 18404 standard restricts their access to a continuous improvement program.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Research Methodology**

39 The research questions set out in this study were exploratory. Therefore, the study used a
40 qualitative research methodology. Qualitative studies are appropriate when researchers seek a
41 deeper, contextual, and more nuanced understanding of a phenomenon, particularly when
42 exploring subjective experiences, social processes, or poorly understood areas (Cresswell et al.,
43 2016). In this case, the research intends to assess the suitability of the current version of the ISO
44 18404 standard for the service industry and identify any necessary amendments. In addition, the
45 research seeks to examine critical success factors and barriers to applying this standard in the
46 service sector. Therefore, the research employed a qualitative study to understand the perspectives
47 of senior professionals working in the service sector about this standard. This approach enabled
48 the capture of diverse viewpoints about this standard through a heterogeneous purposive sampling
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 technique or maximum variation purposive sampling technique (Saunders et al., 2009). The study
4 targeted individuals who are BBs or MBBs with a minimum of five to ten years of experience in
5 the service industry, specifically those engaged in Six Sigma or LSS projects.
6
7

8 The research team developed an open-ended semi-structured interview protocol to gather
9 insights on various aspects of the ISO 18404 standard. The first part of the interview protocol
10 captured the demographic information about the participants. The second part consisted of various
11 aspects of ISO 18404 regarding its applicability in the service sector. The protocol underwent a
12 piloting phase involving four participants.
13
14
15
16

17 Two of them, with over a decade of experience, were industry professionals in the service
18 sector and MBBs. The other two were academicians, each having published a minimum of 10
19 research papers on LSS. The piloting exercise proved instrumental in refining the interview
20 questions for enhanced clarity and understanding. First, the researchers used LinkedIn
21 (Prodromou, 2015), a professional social networking site, to identify participants from four
22 continents: North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia. The qualifying criteria for the participants
23 were those working in the service sector with a minimum of five years of experience with LSS BB
24 or MBBs. The researchers sent a personalised invite to each participant via e-mail outlining the
25 study's objectives. The researchers provided the requested information to participants who needed
26 further information. Once the consent form was signed, the researchers conducted one-on-one
27 semi-structured online interviews. The average time of the interview was 71 minutes, with a
28 standard deviation of 13. The researchers ensured participant anonymity as we will not reveal any
29 identifying information. Assurance of anonymity avoids socially desirable responses
30 (Paulhus, 1994). The interviews were stopped at 15 participants, as the same themes recurred
31 without providing new insights, indicating theoretical saturation (Guest *et al.*, 2006). Further,
32 Creswell et al. (2016) suggest a sample size of 10 to 15 is sufficient in most cases as data would
33 be saturated. Thus, the sample size was adequate for this study. Table 2 presents the participants'
34 backgrounds and demographic information.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The researchers conducted, recorded, and transcribed the interviews via Zoom. Two
49 researchers ensured accuracy by cross-referencing the transcriptions with the original voice
50 recordings. After obtaining the transcribed data for each interview, the researchers anonymised the
51 participants' identities using pseudo-names (P1 to P15). The transcribed content was shared with
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

respective participants, allowing them to cross-check and provide feedback (Cresswell et al., 2016) to enhance the validity of the collected data and ensure its reliability and validity.

Three researchers' data from the 15 interviews underwent independent analysis, leading to thematic categorisation into themes and meta-themes. The interrater percentage agreement reached 89%. In cases of disagreement, all researchers conducted collaborative discussions to achieve amicable resolutions.

Table 2. Participants' profiles

Code	Qualification Level	Job Title	Sector	Years of Experience in the Service Sector	Company Headquarters	Company Size	Business Unit Size
P1	MBB	Program Manager of Customer Service Team	E-commerce	20 years	United States	1,500,000	130,000
P2	MBB	Program Manager of Customer Excellence Team	E-commerce	17 years	United States	1,500,000	50,000
P3	BB	Senior Process Engineer	Finance	Five years	United States	220,000	50,000
P4	MBB	Director Process Operations	Information Technology	24 years	United States	200,000	40
P5	MBB	Head of Continuous Improvement	Probation	30 years	England and Wales	85,000	18,000
P6	BB	Senior Product Owner	Finance	35 years	United States	50,000	20
P7	BB	Associate Director	Business Consulting	16 years	India	21,000	-

P8	MBB	Senior Consultant	Finance	Ten years	Netherlands	20,000	3,000
P9	MBB	Director of Operational Excellence Team	Business Consulting	20 years	United States	20,000	-
P10	MBB	Senior Associate Director	Shared Services	18 years	India	20,000	-
P11	MBB	Senior Performance Improvement Consultant	Healthcare	Six years	United States	14,000	13
P12	BB	Transformation Program Manager	Telecom	18 years	Australia	5000	-
P13	MBB	Quality Improvement Lead	Healthcare	30 years	Ireland	3500	-
P14	MBB	Quality Assurance Compliance Lead	Construction	20 years	Ireland	1500	-
P15	BB	Associate Professor	Higher Education	13 years	Australia	1280	-

Findings

Figure 1 showcases a word cloud derived from the interviews, visually summarising the key themes. This graphical representation effectively highlights the authors' and interviewees' most frequently used keywords, emphasising their relative importance (Lohmann et al., 2015; Munoz Lopez, 2010). Prominent terms included service, belt, organisations, sectors, Lean, ISO, Six Sigma, 18404, process, improvement, competency, and LSS. Figure 2 presents a more detailed analysis plan.

employment, sharing comprehensive knowledge, while P5 was close to implementing it at their organisation but faced resistance from leaders. Six participants had some awareness, with three stating that they learned about the standard from Antony et al. (2022). The results further indicate that 80% of BBs were unaware of the standard before this study, indicating a significant knowledge gap.

