

THE CULTURAL DIALECTICS OF STANDARDIZATION AND INNOVATION FROM THE JAPANESE ETHOS TO THE GLOBAL PRACTICE OF LEAN CONSTRUCTION

Zhong Wang¹, Walter Davis², Thomas Bock³, Qipei Mei⁴, Gaang Lee⁵, & Vicente A. González⁶

ABSTRACT

The global construction industry faces a persistent productivity crisis, often attributing the failure of "Lean Construction" implementation to technical rather than cultural misalignments. This paper investigates the cultural dialectics of standardization and Kaizen as Lean principles move from Japan's collectivist culture to Western individualistic and transactional construction environments. Using a PRISMA 2020 systematic literature review and comparative cultural analysis, the study examines Wa (harmony), Monozukuri (craftsmanship), and Shu-Ha-Ri (mastery stages). It examines the indigenous Japanese concepts of Wa (harmony), Monozukuri (craftsmanship), and Shu-Ha-Ri (stages of mastery) to elucidate how Japanese culture harmonizes strict standardization with continuous innovation, challenging the Western binary view that standardization stifles creativity. The study reviews related works on Kaizen implementation and Standardized Work (SW) in construction, identifying that Western resistance often stems from a "craftsman" identity that views autonomy as the absence of rules. The analysis concludes that successful Lean adoption requires reframing standardization not as a bureaucratic constraint, but as the necessary cultural foundation for innovation and psychological safety.

KEYWORDS

Standardization, continuous improvement/Kaizen, innovation, Lean culture.

INTRODUCTION

The global construction industry continues to grapple with a persistent productivity crisis, in marked contrast to the manufacturing sector's exponential gains in efficiency, quality, and

1 PhD Candidate, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Alberta, Canada, zhong15@ualberta.ca, orcid.org/0000-0002-7113-3439

2 Associate Professor, Department of Art & Design, Faculty of Art, University of Alberta, Canada, wdavis1@ualberta.ca

3 Chair of Building Realization and Robotics, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany, bockrobotics@web.de, orcid.org/0000-0002-1278-7440

4 Assistant Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Alberta, Canada, qipei@ualberta.ca, orcid.org/0000-0003-1409-3562

5 Assistant Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Alberta, Canada, gaang@ualberta.ca, orcid.org/0000-0002-6341-2585

6 Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Alberta, Canada, vagonzal@ualberta.ca, orcid.org/0000-0003-3408-3863

speed since the 1960s (Bloomfield, 2017). These manufacturing advances were propelled by Lean methodologies developed in post-war Japan (Čiarnienė & Vienažindienė, 2012).

Despite notable progress in materials science and digital tools, construction remains characterised by unpredictability, rework, cost overruns, and adversarial relationships (Ofori, 2015). Attempts to transplant Lean principles—most notably the interplay between standardization (Standardized Work) and continuous improvement (Kaizen)—into construction have produced mixed outcomes. While certain projects achieve temporary breakthroughs, many revert to traditional practices once external support is withdrawn (Bajjou & Chafi, 2021; Idrissi Gartoumi et al., 2024; Martinez et al., 2019; Silva et al., 2023; Xing et al., 2021).

The core research problem is not technical but cultural. Lean Construction originated in Japan's high-context, collectivist environment yet is applied in Western low-context, individualistic contexts. This translation generates friction around standardization, which Western practitioners often perceive as antithetical to creativity and professional autonomy.

This paper examines how the cultural dialectics of standardization and innovation can be reconciled to achieve sustainable Lean adoption beyond Japan. The central research question is: How do cultural differences in the perception of standardization and innovation influence the adoption and sustainability of Lean Construction practices between its Japanese origins and Western implementation? To answer this question, this study employs a systematic literature review following PRISMA 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021) combined with thematic comparative cultural analysis. The paper proceeds in four main parts. The following section develops the conceptual framework by contrasting Japanese and Western perspectives on standardization and innovation. Subsequent sections review related literature, extract the Japanese cultural substrate (Wa, Monozukuri, Shu-Ha-Ri), map sources of friction in Western construction, and propose a hybrid cultural-operational model.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In dominant Western management thought, standardization and creativity are positioned as opposing forces. This binary perspective traces its roots to Frederick Winslow Taylor's Scientific Management, where standardization is equated with rigidity, deskilling, bureaucracy, and the suppression of human agency (Taylor, 2004). Creativity, by contrast, is associated with freedom, spontaneity, and rule-breaking—the domain of the autonomous architect, engineer, or skilled craftsman confronting unique problems (Fletcher, 1990). In construction, this manifests as strong resistance to Standardized Work. Professionals view projects as one-off prototypes rather than repeatable production processes and regard standardization as an infringement on professional autonomy (Styhre & Josephson, 2006). Consequently, attempts to standardize processes are often met with cultural resistance, viewed as a disrespect to the professional autonomy of the builder (Albalkhy & Sweis, 2021; Roy et al., 2005).

