

Corrigendum: Lean practices and supply-chain competitiveness in the steel industry in Gauteng, South Africa

**Authors:**

Sizwe Khoza¹ 
Chengedzai Mafini¹ 
Welby V. Loury Okoumba¹ 

Affiliations:

¹Department of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa

Corresponding author:

Welby Loury Okoumba,
welbyl@vut.ac.za

Dates:

Published: 21 June 2023

How to cite this correction:

Khoza, S., Mafini, C. & Loury Okoumba, W.V., 2023, 'Corrigendum: Lean practices and supply-chain competitiveness in the steel industry in Gauteng, South Africa', *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences* 26(1), a4900. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v26i1.4900>

Copyright:

© 2023. The Authors.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

In the published article, Khoza, S., Mafini, C. & Loury Okoumba, W.V., 2022, 'Lean practices and supply-chain competitiveness in the steel industry in Gauteng, South Africa', *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences* 25(1), a4617. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v25i1.4617>, on page 7 the following paragraph is updated as it was incorrectly formulated:

The original incorrect wording:

Explanatory factor analysis

A Harma's one-factor score test was conducted by running the preliminary explanatory factor analysis (EFA) on the sample data. In contrast, the unrotated factor solution was examined to determine the number of necessary factors to account for the variance in the variables. The single factor that emerged yielded one general factor accounting for approximately 24.89% of the covariance among the measures, concluding that common method variance is not a problem.

The revised and updated wording:

Exploratory factor analysis

A Harman's one-factor score test was conducted by running the preliminary exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the sample data. In contrast, the unrotated factor solution was examined to determine the number of necessary factors to account for the variance in the variables. The single factor that emerged yielded one general factor accounting for approximately 24.89% of the covariance among the measures, concluding that common method variance is not a problem.

The authors apologise for this error. The correction does not change the study's findings of significance or overall interpretation of the study's results or the scientific conclusions of the article in any way.

Read online:

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

Note: DOI of original article published: <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v25i1.4617>