

**DEVELOPMENT OF A TWO-STAGE NETWORK DATA ENVELOPMENT
ANALYSIS (DEA) MODEL TO ANALYZE PRODUCTION LINE'S
PERFORMANCE: COMBINATION OF AUTOMATION AND LABOR**

NIK AFIEZA BINTI CHE AZHAR

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Sciences (by Research)

**Faculty of Technology
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG**

OCTOBER 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	
TITLE PAGE	i
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRAK	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction to the Research	1
1.2	Research Question	6
1.3	Problem Statement	6
1.4	Objectives	7
1.5	Research Approach	8
1.6	Scope of the Dissertation	9
1.7	Thesis Overview	9

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Performance Measurement	11
2.2	Quality and Productivity Improvement	12
2.3	Data Envelopment Analysis	14
2.4	Two-Stage Network DEA	15
2.5	Network System in Recent DEA Literature	18
2.6	DEA Charnes-Cooper-Rhodes (CCR) Model	21

2.7	DEA Window Analysis	25
2.8	The Concept of Production Efficiency (Structure of Loss)	28
2.8.1	5 Large losses of Efficient Inhibition of Human	28
2.8.2	Efficient Inhibition of Semi-Automation	30
2.8.3	Efficient Inhibition of Fully Automation	31
2.8.4	7 Major Losses of Equipment	31

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1	Research Procedure	34
3.2	Phase 1 – Information Collection	36
3.2.1	Surfing the internet	36
3.2.2	Books and writing materials	36
3.2.3	Discussion with supervisor and staff at M technologies	37
3.3	Phase 2 – Data Collection	37
3.4	Phase 3 – Deciding DMUs	39
3.5	Phase 4 – Developing Two-Stage Network DEA Model	41
3.5.1	System Planning Stage	41
3.5.2	System Design Stage	42
3.5.3	Measuring Performance	42
3.6	Phase 5 - Recommendations	43

CHAPTER 4 MODEL DESIGN

4.1	Introduction	44
4.2	Development of Two-Stage Network DEA Model	46
4.2.1	Stage 1: Evaluation Performance of Productivity	47
4.2.2	Stage 2: Evaluation of Quality of Product in Terms of Cost and Time in Production Line	49
4.2	Conclusion	50

CHAPTER 5 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

5.1	Result	51
-----	--------	----

5.2	Stage 1: Evaluation Performance of Productivity	54
5.3	Stage 2: Evaluation of Quality of Product in Terms of Cost and Time in Production Line	56
5.4	Discussion and Conclusion	58

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

6.1	Conclusion	61
6.2	Future Work	62

REFERENCES 64

APPENDICES

A1	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model A (Month 1) – Stage 1	68
A2	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model B (Month 1) – Stage 1	70
A3	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model C (Month 1) – Stage 1	72
A4	Sample Of Raw Data Production Line Model D (Month 1) – Stage 1	74
A5	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model E (Month 1) – Stage 1	76
B1	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model A (Month 1) – Stage 2	78
B2	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model B (Month 1) – Stage 2	80
B3	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model C (Month 1) – Stage 2	82
B4	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model D (Month 1) – Stage 2	84
B5	Sample of Raw Data Production Line Model E (Month 1) – Stage 2	86
C1	Sample of Calculation Input And Output Data In Stage 1	88
C2	Sample of Calculation Input And Output Data In Stage 2	90
D1	Sample of Evaluation Data Using DEA-Solver Stage 1	91
D2	Sample of Evaluation Data Using DEA-Solver Stage 2	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
2.1	Example of window analysis	26
2.2	Result of calculation for window analysis Table 2.1	26
5.1	Inputs and outputs data to evaluate productivity	54
5.2	Score of production lines productivity for window 1	56
5.3	Average score and rank of production line productivity	56
5.4	Input and output data to evaluate losses due to time and cost	57
5.5	Score of production lines total losses	59
5.6	Average score and rank of total losses due to time and cost	59
5.7	Relationship between θ_1 and θ_2	61

