

CULTURAL CONDITIONING OF LEAN MANAGEMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

*Aneta Parkes**

Abstract

Background. Implementation and development of the management concept called lean management can be influenced by the culture of an organisation that is mostly determined by the national culture of its representatives. That is why it is important for successful lean management implementation to understand different cultural conditions and how compatible they are with the lean management culture (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014).

Research aims. The aims of the research, which results have been presented in the article, were: the organisational culture and the cultural conditioning of lean management on the example of a case study in Great Britain.

Methodology. The retrospective case study was carried out in 2014 in Great Britain. The main sources of data were: a semi-structured interview (an interview with a standardised list of requested information) and a narrative interview carried out with a long-time company employee, as well as the company's documents. Additional sources of data were: unstructured conversations with the former respondent's co-workers and participant observations carried out in trade and service organisations during my professional and voluntary work.

Key findings. On the basis of the research, the characteristics of researched organisational culture, as being different from the lean management culture according to the level of basic cultural assumptions were presented. Although, shaping lean culture should be a part of lean management implementation, the more an organisational culture differs from lean management culture, the more difficult it could be in my opinion to implement a lean management system (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014).

At the same time, there were elements of lean culture in the researched culture, as a result of secondary socialisation, which can indicate that it is not only desirable, but also possible to create a lean management culture (at least to some degree) while implementing the lean management system into the organisation, even in conditions of different culture. It is debatable to what degree we can change the culture, how to effectively sustain that change and if we possibly have to deal with

* University of Social Sciences. E-mail: a.jakonis@live.com

other factors as well, different from the presented characteristics, but also important from the perspective of lean management implementation.

Keywords: culture, organisational culture, lean management, cultural conditioning of lean management, Great Britain.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to present the results of my research and the literature studies on the subject of culture and cultural conditioning of lean management based on the example of Great Britain. An assumption is made, that the characteristics of national culture can be applied to the culture of organisations (cf.: Hofstede, 2000), especially on the level of basic cultural assumptions. Thus, the characteristics of national British culture were developed on the basis of Ch. Hampden-Turner and A. Trompenaars' classification (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006, pp. 19–20). This classification was used as well in the research of an organisational culture, according to the level of basic cultural assumptions. The obtained information about organisational culture was compared with lean management culture (cf.: Parkes, 2014), which is considered to be an optimal for lean management implementation. The researched organisational culture and lean management culture appeared to be opposite at the level of the basic cultural assumptions. So, the implementation of lean management should not be easy in these conditions (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014). However, in the researched organisation, the lean management system was successfully implemented and developed for about a decade, even though the respondent described this implementation as difficult.

Lean management is a system of – mostly Japanese – tools and methods of management (cf.: Liker & Hosesus, 2008). Lean management or lean production (lean manufacturing, etc.) originates from the Toyota Production System, developed in Japanese Toyoda factories. It is based on a simple rule to eliminate waste of time, resources, manpower, machinery, or materials while producing more and meeting customers' requirements (Dennis, 2002, p. 13). Thus, TPS has been focused on the highest quality, the lowest cost, and the shortest time of a realisation, which should be continuously improved, according to the client's needs (Ohno, 1988). Nowadays, lean management (or lean

production, lean manufacturing, etc.), refers to the whole system for managing the organisation in every area and in the way that minimises the amount of resources used to produce products and services of better quality (cf.: www.lean.org).

Moreover, lean management is not only a system, but also a specific philosophy (cf.: Dennis, 2002). I would say, that it is a set of solutions and a specific organisational culture. So the closer the organisational culture is to the lean management culture (Parkes, 2014) – determined mostly by the Japanese national culture – the easier and more natural it should be to implement and develop lean management in the organisation (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2013, 2014).

BACKGROUND

There is no focused and comprehensive research on the cultural conditioning of lean management. Some of the research trends about the topic were presented in 2010 at the conference in Daytona Beach, Florida (Kristjuhan, 2010). Some examples of the research were shown in that paper, like: European line (Autenrieth & Pfeiffer, 1995, after: Kristjuhan, 2010) or American line (Camarillo, 2002, after: Kristjuhan, 2010; Liker 2004, after: Kristjuhan, 2010; Hosesus, 2008) and some study about lean management implementation in multicultural organisations (Love, 1997, after: Kristjuhan, 2010). Furthermore, the scientific research connecting the categories of lean and a culture has been shown as mainly qualitative (mostly case studies), rarely quantitative (e.g. Miroshkin, 2009, after: Kristjuhan, 2010; Kristjuhan, 2010).