Table 3. Participants' awareness levels of the ISO 18404 standard

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14	P15
Fully aware	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat Aware	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	Yes
Fully unaware	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Adoption of ISO 18404 Standard for Training Purposes

The study also found that none of the participants currently use ISO 18404 for training personnel in Lean or Six Sigma. Instead, their organisations preferred using internal standards, ASQ LSS certification or tailored certifications provided by consulting firms, implying these certifications aligned better with their organisational needs.

Applicability of ISO 18404 Standard as Standard on LSS in the Service Sector

The researchers had participants who agreed to assess the applicability of ISO 18404 in the service sector. As highlighted in Table 4, only four individuals (P1, P3, P6, and P10) endorsed ISO 18404's applicability to the service sector. They believe that its comprehensive nature suits the diverse service sector and effectively addresses the sectors' needs, emphasises process alignment, is applicable across the entire service sector without exception, and emphasises the importance of having uniform competencies.

However, eight participants expressed scepticism about the competencies within the standard, suggesting inflexibility related to different business scenarios and problem severity. They also deemed the standard too rigid and proposed it as a guiding framework. While some found it more

1
2
3 suited to manufacturing, others acknowledged its adaptability but noted that specific aspects might
4 require modification to suit service organisations.
5

6
7 Three participants strongly disapproved of ISO 18404 for LSS in the service sector due to its
8 technical nature. They raised concerns about data collection issues, the service sector's diverse
9 nature, and the need for sector-specific tools. The participants collectively questioned its value,
10 citing existing standards such as ISO 13053-1:2011 and ISO 21500:2021.
11
12

13
14 In summary, 73% of the participants expressed doubts about the standard's applicability in the
15 service sector, indicating a significant level of scepticism. These findings indicate that
16 modifications may be necessary to ensure the standard's adoption and suitability in the service
17 sector.
18
19
20
21

22 Table 4. Participants' viewpoint on the applicability of the ISO 18404 standard as an LSS standard for the
23 service sector
24

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14	P15
Fully Applicable	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat Applicable	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-
Inapplicable	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	Yes

25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 *Shortfalls in the Current ISO 18404 Standard for LSS Implementation in the Service Sector*

38 Although some participants recognised ISO 18404's relevance in the service sector, discussions
39 highlighted notable shortcomings. Table 5 ranks these shortfalls themes by the number of
40 participants expressing each concern.
41
42
43
44

45 Table 5. Shortfalls in the current ISO 18404 standard for LSS implementation in the service sector
46

Shortfalls	Participant Code	Count
Inadequate consideration of the unique characteristics and challenges of the service sector	P1, P2, P7, P9, P11, P14, P15	7
Lack of additional value for the standard	P4, P6, P7, P8, P9	5
Inapplicability of tools in the service sector	P8, P10, P13, P14	4

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Measurement and evaluation obstacles	P4, P5, P11, P12	4
Generalizability of the standard	P4, P12, P15	3

Inadequate Consideration of the Unique Characteristics and Challenges of the Service Sector

Participants identified the standard's primary drawback as insufficient recognition of the distinct traits and complexities within the service sector. They believe the standard's limitations include its inability to encompass the sector's diversity, intricacies, ever-changing dynamics, diverse scenarios, criticality, and data availability issues. They also emphasise the standard's lack of oversight of customer interactions and stress integrating customer viewpoints.

Lack of Additional Value

Five participants raised concerns regarding ISO 18404's perceived value. These respondents believe existing Six Sigma and project management standards may confuse ISO 18404's unique benefits. Additionally, organisations already proficient in Lean and Six Sigma may perceive limited advantages in the current standard.

Inapplicability of Tools in the Service Sector

Four participants noted that specific tools, including control charts, gauge repeatability and reproducibility, design of experiments, and process capability analysis, were seen as inapplicable or less applicable in the service sector. For instance, Participant 14 highlighted challenges with process visualisation and tools such as value stream mapping in this context.

Measurement and Evaluation Obstacles

Four participants identified measurement and evaluation challenges in ISO 18404, focusing on skill assessment in the service sector. The participants noted challenges measuring competencies such as auditing, motivation, customer focus, and leadership development. They highlighted the added complexity of quantification and assessment due to the inherent intangibility of services in this sector.

Generalizability of the Standard

1
2
3 Three participants highlighted the standard's generalizability issues, pointing out its generic,
4 inflexible, prescriptive, and theoretical nature. Participant 15 explained, "the standard is overly
5 prescriptive, which may not suit the service sector's practical needs. In my experience, data
6 availability can be limited."
7
8
9

10 11 12 ***Pros and Cons of Current ISO 18404 Standard in the Service Sector***

13 Participants compiled a list of the pros and cons of the ISO 18404 standards in the service industry.
14 Eight key pros emerged during the interviews. The most common one (P1, P3, P6, P8, P13, P14)
15 is its emphasis on competencies and performance. It offers a "prescriptive model for understanding
16 knowledge, skills, and expertise" and "helps measure and verify competence levels". Additionally,
17 it grants accreditation and recognition, confirming competence (P4, P13, P14, P15). P15
18 highlighted the absence of a global certification for Lean practitioners, making ISO 18404
19 recognition valuable. Further, the ISO 18404 standard ensures consistency and standardisation
20 (P13, P14, P15), serves as a guiding principle (P1, P6, P8, P13), and fosters sustainability and
21 continuous improvement (P2, P13, P11). Notably, it enhances efficiency and operational
22 excellence (P11, P14), customer satisfaction (P11, P14), employee engagement (P14), and
23 competitive advantage (P11).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Thirteen key cons emerged from the interviews. The most prevalent challenge is its rigidity
33 and lack of flexibility (P7, P9, P10, P11, P12, P14, P15). P11 emphasised that excessive
34 standardisation in the service industry can stifle creativity and hinder customisation. Similarly,
35 P14 noted that service sector work is often project-based and unique, making it challenging to
36 tailor the standard to specific organisational needs. The second most common con (P2, P3, P9,
37 P11, P15) is the absence of service-specific knowledge. Interviewees believe that the standard
38 requires adjustments to accommodate service sector characteristics, such as intangibility,
39 variability, customer interactions, challenges associated with data availability, and the absence of
40 anecdotal evidence.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The third most common con is the separation between Lean and Six Sigma (P4, P8, P10, P13,
49 P15). P4 pointed out that although the standard's title mentions LSS, the content treats them as
50 distinct entities. P13 and P10 mentioned that the industry no longer distinguishes Lean and Six
51 Sigma separately but focuses on LSS. P8 and P15 believe it focuses more towards Six Sigma.
52 Other challenges mentioned include vagueness and a theoretical nature (P4, P10, P15), difficulties
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

in measuring competencies and success (P4, P15, P11), lack of a unified body of knowledge (P1, P6), limited coverage of YB (P1, P4), and the standard being costly and time-consuming (P14, P11).