LIST OF FIGURE

Figure No.	Title	Page
2.1	The Process Quality Improvement	13
2.2	Two-Stage process of DMU _j	18
2.3	Series production system	20
2.4	Parallel production system	21
2.5	DEA model	21
2.6	Window analysis model	27
2.7	The relationship of 7 equipment major loss and OEE	35
3.1	Framework of Research Procedure	34
3.2	Step of Data Collection	37
3.3	Production Lines Flow Chart	40
4.1	Process flowchart	45
4.3	Network DEA Model for Production Line Performance	46
5.1	DEA-Solver software	51
5.2	Introduction to DEA-Solver Page	52
5.3	Model Selection Page	52
5.4	Window-I-C Page	52
5.5	Data Sheet Selection Page	53
5.6	File Name Page	53
5.7	Run the Data Page	53
5.8	Exit Page (Last Page)	54
5.9	Variation through window 1 for stage 1	57
5.10	Variation through window 1 for stage 2	59

LIST OF SYMBOLS

θ Efficiency

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCR	Charnes-Cooper-Rhodes
DEA	Data Envelopment Analysis
DMU	Decision Making Units
EFQM	European Foundation for Quality Management
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
ROI	Return on Investment

**DEVELOPMENT OF A TWO-STAGE NETWORK DATA ENVELOPMENT
ANALYSIS (DEA) MODEL TO ANALYZE PRODUCTION LINE'S
PERFORMANCE: COMBINATION OF AUTOMATION AND LABOR**

NIK AFIEZA BINTI CHE AZHAR

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Sciences (by Research)

**Faculty of Technology
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG**

OCTOBER 2016

ABSTRAK

Pada masa kini, pembangunan pelbagai industri tidak lagi asing di mata dunia. Setiap industri bersaing antara satu sama lain untuk meningkatkan produktiviti dan menghasilkan produk baru dan berkualiti tinggi bagi memenuhi permintaan pelanggan. Setiap syarikat boleh mencapai Key Performance Indicator (KPI) atau matlamat yang disasarkan tetapi tanpa mengambil kira kos, tenaga kerja, masa atau lain-lain unsur-unsur adalah tidak cekap terhadap produktiviti. Menambah baik barisan pengeluaran dalam industri pembuatan memerlukan pelaburan yang besar untuk menghasilkan prestasi yang baik. Syarikat boleh mencapai Return of Investment (ROI) dan menyimpan lebih banyak wang daripada membayar gaji buruh dan meningkatkan produktiviti. Walau bagaimanapun, syarikat itu juga mungkin mempunyai risiko kehilangan wang mereka daripada pelaburan yang dilakukan tanpa penilaian barisan pengeluaran yang betul. Dalam kajian ini, kami mengkaji keberkesanan barisan pengeluaran yang dilengkapi dengan kombinasi antara penggunaan automasi dan buruh untuk menentukan produktiviti dan kualiti pengeluaran. Kemudian, membandingkan setiap barisan pengeluaran menggunakan automasi dengan barisan pengeluaran yang menggunakan tenaga buruh. Sebagai kajian kes, kajian ini memberi tumpuan kepada barisan pengeluaran yang menghasilkan produk yang mempunyai permintaan yang tinggi dan berterusan bagi melihat pelaburan ke atas automasi boleh memberi pulangan yang baik ataupun sebaliknya. Oleh itu, model Two-Stage Network DEA telah dibangunkan untuk mengukur barisan pengeluaran di peringkat yang berbeza. Hasil dari penilaian data melalui model ini akan menunjukkan semua keberkesanan barisan pengeluaran. Model ini akan memberi manfaat kepada industri berkaitan dalam prestasi setiap baris pengeluaran oleh itu, syarikat boleh membuat penambahanbaikan terhadap barisan pengeluaran yang tidak cekap.