So, what is culture and what is its relation to the lean management system? According to E. Schein, organisational culture is “the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be thought to new members (...)” (Liker & Hosesus, 2008, pp. 5–6). I assume that national culture is one of the main factors, which influence the organisational culture, especially on the level of the basic cultural assumptions. According to Schein’s levels of organisational culture: artefacts, values, and norms of behaviours and basic assumptions, the level of basic cultural assumptions is being characterised as unconscious, and built of beliefs,

perceptions or feelings, which are taken for granted (cf: Kristjuhaan, 2010, p. 2). These are the characteristics that can be mainly shaped during the process of primary socialisation and can be a part of our cultural programming. So, for example artefacts, norms and partially – values – can be relatively easily modified within an organisation or adjusted to the global patterns, but deeper level of values and the level of basic cultural assumptions are determined mostly by the specific national culture(s) and shaped in the process of first socialisation, so they can be very difficult to change (cf. Parkes, 2014).

And, because the Toyota Production System, called later as lean management, was developed in Japan (despite some Western influences; cf.: Kristjuhan, 2010, p. 4), Japanese culture and Toyoda's organisation culture are considered as the most supportive towards the lean management system (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014). For example, some features of lean concept such as elimination of waste or mutual respect, can be found in Japanese cultural characteristics such as respect towards restricted resources, authorities, or cooperation (cf: Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006; Parkes, 2014). So, what was created as TPS and later called "lean", has an original Japanese heart and soul (cf. Liker & Hoesus, 2008).

Coming to the issue of lean management culture, according to Schein's levels of organisational culture, we can state that the basic cultural assumptions of lean culture are mostly Japanese, and on the other levels (norms, values, and artefacts) we can see some western and local influences as well (Parkes, 2014). Moreover, lean management culture characteristics are similar to the J.K Liker and M. Hoesus' characteristics of Toyota culture (Liker & Hoesus, 2008), which can be considered as lean culture. If we visualise the culture as a pyramid, according to E. Schein's concept of an organisational culture (cf.: Schein, 1986), the top of the pyramid represents the level of the artefacts; in the middle we have the level of norms and values and at the bottom of the pyramid – the level of basic cultural assumptions. The level of basic cultural assumptions of lean management culture was developed on the basis of Ch. Hampden-Turner and A. Trompenaars' characteristics of Japanese national culture, which are: particularism, synthesis, collectivism, outer direction, synchrony, status assigned, and hierarchy (cf.: Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006). On the level of values we have for example: continuous improvement, standardisation, or teamwork. Whereas, on the level of artefacts we

can identify for example: Japanese terminology or some elements of visual control (Parkes, 2014).

Thus, the characteristics of British national culture should influence the organisational cultures created by its representatives, especially on the level of basic cultural assumptions. These characteristics were developed on the basis of Ch. Hampden-Turner and A. Trompenaars classification of seven cultural dimensions (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006). As it was stated above, the same typology, according to Japanese culture, was used to characterise the basic cultural assumptions of lean management culture (Parkes, 2014). And it was used as well in the case study to research the level of basic cultural assumptions of organisational culture, which was described in the Results section.

Great Britain (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) can be characterised as a country with one of the strongest economies and currencies in the world and the state with a lot of cultural, military, scientific, or political influence. It is a highly populated country, and the population is still changing according to the permanent emigration and immigration (cf.: Mole, 2000, p. 132). Ch. Hampden-Turner and A. Trompenaars describe Great Britain as a free market and free trade orientated country (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006, p. 307). According to their typology of national cultures, the characteristics of Great Britain are:

- universalistic,
- analytical,
- individualistic,
- internal control-orientated,
- sequential,
- achieved status orientated;
- and equality orientated (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006, p. 310).