In the Japanese cultural and industrial context, this apparent paradox is illusory. The Japanese model, exemplified by Kaizen, holds that standardization is the indispensable prerequisite for improvement (Singh & Singh, 2009). As Taiichi Ohno articulated: “Without standards, there can be no improvement.” (Ohno, 2012) Here, a standard is not a static, immutable rule but the “current best way”—a living baseline against which variation can be measured, analysed, and harnessed for innovation. Without a standard, variation is mere noise; with a standard, variation becomes actionable insight. Standardization and creativity therefore operate in dialectical unity: stability provides the foundation for change, and the two function as sequential gears in the engine of continuous improvement (Urabe, 1988).

This perspective reframes the role of standards from bureaucratic constraint to cognitive and collective liberation. It underpins the operational logic of the Toyota Production System and, by extension, Lean Construction. The framework therefore treats standardization not as the antithesis of innovation but as its necessary cultural and operational foundation—one that

simultaneously creates psychological safety and frees cognitive resources for higher-order creative problem-solving.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a systematic literature review following PRISMA 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021) combined with thematic comparative cultural analysis.

Databases searched: Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and IGLC proceedings.

Search string: (“Lean Construction” OR “Lean in construction”) AND (standardi* OR “standard work” OR Kaizen OR “continuous improvement”) AND (culture OR innovation OR standardization OR creativity).

Inclusion criteria: English-language peer-reviewed articles or IGLC papers explicitly addressing Lean, standardization/standard work, Kaizen, and cultural/innovation aspects in construction contexts. Exclusion criteria: purely technical tool descriptions without cultural discussion or non-construction settings. Grey literature (e.g., KAIZEN Institute, 2023) was included supplementarily for practical insights and clearly labelled.

PRISMA flow: 289 records identified → 267 after duplicate removal → 116 title/abstract screened → 89 full text assessed → 22 studies included.

Data extraction used a standardised form capturing author, year, key themes, cultural references, and evidence type. Thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke (2006) six-phase approach using NVivo. A deductive-inductive codebook was developed from the research question (examples: “standardization resistance”, “Shu-Ha-Ri mastery”, “culture friction”). Two authors independently coded 25% of papers (Cohen’s Kappa = 0.81); all discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

LITERATURE SYNTHESIS

This section synthesises the empirical evidence drawn from the 62 included studies, focusing specifically on the keywords “Standardized Work,” “Kaizen,” and “Innovation.” It serves two explicit purposes: (a) to establish the evidence base documenting implementation outcomes and recurring friction points, and (b) to articulate the core problem statement that the subsequent Conceptual Framework resolves.

Lean Construction research consistently identifies continuous improvement (Kaizen) and standardization (Standardized Work) as foundational to Lean success, yet both elements remain difficult to sustain beyond isolated pilots. On Kaizen, the literature shows that while tools such as Gemba walks, Value Stream Mapping, and structured events are widely known, adoption is hindered by the project-based nature of construction, which interrupts the long-term learning cycles (Albalkhy & Sweis, 2021; Moradi & Sormunen, 2023; Shang & Sui Pheng, 2013; Tezel et al., 2018). Western firms typically favour radical Kaikaku (one-off reforms) over disciplined daily incremental Kaizen, producing “islands of excellence” rather than systemic change (Helmold et al., 2022; Suárez-Barraza et al., 2011). Empirical case studies confirm short-term gains—for example, structured Kaizen events in social-housing concrete-wall production significantly reduced lead times and workload—yet these improvements rarely embed organisation-wide (Doolen et al., 2008; Erthal & Marques, 2022; Romo et al., 2025; Vieira et al., 2022).

Standardization encounters even stronger resistance. Construction professionals frequently perceive Standardized Work as a threat to professional autonomy and a deskilling of craft labour, viewing it through the lens of Taylorism (Asadian et al., 2021; Haakestad & Friberg, 2020; Shang & Sui Pheng, 2013). Empirical studies document repeated reversion to traditional practices once external support ends, with workers resisting imposed standards while participatory approaches (where trades co-define the “current best way”) can enhance

ownership and self-management (Oudhuis, 2013). The evidence also reveals an unresolved tension between standardization and creativity: some works treat the two as mutually exclusive (Gilson et al., 2005; Kondo, 1995; Shalley & Gilson, 2017), whereas others demonstrate that well-designed standards free cognitive capacity for higher-order innovation, particularly when framed through Japanese Kata routines (Kondo, 2000; Noddings, 2013).

Overall, the empirical base reveals a clear pattern: Lean tools deliver temporary breakthroughs in controlled settings, yet sustained productivity gains elude most Western projects.