Critical Success Factors for the Adoption of ISO 18404 Standard in the Service Sector

Participant input revealed recurring critical success factors themes, as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Critical success factors for adopting ISO 18404 in the service sectors

Success Factors	Participant Code	Count
Leadership buy-in/ Management support	P2, P5, P9, P11, P12, P13, P14, P15	8
Amendment of standard structure	P1, P3, P4, P7, P8, P10, P12	7
Training and education	P1, P2, P10, P11, P13, P14, P15	7
Employee engagement and cross-functional collaboration	P2, P6, P8, P11, P14	5
Fostering a continuous improvement culture	P7, P11, P12, P14, P15	5
Effective performance measurement systems	P5, P6, P11, P12	4
Sustainment plan	P6, P13	2

Leadership buy-in

Nearly half of the participants stressed the importance of strong leadership commitment to LSS success. Participant 8 specifically noted that top management must actively promote the LSS culture, allocate resources, and demonstrate unwavering commitment to process improvement to foster a culture of continuous improvement and ensure LSS's effective implementation throughout the organisation.

Amendment of Standard Structure

Seven participants highlighted the importance of aligning the existing structure with sector-specific needs for successful ISO 18404 implementation. The participants preferred a flexible, guideline-based approach over a strict standard to prevent employee resistance. Participant 10

1
2
3 added, “Real benefits emerge when the standard prescribes Lean and Six Sigma processes, project
4 timelines, and roles, not just competencies.”
5
6
7

8 *Training and Education*

9
10 Seven participants emphasised the importance of LSS training, certification, and education in
11 applying the standard effectively in the service sector to equip employees with the necessary skills.
12 Participant 13 highlighted the value of online training for sustainability, advocating for accessible,
13 continuous learning opportunities to ensure long-term adherence and understanding of the
14 standard.
15
16
17
18

19 *Employee Engagement and Cross-functional Collaboration*

20
21 Five participants highlighted the significance of engaging people in the design and implementation
22 of the standard. They emphasised open communication and employee involvement to secure
23 commitment to process improvements, emphasising cross-functional collaboration, improved
24 information flow, and streamlined organisational decision-making.
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Fostering a Continuous Improvement Culture*

31
32 Five participants emphasised the importance of fostering a culture of continuous improvement in
33 organisations. They believed that instilling a culture of proactive mindset, continuous process
34 improvement, and adaptability to changing customer needs urges employees to pursue growth,
35 innovation, and efficiency, fostering an agile and responsive organisational environment.
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Effective Performance Measurement Systems*

42
43 Four participants emphasised the need for performance measurement systems through KPIs to
44 gauge LSS initiative success, track progress, pinpoint improvement areas, and evaluate intangible
45 aspects while validating outcomes and ensuring corporate goals align with LSS goals.
46
47
48
49

50 *Sustainment Plan*

51
52 Two participants stressed the importance of sustainment plans for ISO 18404 adoption success.
53 Participant 6 highlighted the need to sustain and reinforce understanding regarding “what,” “why,”
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and “who.” This finding underscores the importance of clear, comprehensive plans for ongoing
4 adherence.
5
6
7

8 ***Use of ISO 18404 standard for LSS implementation in the Service Sector*** 9

10 Five participants (P6, P10, P11, P14, P15) stressed their role in providing crucial structure, clarity,
11 and a shared language. One participant, with an operational background, lauded its “systematic
12 approach, making life easier.” Another noted how this structure “ensures consistent and effective
13 LSS application in service organisations.” Additionally, three participants (P11, P13, P15)
14 emphasised the significance of performance measurement in LSS implementation. They
15 highlighted the challenge of quantifying initiative success, a common hurdle in the service sector.
16 Additional insights included cross-functional collaboration, awareness of necessary skills,
17 benchmarking, training checklists, guided process enhancement, knowledge sharing, nurturing a
18 culture of continuous improvement, promoting a customer-centric approach to quality
19 enhancement, obtaining personnel buy-in, and organisational accreditation.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Conversely, three participants (P1, P4, P10) viewed ISO 18404 as overly generic and not
28 tailored to the service industry, resulting in limited adoption. Similarly, two participants (P7, P15)
29 believed that using the ISO 18404 standard only applies to highly structured, transaction-based, or
30 novel services.
31
32
33
34
35

36 ***Critical competencies or skills to be acquired by the LSS professionals*** 37

38 After reviewing ISO 18404, the researchers asked participants to detail critical competencies for
39 GBs, BBs, and MBBs. Three participants (P1, P6, P7) found the standard to adequately cover
40 essential competencies, with P6 stating, “I don’t think there was anything that shouldn’t have been
41 there.” For others, Tables 7, 8, and 9 summarise MBB, BB, and GB critical competencies,
42 including some mentioning YB competencies such as basic improvements (P1, P2) and following
43 BBs’ guidance (P1).
44
45
46
47

48 In a broader context, certain participants noted additional competencies without specifying a
49 belt level, such as a growth mindset, commitment to learning (P9, P12, P14), and critical thinking
50 (P9, P13, P14). Understanding the steps, tools, and requirements (P2, P13) was also highlighted.
51 Moreover, individual competencies surfaced during interviews, including hands-on experience
52 and grasping ground realities (P9), emphasising long-term sustainability in solution
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

implementation (P9), challenging the status quo (P9), fostering a culture across business teams (P7), and possessing an analytical mindset with attention to detail (P14).