According to Ch. Hampden-Turner and A. Trompenaars, applying universal rules and generalisations can be seen in such English phenomena as monetarism and Thatcherism. Moreover, the nation is described by the authors as being more words than action orientated, interested more in economical theories than in economical practice and paying a lot of attention to posing. These features are closely situated to the analytical attitude, which is represented for example in the British attitude to money. Money is considered as empirical data and all corporations

can be reduced to money and profitability. Furthermore, profitability is measured by only one factor of economical growth, which equates to the amount of profit for the shareholders. According to the authors, this tendency to make analysis and reduction causes fragmentation of the human thinking, while submitting to individuals over community leads to fragmentation of the social world as well. Anglo-Saxon countries are characterised by the authors as highly individualistic, so is the British society. But the British individualism is additionally linked with greed and the decline of corporational top management' values. What is more, British individualism is connected by the authors with the need to stand out and consumption for show, which generates envy and jealousy of those enjoying a better or more pleasurable way of life, and it enhances social envy and sustains the class struggle. Thus, the authors state that in Great Britain teamwork, production, and innovation are losing with the so – called capitalism controlled by money and the focus on the highest short – term profit. According to the authors, David Marquand called Great Britain “the unprincipled society”, and characterised British culture as not being able to gather isolated groups of interest around something greater than personal benefits of its members. As to other dimensions, orientation on inner control or inner – direction, this expresses itself in decision-making on the basis of our own judgment, or belief that we have influence on the course of the events. Furthermore, the sequence or sequencing can be described by linear acting or short-termism. According to the authors, the achieved status is won by individual achievements and it is connected to a social prestige. The prestige is defined by ability to perform in public or to consume in a sophisticated manner or to deal with money rather than with real subjects. And according to the last dimension, British society is described as equal, with flat hierarchy (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006, pp. 312–340).

However, the society has been always divided by class conflicts and a strong social hierarchy (Mole, 2000, p. 132). Even today we can observe that the society is very class-orientated, with a lively and strong social hierarchy, which is set up by the amount of wealth. So, even the equal access to the higher positions is not so easy, if it is not supported by a certain amount of money. The money opens doors (for example through the schooling system) to the higher positions in the hierarchy, and higher position in the hierarchy can generate higher income. Contemporary British society is described as highly economically delaminated and full of economical inequalities (www.emito.net).

METHOD

The subject of my ethnographical case study (cf.: Sułkowski, 2012) was selected organisational culture and the cultural conditioning of lean management. British (retrospective) case study was based on the example of the British subsidiary of a global company, which was situated in East Midlands and had operated from 1980 up to 2005, when it was closed according to the global market change. There were a lot of lean management tools implemented into the process of production, for example: statistic process control, fast and flexible machine set-ups (TPM), Just-in-Time, Total Quality and employee empowerment, or *kanban* used in the Materials Requirements Planning System (MRP). This was a local case study, and according to Ł. Sułkowski: “selection of studies based on local knowledge is associated with conscious limitation of the selection scheme to the unit or units (in the case of comparative analysis), which are better known to researcher or in which it is possible to conduct in-depth research (B. Flyvberg, 2011)” (Sułkowski, 2012, p. 281). This (accessibility) was one of the reasons to choose the case, as well as the respondent for the interviews and other sources for collecting additional data. Another reason was the cognitive aspect and practical utility of the researched case.

The sources of data were: interviews and company documents. I have interviewed one of the organisation’s long-time employee who was a member of the management team. The interviews with this respondent had a qualitative character (Babbie, 2003, p. 327) with some standardised elements (a standardised list of requested information). Two types of interviews were carried out: semi-structured interview with a standardized list of requested information (cf.: Przybyłowska, 1978) and a narrative interview (cf.: <http://qsr.webd.pl/KKonecki/publikacje/publikacja2.html>, 2015). Although there was only one respondent, who participated in the interviews, he was one of the people who knew the organisation well. He came to join the organisation as an apprentice and had stayed with it for over 20 years, developing professionally, as well as being a part of lean management implementation and development (for about 10 years). His knowledge, experience, and accessibility were the reasons to choose him as the main source of information.

Other information was gathered on the basis of unstructured conversations with a few available respondents’ former co-workers. And

to compare the case study results with other organisational realities in Great Britain, a few participant observations of the organisational practices in several other organisations (in trade and service sector) were carried out during my organisational activity (work and volunteering). However, it should be mentioned, that – because of the factors stated above – the results should be treated cautiously, and the study can be considered as for example preliminary or a preparation for wider research.