Despite this growing evidence catalogue of tools, barriers, and isolated successes, the literature leaves a critical explanatory gap. Most studies attribute implementation failures to organisational, contractual, or project-specific factors without adequately examining the deeper cultural dialectics between standardization and innovation. The persistent resistance to Standardized Work and the preference for heroic improvisation over disciplined Kaizen cannot be fully explained by technical shortcomings or project uniqueness. Instead, the evidence points to a fundamental cultural incompatibility: Lean's Japanese-originating philosophy treats standardization as the prerequisite for creativity, whereas Western construction norms frame it as antithetical to autonomy and ingenuity. This unresolved cultural clash constitutes the central problem that the Conceptual Framework addresses by contrasting the Japanese dialectical unity of stability and change with Western binary assumptions, thereby explaining why tools alone are insufficient and why a cultural synthesis is required for global Lean viability.

THE JAPANESE CULTURAL SUBSTRATE: ROOTS OF THE PARADOX

The operational excellence of Japanese industry stems less from superior engineering than from centuries-old cultural values that transform standardization into an act of social harmony and personal mastery rather than imposed drudgery.

WA (HARMONY) AND MONOZUKURI (CRAFTSMANSHIP)

At the heart of Japanese culture lies Wa (和)—an active force of group cohesion and consensus that prioritises collective alignment over individual ego (Hirata & Warschauer, 2014; Rohlen, 1979). Rooted in wet-rice agriculture and vulnerability to natural disasters, Wa manifests in business through Nemawashi: extensive informal consultations that ensure buy-in before any standard is formalised (Hirata & Warschauer, 2014; Rohlen, 1979). Once consensus is reached, implementation is swift and resistance minimal.

Complementing Wa is Monozukuri—the spirit of “making things”—which fuses Zen and Shinto influences to view materials, tools, and processes as vessels for excellence and human development (Heller & Fujimoto, 2017; Saito et al., 2011). It is inseparable from Hitozukuri (making people) and Kotozukuri (value creation). In this view, a standard is not a deskilling device but a teaching tool that refines the worker into a master craftsman.

SHU-HA-RI: THE PEDAGOGY OF INNOVATION

One of the most potent conceptual frameworks for resolving the standardization-creativity paradox is Shu-Ha-Ri. Originating from Japanese martial arts (Budo) and traditional arts (like the tea ceremony), Shu-Ha-Ri describes the three non-linear stages of mastery (Suárez-Barraza, 2023):

Shu (守) - Protect/Obey: In this initial stage, the student strictly follows the rules and forms (Kata) of the master without deviation (Suárez-Barraza, 2023). The focus is on precise replication and discipline. The student does not ask "why" or try to "improve" the form; they simply execute it. This phase "protects" the learner from bad habits and establishes a robust

neurological and physical foundation. In an industrial context, this is the strict adherence to Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) (Zanchi et al., 2024).

Ha (破) - Break/Detach: Once the forms are mastered and internalized—when the body moves correctly without conscious thought—the practitioner begins to understand the underlying principles (Suárez-Barraza, 2023). They can now break the rules or adapt them to specific contexts. They experiment, question, and blend techniques. This is the beginning of the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle, where the standard is challenged (Zanchi et al., 2024).

Ri (離) - Depart/Transcend: In the final stage, the practitioner transcends the rules (Suárez-Barraza, 2023). Their actions are natural, intuitive, and creative. They create their own new methods and forms. They are no longer "following" a standard; they are the standard. Innovation at this stage is profound because it is built on a foundation of absolute mastery, not amateur guessing (Antonio Capobianco, 2016).

THE WESTERN INVERSION

This framework reveals a profound cultural inversion. In Japan, creativity (Ri) emerges only after mastery of the standard (Shu); one cannot effectively break the rules (Ha) until the rules have first been internalised. Western approaches, particularly in the creative fields of design and construction, routinely invert this sequence. They encourage “jumping to Ri”—valuing out-of-the-box thinking and heroic improvisation before the box (the standard process) is even understood. As a result, Western workers frequently resent Standardized Work as demeaning and regressive, whereas the Shu-Ha-Ri mindset sees it as the essential initiation into true expertise.

The inversion extends to decision-making and the very purpose of standards. In Western organisations, decisions are typically top-down or driven by the most charismatic leader. In contrast, Japanese Wa demands Nemawashi—extensive informal consultations to build consensus before any standard is formalised. Once agreement is reached, implementation is swift and resistance minimal; adherence becomes an act of loyalty to peers rather than obedience to authority (Sagi, 2015).

The same inversion shapes the worker's relationship to the standard. In the West, standardization is often viewed as a managerial tool to deskill labour and replace skilled workers with cheaper ones. In the Japanese context, the standard serves Hitozukuri (making people): it is a deliberate instrument for developing workers into masters who can later create value through Kotozukuri (Saabye et al., 2024). What the West treats as constraint, Japan treats as the pathway to mastery. This fundamental reversal explains why Lean's core logic encounters such persistent cultural resistance in Western construction.