Table 7. MBB critical competencies

Critical Competency	Participant Code
Leadership and coaching for BBs and GBs	P1, P2, P3, P7, P11, P14
Strategic alignment with organisational goals	P3, P10, P11, P14
Communication with top management and stakeholders	P2, P13, P14,
Problem-solving, Change Management, and Leading Organizational-Level Improvement Initiatives	P7, P11, P13, P14
Statistical Analysis, Data Modelling, and Knowledge of LSS Principles and Tools	P11, P13, P14
Shaping LSS Culture, Continuous Improvement, and Project Management for Complex Projects	P2, P11, P13, P14
Training program design and implementation	P11
Effective presentation to stakeholders	P11

Table 8. BB Critical competencies

Critical Competency	Participant Code
Advanced statistical analysis and new data techniques	P7, P8, P11, P13, P14
Process improvement expertise and change implementation	P1, P3, P7, P13, P14
Effective communication and stakeholder influence	P2, P7, P11, P14

Leadership and mentoring for teams	P1, P2, P11, P14
Project management skills for improvement projects	P1, P3, P11, P14
Driving organisational and cultural change	P10, P11, P13, P14
In-depth LSS principles, methodologies, and tools knowledge	P7, P11, P14
Problem-solving mastery, including root cause analysis	P7, P11, P14
Cross-department project leadership	P2
Understanding of the organisation's strategy	P2
Industry 4.0 expertise	P8

Table 9 GB critical competencies

Critical Competency	Participant Code
Basic understanding of LSS principles, tools, and methodologies	P3, P7, P10, P11, P14
Statistical knowledge and data analysis	P7, P11, P13, P14
Communication, teamwork, presentation skills	P2, P7, P11, P14
Process mapping and improvement	P7, P8, P14
Problem-solving and root-cause analysis	P7, P10, P11, P14
Project management	P11, P114
Customer focus and satisfaction	P14
Ability to apply LSS in real-world scenarios	P1
Process specialisation	P10

Challenges in Applying the ISO 18404 Standard in the Service Sector

Since none of the participants currently adhere to ISO 18404, we prompted them to evaluate potential challenges faced by service sector companies adopting this standard, collectively outlined in Table 10.

Table 10 Challenges facing companies in applying ISO 18404 in the service sectors

Challenge	Participant Code	Count
Inapplicability in the service sector	P2, P3, P4, P5, P8, P9, P10, P11, P13, P14, P15	11
Lack of management support in using the standard	P1, P2, P3, P5, P6, P9, P12, P14	8
Resistance to change	P1, P5, P7, P8, P11, P12, P14	7
Immeasurability of Competencies	P4, P5, P10, P11, P12	5
Competing standards	P1, P4, P6, P8, P15	5
Absence of YB competencies	P1, P4, P5, P7	4
High cost of accreditation	P3, P5, P11, P13	4
Absence of merged LSS competencies	P4, P10, P13	3

Inapplicability in the Service Sector

Participants identified ISO 18404's inapplicability for the service sector as a significant challenge. 73% echoed this concern, citing issues with its alignment with service-oriented organisations. They argued that the standard fails to adequately address the unique needs of the service sector, describing it as overly theoretical, rigid, and tailored primarily for manufacturing. Participant 11 encapsulated this sentiment concisely, stating, "Adapting the standard to align with service organisations, characterised by intangibility, variability, and customer interactions, can be daunting."

Lack of Management Support

53% of the participants identified the second most significant challenge as the lack of management support, emphasising the importance of educating leaders about the standard's reasons, benefits, expected outcomes, and its continuous value to the organisation to facilitate effective application

1
2
3 within their business domains. Participant 5 stressed the need to persuade leaders, “Without
4 convincing leaders, momentum is hard to gain.”
5
6
7

8 *Resistance to Change*

9
10 Resistance to change, identified by seven participants, emerged as the third most influential
11 challenge, underscoring the potential reluctance from employees and stakeholders when adopting
12 new practices. Participant 8 stated, “In my country, people don’t readily embrace standards; it feels
13 imposed, and they are entrepreneurial and prefer autonomy.” Likewise, participant 7 expressed
14 concerns about the perception of the standard as an extra burden for team members.
15
16
17
18

19 *Immeasurability of Competencies*

20
21 Five participants highlighted the challenge of competencies’ immeasurability, underlining the
22 difficulty in accurately assessing and quantifying necessary skills. Participant 11 succinctly
23 captures this by saying, “In the service sector, services are often intangible, making performance
24 measurement more difficult.” Participant 5 echoes this sentiment by posing questions like, “How
25 can you audit motivating others? How can you audit customer focus? How can you audit leadership
26 development?”
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 *Competing Standards/Bodies of Knowledge*

35
36 As highlighted by five participants, numerous competing standards or bodies of knowledge pose
37 a significant challenge. This challenge arises from companies’ difficulty when selecting a standard
38 and determining its suitability. The respondents questioned the effectiveness of introducing the
39 ISO 18404 standard separately, suggesting that integrating it into the existing LSS standard
40 provided by ASQ might have been more efficient. Similarly, Participant 8 questioned the authority
41 behind the ISO standard and its alignment with their company’s specific needs, asking, ‘Who
42 created this ISO standard, and how do they know what is best for our company?’
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Absence of YB Competencies*

51
52 Four participants noted the standard’s absence of YB competencies. One participant emphasised,
53 “The standard overlooks YB competencies, which are often the starting point for many individuals
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in organisations.” Likewise, Participant 1 echoed this concern: “The standard lacks YB
4 considerations, yet the importance of LSS YBs is prevalent globally.”
5
6
7