RESULTS

The characteristics of the organisational culture (on the level of basic cultural assumption) have been divided into: primary and secondary features. The primary features have been assumed as its main characteristics, because of the additional data collected and literature studies. Whereas, the secondary features were concluded as a result of secondary socialisation to lean principles. What can be mentioned is that the characteristics of British national culture, which were described above, and chosen characteristics of the researched organisational culture, appeared to be the same.

According to my case study, the researched organisational culture, especially on the level of the basic cultural assumptions, can be described as having the following features:

- universalism,
- analysis,
- individualism,
- internal control,
- sequence/sequencing,
- achieved status,
- and equality.

My respondent presented himself as a responsible person who followed organisational rules and procedures, which implies a universalistic attitude. Nevertheless he stated that according to the standards, he preferred a particularistic attitude, which results in individual reaction to every case. But, he was aware that this attitude was the result of his lean training in the company, which organisational culture was researched. He stated that his work in this company had become a different experience than work in other British organisations he had

worked with, because of its organisational culture, which was shaped by lean management principles, as well as by other cultural factors. Whereas, his experience before lean management implementation, as well as other work experiences, showed a lack of trust, which results in the need to create more regulations and prohibitions in order to control people's interactions ("too much bureaucracy" he stated), which is not compatible with lean principles. In participant observations I have noticed that people have also been obeying the established rules, even if they have perceived these rules as being inefficient.

A similar situation appeared towards the next dimension, which was an analysis. The respondent's attitude approached towards combining information in the bigger picture (synthesis), which was the result of his secondary socialisation at the researched organisational culture. At the same time, he stated that people were focusing on analysing and seeing the reality from only one point of view. While, as he said, "the Japanese saw around", which was a lean attitude characteristic as well. However, comparing organisations to machines, which are created to make a profit, he placed his work attitude in the area of analysis. According to the observations and conversations with a few sole traders, profit was also perceived as the main measure of success of their businesses.

Moreover, the respondent showed a very strong declared collectivistic attitude, for example according to the orientation on the whole organisation's benefit, teamwork, cooperation and matching to the group or desire to work in the researched organisation his entire professional life. And he was disappointed that he had not met that kind of work culture in any other (British) organisation he had worked with. He stated that: the collectivistic orientation "gives protection to the weakest and supports group decision making", which is better and more beneficial for the organisation and it should be a feature of lean organisation. But, according to my observations, highly individualistic motivations have been noticed, especially in trade organisations. According to R. Dore, in Great Britain the main attitude is considered to be highly individualistic and egoistic, so the work relations are based on a lack of trust and a high level of control, which results in precise formal agreements. Whereas, the Japanese culture is based on the belief that man has a tendency to live in a group, placing a group's interest over the individual one and coexist in harmony (Dore, 1973).

According to the respondent, the researched culture was shaped to be highly collectivistic, but it was not cultivated enough, so it diminished, which was another reason for an organisational failure as well. So, primarily, the researched culture was individualistic. What is important, this shows that there is a possibility to develop collectivistic attitudes in an individualistic culture, but it requires permanent work and effort to sustain it. And it shows that organisation culture is possible to change, even that this can be a long and difficult process. According to this case study, the interesting question is, how deep can we implement collectivistic attitudes into the individualistic culture? In my opinion, it is debatable if we can reach the basic assumption level. For example collectivistic norms could be only used instrumentally, on higher levels of the culture, as the tools to improve performance. So, in that sense, it can be still individualistic, because it is based on the pursuit of individual interests. Besides the depth of this process, the respondent's hankering for his previous work environment could be a result of the deep secondary socialisation towards the collectivistic attitude (we should remember that his first socialisation took place in an individualistic national environment), or maybe there were other cooperating personal factors as well.

Another characteristic of the researched organisational culture was internal control, which results in self-confidence and self-reliance and a belief in having control over an external environment ("I know that I have influence on the designed process", my respondent said). This self-reliance and self-responsibility were represented by the respondent's former co-workers as well. However, the need to control could require a lot of detailed and non-effective procedures and extensive bureaucracy, causing inefficiency and preventing flexibility required in lean management, which was brought out in the respondent's statements.