THE TOYOTA GENESIS: OPERATIONALIZING CULTURE

The Toyota Production System (TPS) did not invent these cultural values; rather, it operationalized them into a rigorous management system. TPS is the bridge that carried these ancient values into the modern industrial world, and subsequently, into Lean Construction. It is vital to remember that TPS was born in post-World War II Japan, a nation with decimated infrastructure, no natural resources, and a lack of capital. Unlike US manufacturers like Ford, who could afford massive inventories and waste due to the abundance of the American economy, Toyota had to be efficient to survive. This scarcity mindset aligned perfectly with the cultural value of Mottainai (a sense of regret concerning waste).

THE PARADOXES OF KAIZEN

The Kaizen Institute identifies "Seven Paradoxes" that challenge traditional Western mindsets, the most relevant being: "Standardize to Improve" (KAIZEN Institute, 2023). This paradox functions through two distinct cycles:

- SDCA (Standardize-Do-Check-Act): This is the maintenance cycle. It standardizes a process to ensure it is consistent. Without SDCA, a process is unstable and cannot be improved because the baseline is moving (Knop & Mielczarek, 2015).
- PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act): This is the improvement cycle, originally developed and popularized by Shewhart and Deming (1986), forms the improvement engine after standardization is achieved via SDCA. Once a process is standardized, PDCA is used to elevate it to a new level which then becomes the new standard (SDCA again) (Shewhart & Deming, 1986).

Western companies often focus solely on the "Improvement" (PDCA) or the "Innovation" part, neglecting the "Standardization" (SDCA) part. This leads to the "saw-tooth effect" where improvements are made but quickly lost because they were never standardized.

KEIRETSU: THE STRUCTURAL TRUST

Another crucial element of the Japanese industrial model is the Keiretsu—a network of interlocking business relationships and shareholdings (Gilson & Roe, 1993). In the automotive industry, Toyota maintains long-term, stable relationships with its suppliers (Aoki & Lennerfors, 2013). These are not transactional, low-bid relationships but strategic partnerships. Because the relationship is long-term, Toyota can impose its standards on suppliers, and suppliers are willing to invest in learning those standards because they know they won't be fired for a slightly cheaper competitor next year. In the meantime, risks and profits are often shared. If a supplier struggles, Toyota sends engineers to help them fix the process (Kaizen) rather than cancelling the contract (Aoki & Lennerfors, 2013).

THE LEAN CONSTRUCTION TRANSLATION: THEORY MEETS REALITY

In the early 1990s, the principles of TPS began to migrate from manufacturing to construction. This movement, spearheaded by researchers like Lauri Koskela, Glenn Ballard, and Greg Howell, sought to address the "physics of production" in construction.

Lauri Koskela proposed the "TFV" theory, arguing that traditional construction management focused only on Transformation (converting inputs to outputs) while ignoring Flow (movement and waiting) and Value (customer requirements) (Koskela et al., 2007). The most significant innovation in Lean Construction is the Last Planner System (LPS) of production control, developed by Ballard (Ballard, 2000). Recognizing that construction sites are not factories—the "factory" moves, the workers are transient, and the product is unique—LPS attempts to create reliability through social commitment rather than machine automation. LPS decentralizes planning. Instead of a project manager creating a master schedule in a silo, the "Last Planners" (foremen and trade leads) plan the work.

Deeply analysed, LPS is an attempt to simulate Japanese cultural values in a Western context:

- Simulated Wa: The "Big Room" or Obeya planning sessions force face-to-face consensus building (Nemawashi) among trades who usually ignore each other.
- Simulated Kaizen: The calculation of PPC and the categorization of "Reasons for Variance" forces a Root Cause Analysis and a learning cycle (PDCA).
- Standardized Work: The Weekly Work Plan becomes the "Standard" for that week.

However, despite the theoretical elegance of LPS, its implementation has been fraught with difficulty (Fernandez-Solis et al., 2013; Perez & Ghosh, 2018; Porwal et al., 2010; Viana et al., 2010). Research consistently shows that while the mechanics (sticky notes, meetings) are adopted, the culture is often neglected (Lühr et al., 2023).

THE CULTURAL FRICTION: WHY THE WEST STRUGGLES WITH STANDARDIZATION

The translation of Lean Construction from its Japanese origins to Western contexts is not merely a technical challenge; it is fundamentally a cultural one. Lean principles were developed within Japan's high-context, collectivist culture, which emphasises consensus building, long-term relationships, group harmony, and disciplined adherence to shared standards. These cultural foundations naturally support both rigorous standardization and continuous improvement.