8 *High Cost of Accreditation and Implementation*

9

10 Four participants identified high accreditation and implementation costs as a significant obstacle,
11 potentially hindering widespread ISO 18404 adoption due to financial constraints. Participant 3
12 highlighted leadership’s view on continuous improvement initiatives: “The continuous
13 improvement team is seen as a cost center by the top executives, which is frustrating, but we
14 consistently save the company money. Selling the value of improvement initiatives, like this
15 standard, to leadership is something that I have been struggling with for five years.”
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Absence of Merged LSS Competencies*

23

24 Three participants raised concerns about the absence of integrated LSS competencies, arguing that
25 the separation of Lean and Six Sigma could diminish the standard’s effectiveness. Participant 4
26 highlighted the issue: “The standard’s title mentions LSS, but it lists separate competencies for
27 Lean and Six Sigma. This distinction overlooks that Lean and Six Sigma are intrinsically part of
28 LSS.”
29
30
31
32
33

34 *Further Changes Required in the ISO 18404 Standard*

35

36 Participants offered diverse opinions and recommendations to improve ISO 18404 standards. The
37 most common suggestions, mentioned by six participants, revolved around the need for greater
38 people orientation (P9, P2, P15, P8, P11) and increased service-specific focus (P2, P15, P8, P14,
39 P15).
40
41
42

43 Participant 8 emphasised the importance of considering service industry characteristics,
44 focusing less on data and specifications and more on people’s opinions and feelings. Participant 9
45 advocated for introducing “feed-forward” to involve customers in the loop, while P15 highlighted
46 the inclusivity of “people” in the service sector, encompassing both employees and customers.
47
48
49

50 Regarding service-specific recommendations, P11 suggested providing specific guidance for
51 adapting LSS methodologies, tools, and performance indicators to the unique features of the
52 service sector, such as intangibility and variability. Four participants (P8, P11, P10, P7) proposed
53 making the standard less rigid, emphasising that it should serve as a guideline, allowing
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 organisations to balance efficiency and customisation, as noted by P11. P8 stressed that ownership
4 by those involved is crucial for success.
5

6 Integration with existing standards was also a recurrent recommendation (P4, P14, P13, P6).
7 P14 proposed incorporating ISO 18404 into the high-level structure of ISO 9001:2015 (Quality
8 Management System), ISO 45001 (Health and Safety Management System), ISO 14001
9 (Environmental Management System), and ISO 27001 (Information Security System) for
10 streamlined implementation of continuous improvement of these systems.
11
12
13
14

15 Several participants suggested focusing on improving the body of knowledge (P4, P1, P10),
16 measuring competencies (P4, P15), emphasising emerging trends and future focus (P9, P11, P15),
17 and providing greater depth (P4, P6, P15). Additional recommendations included incorporating
18 YBs (P1, P15), enhancing guidance on change management (P11, P8), integrating leadership and
19 culture (P15), emphasising sustainability (P11, P13), reducing statistical tools (P2, P13),
20 addressing technical skills (P4), providing the required information in the appendix (P13),
21 considering workforce diversity (P11), accommodating different maturity levels (P15), promoting
22 creative thinking (P15), integrating Design For Six Sigma methods (P15), incorporating advanced
23 statistics and analytical tools (P8), offering practical cases and real-world examples (P14), and
24 linking competencies with organisational competency matrices and LSS frameworks with human
25 resources frameworks (P2). However, P3 believed that ISO 18404 requires no changes or
26 enhancements.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Measures to Sustain the ISO 18404 Standard in the Service Sector*

39 The interview's last part discussed ISO 18404's sustainability in the service sector. Some were
40 concerned, finding it challenging due to its competency-based nature (P10, P12, P13). They
41 believed the dynamic service sector posed obstacles (P8, P11, P14). On the contrary, some argue
42 that maintaining it is straightforward due to its broad applicability (P4, P7). Table 11 outlines
43 participants' steps for long-term sustainability and adherence to the standard.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Table 11. Measures to facilitate adherence and long-term sustainability of the standard

51 Measure	52 Participant Code	53 Count
54 Reviewal measurement systems	55 P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P11, P12, P13	56 8

57
58
59
60

Training, education, and embedment of a culture of skill development	P6, P8, P11, P12, P13, P15	6
Tailoring of the standard	P5, P8, P11, P14	4
Digitalisation	P8, P14	2

Reviewal Measurement Systems

Most of the participants, 8 out of 15, identified the use of review and measurement systems as the critical factor in promoting adherence and ensuring the long-term success of the standard. Participant 2 believes that “without tracking outcomes and having control plans, there is no ownership of the process. We need to validate these outcomes over time to see if the standard is truly effective in the long run.”

Training on the standard

Six participants stressed the significance of training, education, and nurturing a culture of continuous improvement. Participant 15 emphasised education, stating, “the first step is educating and training people, and education should start from the top down. In quality management, empowering, trusting, and educating people is vital.”

Tailoring of the standard

Four participants stressed the importance of tailoring the standard to suit various service sectors. Participant 8 aptly coined this as “customising the standard to fit the company’s context” to minimise team resistance. They mentioned that techniques like gauge R&R or design of experiments (DOE) might pose challenges in service settings, so the team should perceive the standard’s relevance and feasibility.