Sequence is connected to the speed, acting in an established order, and linear perception. However, even despite the respondent's primary sequential orientation (e.g. by showing the future as the most important one), he showed as well highly Japanese – synchronic – understanding of time which he considered as better for lean organisation. He connected the past, present and future, and underlined the significance of the past as a place where we can find the answers for the possible future questions. But, the sequential attitude, as well as universalism, individualism, and analysis, tend to dominate in retrospectively researched organisational reality as the primary features. And as

well in my observations and conversations with several British sole traders, they were convinced that it is important to follow their daily routine and weekly schedules in order to achieve a measurable success.

The respondent said that in his opinion, a higher status in the organisation should be given to people with older age and experience (status assigned was cultivated in the studied case) that is very much like in the lean philosophy, which states that experience comes with age, so the ability to do a better job. So, again, his work experience could have shaped him towards a lean attitude, but it was not commonly seen before lean implementation and even in the contemporary respondent's organisational reality, where young university graduates – managers – were younger and less experienced than their subordinates. Moreover, my respondent stated that he couldn't see the connection between network of friends and family, helping each other to get a better work position, so at the end he pointed out that status was definitely achieved. According to my observations, there was a presence of a phenomenon of networking, but this was not the most important factor of selection. Possibly because, one has to still do a good job in the first place, so the ability to perform is more important than family connections (cf.: Mole, 2000, p. 145).

The last characteristic was equality. The organisation implied flat hierarchy and support for individual achievements. However, even though my respondent opted for equality; at the same time he stated that everybody was required to know his place in the hierarchy. And he admitted that the society could not be truly equal because of the historical class system. According to this, the parentage, amount of wealth and the educational path can shape one's future class position. Nevertheless, according to organisational reality, the respondent stated that organisational members were treated equally and the organisational hierarchy was flat.

According to the case study, the primary features of an organisational culture on the level of basic cultural assumptions were: universalism, analysis, individualism, sequence, internal control, achieved status, and equality. And there is none amongst them that we could describe as directly supportive towards lean management. Universalism – most of the time – can be restrictive because of the rigidity of standards and accumulation of procedures. Achieved status, internal control, and equality can be used for motivational purposes during lean implementation or as system controllers that help to

maintain subordination and effectiveness of newly introduced rules. However, the analytical attitude towards work does not support lean management implementation because it can be connected to lack of bonds between people and short-term thinking. Sequence is not helping with lean management implementation as well, because this attitude could be connected to: linearity, individualism, or control (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012). What is more, the need of individualistic achievements, by definition, assumes the realisation of personal goals. This could apply also to the system, which could be supported only so far as it serves particular interests.

DISCUSSION

The level of basic cultural assumptions of organisational culture, when based on the chosen Japanese national culture's values, should be more supportive towards lean management. According to the literature, European cultural features are different from Japanese ones, for example in the area of decision-making, management, or motivation. The Japanese are more group orientated; they respect authorities and search for unanimity (Mole, 2000, p. 231). And, as it was stated above, the Japanese culture is characterised as: particularistic, synthetic, collectivistic, synchronic, hierarchical and with outer control and assigned status (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006) which can be considered as supportive towards lean concept (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014). For example, the cultural feature such as collectivism is supporting towards lean management. While the individualistic approach is opposite to the foundation of lean philosophy, its rules and tools (cf: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2013). Additionally, competition and selection of the best individuals is not conducive to building a relationship with the organisation. And the focus on quick profit does not facilitate understanding of the basic lean management assumptions. R. Dore is showing differences between human resource management in Japanese and British organisations when stating that different assumptions towards human nature determine different relationships between managers and workers. In Great Britain the individualistic and egoistic attitudes shape the foundations of employer-employee interactions, which are based on a lack of trust and a tendency to control each other. Whereas, the Japanese model

is based on such values as: cooperation, harmonious relations, and common work for the best of the group as a whole (Dore, 1973).

In my opinion, implementation of lean management requires shaping the lean culture as well, and the more differences we can observe between the cultures, the more difficult that process can be. Nonetheless, as it was shown on the example of the case study, even wide cultural change is possible. So, all the primary cultural characteristics described above can be shaped towards a lean management culture (cf.: Parkes, 2014).