Western construction, by contrast, is rooted in a low-context, highly individualistic and transactional culture characterised by short-term contracts, adversarial relationships, and a strong preference for personal autonomy and heroic problem-solving. This deep incompatibility between Lean's collectivist, discipline-based logic and the individualistic reality of Western construction is the primary source of resistance to standardization.

THE "HERO" VS. THE PROCESS

Western construction culture, particularly in the US, UK, and Australia, is deeply individualistic (Yeung et al., 2013). It lionizes the "Hero"—the superintendent who works 80 hours a week, yells at subcontractors, creates miracles, and "pushes" the job across the finish line through sheer force of will. This "firefighting" mentality is culturally ingrained. It provides an adrenaline rush and immediate validation of the individual's worth (Cohen et al., 2016).

Comparing with the heroic scenes on the western construction site, lean is boring. A Lean job site is quiet, predictable, and orderly. It relies on standard processes, not heroic intervention (Erthal & Marques, 2022). Implementing Lean effectively strips the "Hero" of their identity. If the job runs smoothly due to good planning, there are no fires to fight, and the "Hero" feels unnecessary. This psychological resistance is a major, often unspoken, barrier to the adoption of standard work (Cohen et al., 2016; Yeung et al., 2013).

Contrastively, in Japan, the "Hero" is the team that maintains Wa and adherence to the standard. In the West, the hero is the cowboy who breaks the rules to "get it done".

THE "CRAFTSMAN" RESISTANCE TO STANDARDIZATION

In Western trade culture, "Standard Work" is often conflated with Taylorism. Skilled tradespeople (electricians, pipefitters, carpenters) view their autonomy as a badge of honour and a mark of their skill level, for example one may say: "I don't need a checklist; I've been doing this for 20 years." (Porter, 2024).

Western workers often perceive standardization as an attempt by management to "deskill" them—to turn them into interchangeable parts so they can be paid less or replaced (Harris, 1998). This is the antithesis of the Monozukuri spirit, where following the standard is an expression of high skill. Research shows that Western tradespeople experience "autonomy" as the absence of external constraints (Cohen et al., 2016; Porter, 2024; Yeung et al., 2013). Lean attempts to redefine autonomy as "ownership of the improvement process," but this nuance is rarely communicated effectively.

THE LOW-TRUST CONTRACTUAL ENVIRONMENT

One of the most significant structural barriers is the absence of the Keiretsu system. Western construction is defined by "low-bid" procurement and transactional, adversarial relationships. General Contractors (GCs) and Subcontractors often view each other as enemies and the contract is a weapon (Korb et al., 2016). In the Last Planner System, a subcontractor is supposed to be transparent about their constraints (Sacks et al., 2010). However, in a low-trust environment, the subcontractor might hide this fact to avoid contractual notices of delay (Sacks et al., 2010). Conversely, they might "sandbag" (under-promise) to protect themselves from liability.

Without the long-term relationship of the Keiretsu, it is rational for individual actors to optimize for themselves (sub-optimization) rather than for the project (global optimization). This destroys the "Flow" that Lean attempts to create.

RESOLVING THE DIALECTIC: ADVANCED ADAPTATIONS AND HYBRID MODELS

Recognizing that a "copy-paste" of Japanese culture is impossible, successful Lean practitioners in the West are developing hybrid models that adapt Japanese principles to Western realities. Recent action research in construction has shifted focus from "Lean Tools" to "Toyota Kata" (Rother, 2009). Instead of telling a Western superintendent how to solve a problem, which triggers resistance to autonomy, Kata teaches a routine for scientific thinking:

1. Understand the Direction (The Goal).
2. Grasp the Current Condition (Data).
3. Establish the Next Target Condition (Short-term goal).
4. Experiment (PDCA) toward the target.

This approach leverages the Western desire for autonomy—giving the team the challenge but letting them figure out the solution—while smuggling in the discipline of the scientific method (Standardization of Thought), aligning with the Coaching Kata.

Digital technologies overcome cultural resistance to standardization by embedding standards directly into the workflow, making adherence the default and deviation technically difficult. Integrated BIM and Lean platforms such as VisiLean codify Standardized Work through mandatory data fields, automated validation, rule-based sequences, and clash detection (Dave et al., 2011).

Digital Twins and real-time IoT monitoring add objective transparency by creating a live "Single Source of Truth." These systems eliminate information asymmetry, reduce sandbagging, and trigger immediate deviation alerts—critical advantages in Western construction's low-trust, adversarial environment (Sacks et al., 2020).

Beyond enforcement, the technologies deliver the process stability required for genuine Kaizen. Consistent data enable rigorous PDCA cycles and clear distinction between common- and special-cause variation, while automation of routine checks frees cognitive capacity for creative problem-solving and innovation (Sacks et al., 2009).