Digitalisation

Participants P8 and P14 noted that using digitalisation and analytics is crucial. P14 stressed the advantages of digital transformation and adopting evolving digital technologies, especially in the construction sector. They argued that improved data management through digitalisation would support LSS standard implementation. P8 recommended including data mining, robotic process

1
2
3 automation (RPA), and big data analytics to gain valuable insights. The current standard version
4 does not mention the importance of such skills, especially with the evolution of Industry 4.0 and
5 5.0.
6
7
8
9

10 **Discussion and Implications**

11 Many participants were not fully aware of the ISO 18404 standard, with almost half having no
12 prior knowledge or exposure to the standard. This finding correlated with the literature, which
13 indicated little or no mention of organisations embracing the standard (McDermott *et al.*, 2023).
14 Due to the lack of familiarity with the standard, none of the participants currently use it as part of
15 their LSS training programs. This finding indicates alternative approaches are available to
16 organisations for training and certification in LSS that provide a better alignment with the
17 organisation.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 It is important to note that only four of the 15 participants (less than 30%) expressed some
25 level of support for the standard. Further, over half of the participants expressed concerns regarding
26 the competencies outlined in the standard aligning with previous studies on the standard (Antony,
27 McDermott, Sony, Cudney, *et al.*, 2021; Antony, McDermott, Sony, Powell, *et al.*, 2021;
28 McDermott *et al.*, 2023). This lack of support suggests that considerable effort must occur to bring
29 the standard to where it must be to support the service sector. This lack of support is likely due to
30 the perceived poor alignment to the specific challenges within the service sector, lack of additional
31 value from the standard, and inapplicability of the tools to the service sector (Antony, McDermott,
32 Sony, Cudney, *et al.*, 2021; McDermott *et al.*, 2023). Due to the diverse nature of the service
33 sector, the ISO 18404 standard should consider the unique characteristics and challenges of the
34 sector. One of the biggest hurdles rests with the lack of available data in the service industry.
35 Therefore, the standard may need to be explicitly rewritten with the service sector in mind to
36 address the sector's intricacies.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The findings of our study can be extremely beneficial to many key decision-makers in service
47 organisations before they invest in ISO 18404. **Initially, it aids decision-makers in comprehending
48 the limitations and challenges associated with the existing standard, providing a nuanced
49 understanding before any commitment is made. Moreover, the study sheds light on specific
50 concerns, such as the incongruence between the outlined competencies and the unique
51 characteristics and challenges prevalent in the service sector—factors like intangibility, variability,**
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 customer interactions, and data availability issues. This scrutiny enables decision-makers to
4 thoroughly assess the compatibility of the standard with their organization.

5
6 Furthermore, our research delivers essential insights into critical success factors, barriers, and
7 challenges inherent in the application of this standard within the service sector. This knowledge
8 empowers decision-makers to strategically plan and prepare for potential hurdles, facilitating
9 informed decisions should they choose to adopt the standard. Additionally, the study offers
10 guidance on necessary customizations and adaptations essential to align the standard with the
11 specific needs of the service sector, addressing its intricacies. This equips decision-makers with a
12 clear understanding of the efforts required for a successful implementation.

13
14 Importantly, the research serves as a cautionary guide by highlighting the lack of support for
15 the standard in its current form, drawing on the perspectives of experienced professionals. This
16 not only raises awareness but also emphasizes the risks associated with investing without essential
17 modifications. The evidence-based assessment provided by our findings serves as a robust
18 foundation for decision-making, going beyond promotional information about the standard. This
19 approach is crucial in averting potential pitfalls and ensuring a more thorough consideration of the
20 implications before committing to ISO 18404 in the context of the service industry.

21 22 **Conclusion, limitations, and further research**

23
24 This study revealed the challenges and opportunities to implementing the ISO 18404 standard in
25 the service sector. Though the participants emphasised the standard's rigidity and limited
26 compatibility with the dynamic nature of services, they also highlighted the importance of
27 customisation and adaptation to align with service organisations' unique characteristics. The study
28 expounds on critical success factors for deploying the standard, including leadership support,
29 amendments to the standard structure, comprehensive training, employee engagement, a culture of
30 continuous improvement, effective measurement systems, opportunity prioritisation, and
31 sustainment plans. These findings contribute theoretically to the ISO 18404 standards and their
32 suitability in the service sector. One of the limitations of this study is the sample size of 15
33 participants determined by data saturation. Therefore, we suggest future research to consider sub-
34 sectors within service organisations. This study will help understand the sub-sector specific
35 characteristics of ISO 18404 to cite instances of how relevant ISO 18404 will be in the hospitality
36 or education sector. An area of future research would be to study the applicability of ISO 18404
37 in the service sector by classifying the nature of services (tangible/intangible), service delivery
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 location (front office / back office), customer interaction (customer-facing / noncustomer facing),
4 degree of customisation and service processes (core / peripheral services).
5
6
7

8 **Acknowledgements**

9
10 We express our sincere gratitude to all the participants in this study. Your invaluable contributions
11 and participation have been instrumental in completing this research. We sincerely appreciate your
12 assistance and willingness to participate in this study, as it would not have been possible without
13 your valuable input.
14
15
16
17

18 **References**

- 19
20 “ISO 18404:2015”. (2015), *ISO*, available at: <https://www.iso.org/standard/62405.html> (accessed
21 12 December 2023).
22
23
24 Alqahtani, S., Seoane-Vazquez, E., Rodriguez-Monguio, R. and Egualde, T. (2015), “Priority
25 review drugs approved by the FDA and the EMA: time for international regulatory
26 harmonisation of pharmaceuticals?”, *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety*, Vol. 24 No. 7,
27 pp. 709–715, doi: 10.1002/pds.3793.
28
29
30
31 Antony, J., McDermott, O., Sony, M., Cudney, E.A., Snee, R.D. and Hoerl, R.W. (2021), “A study
32 into the pros and cons of ISO 18404: viewpoints from leading academics and practitioners”,
33 *The TQM Journal*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. Ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/TQM-03-2021-0065.
34
35
36 Antony, J., McDermott, O., Sony, M., Powell, D., Snee, R. and Hoerl, R.W. (2021), “Global study
37 into the pros and cons of ISO 18404: a convergent mixed method study and recommendations
38 for further research”, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Emerald
39 Publishing Limited, Vol. ahead-of-print No. Ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/IJQRM-10-2021-
40 0356.
41
42
43
44
45 Antony, J. and Snee, R. (2010), ““Leading Role – Identifying the Skills Master Black Belts and
46 Black Belts need to be Effective Leaders””, *Six Sigma Forum Magazine*.
47
48
49 Antony, J., Snee, R. and Hoerl, R. (2017), “Lean Six Sigma: yesterday, today and tomorrow”,
50 *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol.
51 34 No. 7, pp. 1073–1093, doi: 10.1108/IJQRM-03-2016-0035.
52
53
54 Antony, J., Swarnakar, V., Salentijn, W., Shokri, A., Doulatbadi, M., Bhat, S., McDermott, O.,
55 *et al.* (2022), “A global study on applicability of ISO 18404:2015 for SMEs: an exploratory
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 qualitative study”, *The TQM Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. ahead-of-print No.
4 Ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/TQM-08-2022-0276.