There is still a question mentioned above, which level of the culture are we able to change? Can we reach the deepest and unconscious level of basic cultural assumptions? For example, Toyota managed to build its lean culture nearly all around the word (cf.: Liker & Hosesus, 2008, p. 547). But even Toyota does not insist on exactly the same culture globally, because of the cultural factors (cf.: Liker & Hosesus, 2008, p. 19; Parkes, 2014). The case study showed that we possibly can reach deeper levels of a culture – the secondary socialisation in the researched culture had been proceeding for around 10 years and it was a rather deep process, which could be shown by the respondent's hankering for this particular organisational environment. And, if we can reach deeper levels, can we really change them? I am unable to answer that question on the basis of my research. But, even if we can modify only the highest and more visible levels of the culture, we can still shape them towards a desirable direction. And the research has shown that we should work on the culture all the time in order to sustain it, otherwise it will come back to its primarily socialised values.

CONCLUSIONS

The organisational culture, determined by the national culture of its representatives (especially on the level of basic cultural assumptions), could be the important factor, which can influence the success or failure of lean management implementation. The more the culture is similar to the lean management one – which basic cultural assumptions are based on the Japanese national culture – the more supportive it should be towards this concept of management (cf.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014).

According to the characteristics of the British national culture and the researched organisational culture, the described cultural features are opposite towards the supporting ones. According to the characteristics of national cultures (cf.: Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006) in the British culture there is no feature that we could describe as compatible with lean characteristics. British culture seems to be rather individualistic, and remaining characterised features do not seem to be compatible with the level of basic cultural assumptions of lean management culture (cf. Parkes, 2014). So, the Japanese system can face difficulties in its implementation in the Anglo-Saxon culture (Hofstede, 2000, p. 84). However, we can observe a popularity of the lean management concept in Anglo-Saxon countries which can be the result of its economical efficiency. And, there is something in the British culture, which can motivate its people to use an efficient idea to improve their performance, even if the idea is based on slightly different cultural assumptions. British people can still adjust it to their own needs and make it efficient in their own way. And this perseverance – which I perceive as a cultural British characteristic – can be the significant factor, which can enable them to use these different cultural solutions to improve their own performance.

The compatible features on an organisational level were neither present as a primary features in the researched case study, nor in my organisational (work and volunteering) experience. However, even though practising lean management in a culture with features opposite towards lean can be difficult and challenging, as it was stated above, it is possible, at least to some extent. It demands developing and sustaining lean management culture, at least on the highest, more visible and conscious levels of the culture, even with limited impact on the deepest and subconscious level of basic cultural assumptions. We can conclude that if the culture of the researched organisation has not been shaped towards lean management culture, than the lean implementation could be even more difficult, if possible. Thus, we should build the consciousness of cultural differences and its influence on the lean management system.

Summing up, lean management implementation should be a long-term and deep process, considering the whole organisation, with its culture as well. This is because the culture of an organisation (determined mostly by the national culture of its representatives) can influence the success of lean management implementation. That is

why, we should try to understand what is the organisational culture and how compatible it is to the lean management culture (cf.: Parkes, 2014) or is there another (cultural) factor that could have influence on lean management system implementation.

REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. (2003). *Badania społeczne w praktyce*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Dennis, P. (2002). *Lean Production Simplified*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Dore, R. (1973). *British Factory – Japanese Factory*. Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hampden-Turner, Ch. & Trompenaars, A. (2006). *Siedem kultur kapitalizmu*. Kraków: OE.
- Hofstede, G. (2000). *Kultury i organizacje. Zaprogramowanie umysłu*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Jakonis, A. (2011). Kulturowe uwarunkowania Lean Management. In: P. Trippner (red.), *Znaczenie mikro i makroprocesów w funkcjonowaniu i rozwoju systemu społeczno-ekonomicznego, Przedsiębiorczość i zarządzanie*, t. XII, z. 12. Łódź: SWSPiZ.
- Jakonis, A. (2012). Cultural conditioning of LEAN MANAGEMENT – continuation of the research. *Journal of Intercultural Management*, 4(2), June.
- Kristjuhan, K. (2010). *Cultural and Habitual Features and the Implementation of Lean Principles in Companies: Mapping out the Research*. <http://www.google.co.uk/uwww.leaneducatorconference.org> (access: 07.03.2014).
- Liker, J.K. & Hosesus, M. (2008). The Centre for Quality People and Organizations, *Toyota Culture. The Heart and Soul of the Toyota Way*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mole, J. (2000). *W tyglu Europy. Wzorce i bariery kulturowe w przedsiębiorstwach*. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
- Ohno, T. (1988). *Toyota Production System. Beyond Large-Scale Production*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Parkes, A. (2013). Indywidualizm i kolektywizm jako przykład kulturowych uwarunkowań Lean Management. In: M. Walachowska, A. Zduniak (red.), *Edukacja XXI wieku. Podmiotowość w edukacji wobec odmienności kulturowych oraz społecznych różnicowań*. Poznań: WSB.
- Parkes, A. (2014). Lean management culture. In: M. Matejun (ed.), *Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in the European Union: Development Challenges in 2014–2010 Perspective*. Monographs, Lodz: Lodz University of Technology.