In this hybrid model, technology serves as a culturally neutral scaffold. It compensates for the absence of organic collectivism and long-term trust, and—when paired with participatory standard development and Toyota Kata—reframes standardization as infrastructure that enables autonomy rather than constraining it. This digital enforcement represents one of the most powerful adaptations for embedding Lean principles in individualistic, project-based Western contexts.

CONCLUSION

The apparent paradox of standardization and innovation is not merely a Western cultural artifact; it is the visible symptom of a deeper epistemological divide in how mastery itself is constructed across civilizations. Where Japanese praxis—forged in Wa, Monozukuri, and the pedagogical arc of Shu-Ha-Ri—treats the standard as a living kata that scaffolds both neurological and collective mastery, Western construction has long romanticized tacit, heroic improvisation as the pinnacle of professional identity.

Yet herein lies the surprising inversion: the very project-based volatility, one-off prototypes, and individualistic "hero" ethos that have been diagnosed as Lean's Achilles' heel may ultimately prove its greatest global advantage. Rather than demanding a faithful transplantation

of Japanese collectivism or an awkward hybrid compromise, successful Lean adoption in construction may require a dialectical transcendence that neither pure Japanese consensus culture nor unbridled Western autonomy could achieve in isolation.

By channeling Western autonomy through Toyota Kata's scientific-thinking patterns and digitally encoded standards (BIM, VisiLean, Digital Twins), organizations can deliberately accelerate the Ha and Ri phases of mastery. Individual agency—once reframed through psychological safety and “artificial Wa” via Integrated Project Delivery—transforms from a source of sub-optimization into a catalyst for bolder, more disruptive Kaizen than the consensus-bound Japanese model typically permits. The hero does not vanish; he evolves into the “master-improver,” whose personal ingenuity is systematically harnessed rather than chaotically expended in firefighting.

Standardization, therefore, ceases to be a cultural concession and becomes cognitive liberation: it automates the mundane, protects against burnout (Muri), and generates the mental bandwidth for genuine, context-specific innovation at scale. The construction industry's decades-long productivity crisis is thus reinterpreted—not as a failure of technique or cultural incompatibility, but as an invitation to birth a new industrial philosophy: Project-Based Monozukuri or Nomadic Kaizen. In this emergent paradigm, rules do not stifle rebellion; they enable a refined, evidence-based rebellion that refines the rules themselves.

This reframing does more than solve Lean's translation problem. It positions Western construction as the crucible in which Lean itself matures into its global Ha stage—potentially producing innovation cycles faster and more adaptive than those of its factory-born Japanese progenitor. Future empirical research should test this transcendence hypothesis through longitudinal studies of Kata-integrated sites that deliberately amplify (rather than suppress) individual creative agency within stabilized processes.

Only by embracing this counterintuitive synthesis will the global construction industry move beyond importing Japanese efficiency to co-creating a truly 21st-century construction culture—one where the disciplined standard becomes the launchpad for a creativity that is simultaneously collectively sustainable and individually exhilarating.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere acknowledgement to the Canada Research Chair Program of the Government of Canada (CRC-2021-00531).

REFERENCES

- Albalkhy, W., & Sweis, R. (2021). Barriers to adopting lean construction in the construction industry: a literature review. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 12(2), 210-236.
- Antonio Capobianco, D. (2016). Shu-Ha-Ri: how to break the rules and still be agile. Proceedings of 4th International Conference in Software Engineering for Defence Applications: SEDA 2015,
- Aoki, K., & Lennerfors, T. T. (2013). Whither Japanese keiretsu? The transformation of vertical keiretsu in Toyota, Nissan and Honda 1991–2011. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 19(1), 70-84.
- Asadian, E., Leicht, R., & Messner, J. (2021). Lean adoption barriers for trade contractors. Canadian Society of Civil Engineering Annual Conference, Singapore.
- Bajjou, M. S., & Chafi, A. (2021). Lean construction and simulation for performance improvement: a case study of reinforcement process. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 70(2), 459-487.
- Ballard, H. G. (2000). *The last planner system of production control* [University of Birmingham].
- Bloomfield, G. T. (2017). The world automotive industry in transition. In *Restructuring the global automobile industry* (pp. 19-60). Routledge.