5
6 Bhat, S., Antony, J., Gijo, E.V. and Cudney, E.A. (2019), “Lean Six Sigma for the healthcare
7 sector: a multiple case study analysis from the Indian context”, *International Journal of*
8 *Quality & Reliability Management*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 90–111,
9 doi: 10.1108/IJQRM-07-2018-0193.

10
11 BSI. (2019), “DEWA ACHIEVED ISO 18404 CERTIFICATION”, *BSI.Org*, available at:
12 [https://www.bsigroup.com/en-AE/About-BSI/Media-Center/Press-releases/2019/july-](https://www.bsigroup.com/en-AE/About-BSI/Media-Center/Press-releases/2019/july-2019/DEWA-BSI/)
13 [2019/DEWA-BSI/](https://www.bsigroup.com/en-AE/About-BSI/Media-Center/Press-releases/2019/july-2019/DEWA-BSI/) (accessed 13 October 2021).

14
15 Creswell, John W., and Cheryl N. Poth. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among*
16 *five approaches*. Sage Publications, 2016.

17
18 George, M.L. (2002), *Lean Six Sigma: Combining Six Sigma Quality with Lean Production Speed*,
19 McGraw-Hill, NY.

20
21 Herrera, M., and van Hillegersberg, J. (2019), “Using Metamodeling to Represent Lean Six Sigma
22 for IT Service Improvement”, *2019 IEEE 21st Conference on Business Informatics (CBI)*, Vol.
23 01, presented at the 2019 IEEE 21st Conference on Business Informatics (CBI), pp. 241–248,
24 doi: 10.1109/CBI.2019.00034.

25
26 Illankoon, K. (2022), “Sobha Facades accredited with ISO 18404 Certification - Construction
27 Business News Middle East”, <https://www.cbnme.com/author/kaz/>, available at:
28 <https://www.cbnme.com/news/sobha-facades-accredited-with-iso-18404-certification/>
29 (accessed 6 June 2023).

30
31 ISO. (2019), “Guidance on the Systematic Review process in ISO”, *ISO.Org*.

32
33 ISO 18404 (2015), *ISO.org*

34
35 Kazakova, E. (2019), “Problems of implementation of ISO 18404: 2015 in the enterprise in
36 Russia”, *Volga State Technological University*, Vol. 2 No. 7, pp. 4–9.

37
38 Kikuchi, T. and Suzuki, M. (2018), “Kaizen and Standardization”, in Otsuka, K., Jin, K. and
39 Sonobe, T. (Eds.), *Applying the Kaizen in Africa: A New Avenue for Industrial Development*,
40 Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 111–149, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-91400-8_4.

41
42 Lohmann, S., Heimerl, F., Bopp, F., Burch, M. and Ertl, T. (2015), “Concentric cloud: word cloud
43 visualisation for multiple text documents”, Presented at the 2015 19th International Conference
44 on Information Visualisation, pp. 114–120, doi: 10.1109/iV.2015.30.

- 1
2
3 Louzada, P. de S., Sigahi, TFAC, Moraes, G.H.GHSM Rampasso, I.S., Anholon, R., Antony, J.
4 and Cudney, E.A. (2022), “Critical analysis of Lean Six Sigma black belt certification courses
5 offered in Brazil”, *The TQM Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. ahead-of-print No.
6 Ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/TQM-08-2022-0254.
7
8
9
10 McDermott, O., Antony, J., Bhat, S., Jayaraman, R., Rosa, A., Marolla, G. and Parida, R. (2022a),
11 “Lean Six Sigma in Healthcare: A Systematic Literature Review on Challenges, Organisational
12 Readiness and Critical Success Factors”, *Processes*, Vol. 10 No. 10, doi: 10.3390/pr10101945.
13
14 McDermott, O., Antony, J., Bhat, S., Jayaraman, R., Rosa, A., Marolla, G. and Parida, R. (2022b),
15 “Lean Six Sigma in Healthcare: A Systematic Literature Review on Motivations and Benefits”,
16 *Processes*, Vol. 10 No. 10, doi: 10.3390/pr10101910.
17
18
19 McDermott, O., Antony, J., Sony, M. and Swarnakar, V. (2023), “The misplacement of ISO
20 18404:2015 in organisational improvement: A point-counterpoint article”, *The TQM Journal*,
21 doi: 10.1108/TQM-01-2023-0019.
22
23
24
25
26 Munoz Lopez, S. (2010), “Process definition for the implementation of an energy efficiency
27 program in manufacturing focused on key performance indicators”, [WWW Document],
28 Polite, available at: <https://www.politesi.polimi.it/handle/10589/783> (accessed 16 August
29 2023).
30
31
32
33 O. S. Artamonova, V. V. Silaeva, O. A. Erochkina, and S. N. Kuzmina. (2022), “Practical
34 Approach to Lean Manufacturing Development and Training”, *2022 International Conference*
35 *on Quality Management, Transport and Information Security, Information Technologies*
36 *(IT&QM&IS)*, presented at the 2022 International Conference on Quality Management,
37 Transport and Information Security, Information Technologies (IT&QM&IS), pp. 1–4, doi:
38 10.1109/ITQMIS56172.2022.9976870.
39
40
41
42
43 Oudrhiri, R., Al-Balushi, M., Anwyl, S., Bendell, A., Chamie, S., Coleman, S.Y., Hayman, M., *et*
44 *al.* (2022), “The place of ISO 18404:2015 in organisational improvement”, *The TQM Journal*,
45 Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. ahead-of-print No. Ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/TQM-08-
46 2021-0243.
47
48
49
50 Prodromou, Ted. *Ultimate guide to LinkedIn for business*. Entrepreneur Press, 2015.
51
52 Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of*
53 *personality and social psychology*, 46(3), 598.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Roser, C. (2016), “‘Lean Standard’ ISO 18404 – A questionable Idea ... | AllAboutLean.com”, 11
4 October, available at: <https://www.allaboutlean.com/iso-18404/> (accessed 27 June 2020).
5
6 Sá, J.C., Vaz, S., Carvalho, O., Lima, V., Morgado, L., Fonseca, L., Doiro, M., *et al.* (2020), “A
7 model of integration ISO 9001 with Lean six sigma and main benefits achieved”, *Total Quality*
8 *Management and Business Excellence*, Routledge, doi: 10.1080/14783363.2020.1829969.
9
10 Snee, R. and Hoerl, R. (2018), *Leading Holistic Improvement with Lean Six Sigma 2.0*, 2nd ed.,
11 Pearson FT, NJ, USA.
12
13 Sunder M., V., Ganesh, L.S. and Marathe, RR (2018), “A morphological analysis of research
14 literature on Lean Six Sigma for services”, *International Journal of Operations & Production*
15 *Management*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 149–182, doi:
16 10.1108/IJJOPM5-2016-0273.
17
18 Saunders, Mark, Philip Lewis, and Adrian Thornhill. *Research methods for business students*.
19 Pearson Education, 2009.
20
21 Tarí, J.J., Molina-Azorín, J.F. and Heras, I. (2012), “Benefits of the ISO 9001 and ISO 14001
22 standards: A literature review”, *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, JIEM,
23 Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 297–322, doi: 10.3926/jiem.488.
24
25 UPMC Whitfield. (2021), “Health & Safety - UPMC”, available at: [https://www.upmc.ie/health-](https://www.upmc.ie/health-safety/)
26 [safety/](https://www.upmc.ie/health-safety/) (accessed 13 October 2021).
27
28 Ward, S.A. and Caklais, S. (n.d.). “Piloting the Deployment of ISO 18404 in the Construction
29 Sector, an Approach to Organisational Transformation”, *Proc. 27th Annual Conference of the*
30 *International Group for Lean Construction (IGLC)*.
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