- Przybyłowska, I. (1978), Wywiad swobodny ze standaryzowaną listą poszukiwanych informacji i możliwości jego zastosowania w badaniach socjologicznych. *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, XXX.
- Schein, E.H. (1986). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco–London: Jossey-Bass.
- Sułkowski, Ł. (2012). *Kulturowe procesy zarządzania*. Warszawa: Difin.
<http://qsr.webd.pl/KKonecki/publikacje/publikacja2.html> (access: 28.08.2015).
- http://www.emito.net/finanse/wiadomosci_/wysoki_koszt_nierownosci_spolecznych_1606254.html (access: 12.12.2014).
- <http://www.lean.org/WhoWeAre/LEINewsStory.cfm?NewsArticleId=180> (access: 16.06.2015).

KULTUROWE UWARUNKOWANIA LEAN MANAGEMENT W WIELKIEJ BRYTANII

Abstrakt

Tło badań. Wdrożenie i rozwój koncepcji zarządzania zwanej *lean management* mogą być uwarunkowane kulturą organizacji, która z kolei jest w przeważającym stopniu determinowana kulturą narodową jej przedstawicieli. Dlatego więc, z punktu widzenia sukcesu we wdrożeniu *lean management*, istotne jest zrozumienie różnych kulturowych uwarunkowań i tego, na ile są one kompatybilne z kulturą *lean management* (zob.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014).

Cel badań. Celem badań, których wyniki zaprezentowane zostały w artykule, była analiza kultury organizacyjnej i kulturowych uwarunkowań *lean management* na przykładzie studium przypadku w Wielkiej Brytanii.

Metodologia. Retrospektywne studium przypadku przeprowadzono w 2014 roku w Wielkiej Brytanii. Głównymi źródłami danych były: wywiad swobodny ze standaryzowaną listą poszukiwanych informacji i wywiad narracyjny, przeprowadzone z długoletnim pracownikiem firmy, oraz dokumenty firmy. Dodatkowymi źródłami danych były: swobodne rozmowy z byłymi współpracownikami respondenta oraz obserwacje uczestniczące prowadzone w organizacjach handlowych i usługowych w związku z wykonywaną pracą zawodową i wolontariatem.

Kluczowe wnioski. Na podstawie przeprowadzonych badań scharakteryzowano badaną kulturę organizacyjną jako różną od kultury *lean management* w zakresie poziomu podstawowych założeń kulturowych. Mimo iż wdrażanie *lean management* powinno być również kształtowaniem kultury *lean*, to jednak im bardziej różniła się kultura od kultury *lean*, tym – moim zdaniem – trudniej wdrożyć system *lean management* (zob.: Jakonis, 2011, 2012; Parkes, 2014).

Jednocześnie w badanej kulturze obecne były elementy kultury *lean* jako wynik socjalizacji wtórnej, co może wskazywać, że nie tylko pożądane, ale i możliwe jest ukształtowanie kultury *lean* (przynajmniej do pewnego stopnia) podczas wdrażania systemu *lean management* w organizacji, nawet w warunkach różnej kultury. Przy czym dyskusyjne jest tu, do jakiego stopnia możemy zmienić kulturę, jak tę zmianę efektywnie podtrzymywać i czy mamy do czynienia również z innymi czynnikami niż przedstawione charakterystyki, istotnymi z punktu widzenia wdrożenia *lean management*.

Słowa kluczowe: kultura, kultura organizacyjna, lean management, kulturowe uwarunkowania lean management, Wielka Brytania.