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Čiarnienė, R., & Vienažindienė, M. (2012). Lean manufacturing: theory and practice. *Economics and management*, 17(2), 726-732.
- Cohen, A. B., Wu, M. S., & Miller, J. (2016). Religion and culture: Individualism and collectivism in the East and West. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(9), 1236-1249.
- Dave, B., Boddy, S., & Koskela, L. (2011). Visilean: Designing a production management system with lean and BIM. 19th Annual conference of the international group for lean construction,
- Doolen, T. L., Van Aken, E. M., Farris, J. A., Worley, J. M., & Huwe, J. (2008). Kaizen events and organizational performance: a field study. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57(8), 637-658.
- Erthal, A., & Marques, L. (2022). Organisational culture in lean construction: managing paradoxes and dilemmas. *Production Planning & Control*, 33(11), 1078-1096.
- Fernandez-Solis, J. L., Porwal, V., Lavy, S., Shafaat, A., Rybkowski, Z. K., Son, K., & Lagoo, N. (2013). Survey of motivations, benefits, and implementation challenges of last planner system users. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 139(4), 354-360.
- Fletcher, W. (1990). The management of creativity. *International Journal of Advertising*, 9(1), 1-37.
- Gilson, L. L., Mathieu, J. E., Shalley, C. E., & Ruddy, T. M. (2005). Creativity and standardization: complementary or conflicting drivers of team effectiveness? *Academy of Management journal*, 48(3), 521-531.
- Gilson, R. J., & Roe, M. J. (1993). Understanding the Japanese keiretsu: Overlaps between corporate governance and industrial organization. *Yale Law Journal*, 871-906.
- Haakestad, H., & Friberg, J. H. (2020). Deskilling revisited: Labour migration, neo-Taylorism and the degradation of craft work in the Norwegian construction industry. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 41(3), 630-651.
- Harris, J. (1998). Scientific management, bureau-professionalism, new managerialism: The labour process of state social work. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 28(6), 839-862.
- Heller, D. A., & Fujimoto, T. (2017). Monozukuri management: Driver of sustained competitiveness in the Japanese auto industry. In *Japanese Management in Evolution* (pp. 107-126). Routledge.
- Helmold, M., Küçük Yılmaz, A., Flouris, T., Winner, T., Cvetkoska, V., & Dathe, T. (2022). Kaizen (改善), Kaikaku (改革) and Innovation Management. In M. Helmold, A. Küçük Yılmaz, T. Flouris, T. Winner, V. Cvetkoska, & T. Dathe (Eds.), *Lean Management, Kaizen, Kata and Keiretsu: Best-Practice Examples and Industry Insights from Japanese Concepts* (pp. 19-25). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10104-5_2
- Hirata, K., & Warschauer, M. (2014). *Japan: The paradox of harmony*. Yale University Press.
- Idrissi Gartoumi, K., Aboussaleh, M., & Zaki, S. (2024). Implementing lean construction to improve quality and megaproject construction: a case study. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 29(1), 1-22.
- KAIZEN Institute. (2023). *Standardize to improve: Standards foster creativity, improvement, and innovation*. <https://kaizen.com/insights/standardize-improve-standards/>
- Knop, K., & Mielczarek, K. (2015). The Improvement on the Basis of PDCA and SDCA Cycles. *Zeszyty Naukowe. Quality. Production. Improvement*.
- Kondo, Y. (1995). Are creativity and standardization mutually exclusive? *Human systems management*, 14(4), 309-312.
- Kondo, Y. (2000). Innovation versus standardization. *The TQM Magazine*, 12(1), 6-10.

- Korb, I., Haronian, E., Sacks, R., Judez Muñoz, P., & Shaked, O. (2016). Overcoming “but we’re different”: An IPD implementation in the middle east. Proceedings 24th Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction, Boston, MA, USA, sect. 7,
- Koskela, L., Rooke, J., Bertelsen, S., & Henrich, G. (2007, 2007/07/18). The TFM Theory of Production: New Developments. 15th Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction, East Lansing, Michigan, USA.
- Lühr, G. J., Bosch-Rekvelde, M., & Radujković, M. (2023). The Last-Planner-System’s impact on project culture. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 21(5), 1303-1322.
- Martinez, E., Reid, C. K., & Tommelein, I. D. (2019). Lean construction for affordable housing: a case study in Latin America. *Construction Innovation*, 19(4), 570-593.
- Moradi, S., & Sormunen, P. (2023). Implementing lean construction: a literature study of barriers, enablers, and implications. *Buildings*, 13(2), 556.
- Noddings, N. (2013). Standardized curriculum and loss of creativity. *Theory into practice*, 52(3), 210-215.
- Ofori, G. (2015). Nature of the construction industry, its needs and its development: A review of four decades of research. *Journal of construction in developing countries*, 20(2), 115.
- Ohno, T. (2012). The Standard Time Should Be the Shortest. In *Taiichi Ohno's Workplace Management: Special 100th Birthday Edition* (pp. 145). McGraw Hill LLC. <https://books.google.ca/books?id=B4J6J4whSwEC>
- Oudhuis, M. (2013). Experiences from Implementation of Lean production: standardization versus self-management: a Swedish case study. *Nordic Journal of working life studies*.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S.,...Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Perez, A. M., & Ghosh, S. (2018). Barriers faced by new-adopter of Last Planner System®: a case study. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 25(9), 1110-1126.
- Porter, K. (2024). The Culture of Construction in Western Society. In *Embracing Ethnography* (pp. 9-22). Routledge.
- Porwal, V., Fernández-Solís, J., Lavy, S., & Rybkowski, Z. K. (2010). Last planner system implementation challenges. Proceedings of the 18 Annual Conference International Group for Lean Construction, IGLC,
- Rohlen, T. P. (1979). *For harmony and strength: Japanese white-collar organization in anthropological perspective*. Univ of California Press.
- Romo, R., Orozco, F., Moreno, F., & Forcael, E. (2025). Lean construction barriers from the organizational culture lens. Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction (IGLC),
- Rother, M. (2009). *Toyota kata*. McGraw-Hill Professional Publishing New York, NY.
- Roy, R., Low, M., & Waller, J. (2005). Documentation, standardization and improvement of the construction process in house building. *Construction Management and Economics*, 23(1), 57-67.
- Saabye, H., Powell, D., & Hines, P. (2024). The microfoundations of lean leadership: Monozukuri, Hitozukuri, Kotozukuri. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 35(9-10), 998-1014.
- Sacks, R., Brilakis, I., Pikas, E., Xie, H. S., & Girolami, M. (2020). Construction with digital twin information systems. *Data-centric engineering*, 1, e14.
- Sacks, R., Koskela, L., Dave, B. A., & Owen, R. (2010). Interaction of lean and building information modeling in construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(9), 968-980.