Dear Editor,

We wish to convey our heartfelt thanks for the invaluable opportunity to revise and enhance our manuscript. Our sincere appreciation extends to the esteemed reviewers whose insightful suggestions have played a pivotal role in elevating the overall quality of our work. In light of the constructive feedback provided by the reviewers, we have undertaken a thorough revision, offering a comprehensive overview of the measures implemented in response to each comment.

The thoughtful input and guidance provided by the reviewers have been instrumental in refining our paper, and we are truly grateful for the chance to incorporate these improvements. We express our gratitude once again for this enriching opportunity to strengthen our manuscript, and we look forward to the continued enhancement of our research in collaboration with your esteemed publication.

Sincerely,

Authors

Reviewers' Comments to the Author

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, the paper presents some interesting insights that have applicability and value to managers and academics alike.

Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Literature review is sufficient - although don't see the need for the wording "despite.....in the same report" in the first paragraph and think this could be removed.

I would also suggest the authors consider re-phrasing RQ1. in it's current form it can be answered with a straight yes/no.

Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. We have accordingly edited the sentence, removing the wording "despite.....in the same report". We also re-phrased RQ1 from "Is the current version fit for purpose in the service industry?" to "What extent does the current version meet the requirements and challenges of the service industry?" to

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts,

1
2
3
4 or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is
5 based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: this is good.

6
7 Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback.
8
9

10
11 4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions
12 adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are clearly
13 presented. In the discussion section, the authors state "the findings of our study can be
14 extremely beneficial to many key decision makers..."...I think this could benefit from further
15 expansion on how exactly .

16
17 Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback. We have edited the
18 initial paragraph to include the reasons why this study could be beneficial for many key
19 decision-makers, as follows:
20

21 "The findings of our study can be extremely beneficial to many key decision-makers in
22 service organizations before they invest in ISO 18404. Initially, it aids decision-makers in
23 comprehending the limitations and challenges associated with the existing standard,
24 providing a nuanced understanding before any commitment is made. Moreover, the study
25 sheds light on specific concerns, such as the incongruence between the outlined
26 competencies and the unique characteristics and challenges prevalent in the service
27 sector—factors like intangibility, variability, customer interactions, and data availability
28 issues. This scrutiny enables decision-makers to thoroughly assess the compatibility of
29 the standard with their organization.
30

31 Furthermore, our research delivers essential insights into critical success factors, barriers,
32 and challenges inherent in the application of this standard within the service sector. This
33 knowledge empowers decision-makers to strategically plan and prepare for potential
34 hurdles, facilitating informed decisions should they choose to adopt the standard.
35 Additionally, the study offers guidance on necessary customizations and adaptations
36 essential to align the standard with the specific needs of the service sector, addressing its
37 intricacies. This equips decision-makers with a clear understanding of the efforts required
38 for a successful implementation.
39

40 Importantly, the research serves as a cautionary guide by highlighting the lack of support
41 for the standard in its current form, drawing on the perspectives of experienced
42 professionals. This not only raises awareness but also emphasizes the risks associated
43 with investing without essential modifications. The evidence-based assessment provided
44 by our findings serves as a robust foundation for decision-making, going beyond
45 promotional information about the standard. This approach is crucial in averting potential
46 pitfalls and ensuring a more thorough consideration of the implications before committing
47 to ISO 18404 in the context of the service industry.
48
49

50
51 5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any
52 implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between
53 theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial
54 impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of
55 knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting
56 quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the
57 paper?: clear practical implications to guide the decision making of managers.
58

59 Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback.
60

1
2
3
4
5 6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against
6 the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's
7 readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as
8 sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: the paper is well written.
9

10 Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback.
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

The TQM Journal