- Sacks, R., Treckmann, M., & Rozenfeld, O. (2009). Visualization of work flow to support lean construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 135(12), 1307-1315.
- Sagi, D. S. (2015). 'Nemawashi'a Technique to Gain Consensus in Japanese Management Systems: An Overview. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Management Studies*, 1(4).
- Saito, K., Salazar, A. J., Kreaflle, K. G., & Grulke, E. A. (2011). Hitozukuri and Monozukuri: Centuries' old eastern philosophy to seek harmony with nature. *Interdisciplinary information sciences*, 17(1), 1-9.
- Shalley, C. E., & Gilson, L. L. (2017). Creativity and the management of technology: Balancing creativity and standardization. *Production and Operations Management*, 26(4), 605-616.
- Shang, G., & Sui Pheng, L. (2013). Understanding the application of Kaizen methods in construction firms in China. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 8(1), 18-33.
- Shewhart, W. A., & Deming, W. E. (1986). *Statistical method from the viewpoint of quality control*. Courier Corporation.
- Silva, E. N. d., Brasil de Brito Mello, L. C., & Pinto, G. O. (2023). Challenges for lean construction adoption in the Brazilian industry: A study in construction companies, universities and class organizations. *Construction Innovation*, 23(5), 1130-1150.
- Singh, J., & Singh, H. (2009). Kaizen philosophy: a review of literature. *IUP journal of operations management*, 8(2), 51.
- Styhre, A., & Josephson, P. E. (2006). Revisiting site manager work: stuck in the middle? *Construction Management and Economics*, 24(5), 521-528.
- Suárez-Barraza, M. F. (2023). KAIZEN and Its Origin in ZEN Buddhism and Shintoism. In *KAIZEN-21* (pp. 3-11). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Suárez-Barraza, M. F., Ramis-Pujol, J., & Kerbache, L. (2011). Thoughts on kaizen and its evolution: Three different perspectives and guiding principles. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 2(4), 288-308.
- Taylor, F. W. (2004). *Scientific management*. Routledge.
- Tezel, A., Koskela, L., & Aziz, Z. (2018). Lean thinking in the highways construction sector: motivation, implementation and barriers. *Production Planning & Control*, 29(3), 247-269.
- Urabe, K. (1988). Innovation and the Japanese management system. *Innovation and management, international comparisons*, 3-25.
- Viana, D. D., Mota, B., Formoso, C. T., Echeveste, M., Peixoto, M., & Rodrigues, C. L. (2010). A survey on the last planner system: Impacts and difficulties for implementation in Brazilian companies. Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction, IGLC,
- Vieira, J., Etges, B., Pellegrino, R., Lins, M., & Costa, L. (2022). Kaizen as an improvement method for concrete walls construction in social housing project. Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction. <https://doi.org/10.24928/2022/0136>,
- Xing, W., Hao, J. L., Qian, L., Tam, V. W., & Sikora, K. S. (2021). Implementing lean construction techniques and management methods in Chinese projects: A case study in Suzhou, China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 286, 124944.
- Yeung, J. F., Chan, A. P., & Lam, P. T. (2013). Evaluating national culture from Eastern and Western perspectives in the context of construction. *International Journal of Project Organisation and Management*, 5(4), 355-376.
- Zanchi, M., Romero, D., & Gaiardelli, P. (2024, 2024//). Digitally-Enhanced Shu-Ha-Ri Learning Cycle for Assembly Procedures in Smart-Learn Workstations. Advances in Production Management Systems. Production Management Systems for Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, and Ambiguous Environments, Cham.