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, the growth of industry can be seen as a nature of the world. Each company race again each other to increase productivity to produce new, high quality and product that fulfil customer demand. One can achieve the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) or targeted goal but without considering the cost, manpower, time or others elements is inefficient toward productivity. Upgrade production line in manufacturing industry needs huge investment to come out with good performance. The company can receive Return of Investment (ROI) and save more money from paying labor salary and increase productivity. However, the company also may have the risk of losing their money from the investment done without proper production line evaluation. In this research, we studied the effectiveness of production line that equipped with combination between automation usage and labor to determine the productivity and quality of the production line. Then, compare those production line with production line that use labor energy. As a case study, this research focuses on the production line that producing a product with a high and continues demand to observe how the investment on automation can give good return or otherwise. Therefore, the model of Two-Stage Network DEA was developed in order to measure those production line in different stages. As a result, the evaluation of data through this model will show all the effectiveness of the production line. The model will benefit the related industries in their performance by show the efficiency of each production line then company can make improvement toward those inefficient production line.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Z., Jun, M., Abdullah, M., Ishaq, M. N., Lateef, M. and Khan, I. (2015). Optimal Scheme Selection of Agricultural Production Structure Adjustment – Based on DEA model: Punjab (Pakistan). *Journal of Northeast Agricultural University (English Edition)*, 22(4), 48-52.
- Bouyssou, D. (1999). Using DEA as a tool for MCDM: some remarks. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 50, 974-978.
- Castelli, L., Pesenti, R. and Ukorich, W. (2004). DEA – like models for the efficiency evaluation of hierarchically structured units. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 154(2), 465-476.
- Carbone, T. D. (2000). Measuring Efficiency of Semiconductor Manufacturing Operations Using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). In Conference RWS. IEEE/Semi Advanced Semiconductor Manufacturing Conference, Springer, US, 56-62.
- Charnes, A., Cooper, W. W. and Rhodes, E. (1978). Measuring the efficiency of decision making units. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2, 429–44.
- Charnes, A., Clark, T., Cooper, W. W. and Golony, B. (1985). A development study of Data Envelopment Analysis for measuring the efficiency of maintenance units in the U. S. air force. *Annals of Operation Research*, 2, 95-112.
- Cook, W. D., Liang, L. and Zhu, J. (2010). Measuring performance of two-stage network structures by DEA: A review and future perspective. *Omega*, 38(6), 423-430.
- Cooper, W. W., Angela, T. K. and Joseph, C. P. (2014). Two-Stage financial risk tolerance assessment using data envelopment analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 233(1), 273-280.
- Cooper, W. W., Seiford, L. M., and Zhu, J. (2011). Hand book on data envelopment analysis. 2nd ed. Boston: Springer.
- Fare, R. and Grosskopf, S. (2000). Network DEA. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 34(1), 35-49.
- Fornell, C., Johnson, M. D., Anderson, E. W., Cha, J. and Everitt Bryant, B. (1996). The American customer satisfaction index: Nature, purpose, and findings. *Journal of Marketing*, 60, 7-18.

- Fukuyama, H. and Weber W. L. (2010). A slacks-based inefficiency measure for a two-stage system with bad outputs. *Omega*, 38(5), 398-409.
- Giese, A. (2012). Differenziertes Performance Measurement in Supply Chains. Dissertation, Fernuniversität Hagen. GablerVerlag, Wiesbaden.
- Global Bechmaking Network (GBN). Retrieved from www.globalbenchmarking.org/home/ on 4 January 2015.
- Goold, M. and Quinn, J. J. (1990). The paradox of strategic controls. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 43–57.
- Guo, C., Shureshjani, R.A., Foroughi, A.A. and Zhu, J. (2016). Decomposition weights and overall efficiency in Two-Stage additive Network DEA. *European Journal of Operation Research*. In press
- Gunasekaran, A., James, W. H. and McGaughey R. E. (2005). Performance measurement and costing system in new enterprise. *Technovation*, 25(5), 523-533
- Hartman, T. E. and Storbeck, J. E. (1996). Input congestion in loan operations. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 46–47, 413-421.
- Hsieh, L. F. and Lin, L. H. (2010). A performance evaluation model for international tourist hotels in Taiwan – An application of the relational Network DEA. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 14-24.
- Itoh, H. (2002). Efficiency Changes at Major Container Ports in Japan: A window Application of Data Envelopment Analysis. Proceeding of The Applied Regional Science Conference, Blackwell, UK, pp. 133-154.
- Jonsson, P. and Lesshammar, M. (1999). Evaluation and improvement of manufacturing performance measurement systems – the role of OEE. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 19(1), 55-78.
- Kao, C. (2008). Efficiency decomposition in two stage data envelopment analysis: a relation model. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 192 (3), 949-962.
- Kao, C. and Hwang, S. N. (2008). Efficiency decomposition in two-stage data envelopment analysis: an application to non-life insurance companies in Taiwan. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 185, 418–29.
- Kao, C. (2009). Efficiency measurement for parallel production systems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 196, 1107–1112.

- Kao, C. and Hwang, S.N. (2011). Decomposition of technical and scale efficiencies in two-stage production systems. European Journal of Operational Research, 211(3), 437-446.
- Kaplan, R. S. and Norton, D. P. (1996). Using the Balance Scorecard as a strategic management system. Harvard Business Review. 75-85.
- Kaydos, W. (1991). Measuring, Managing and Maximizing Performance. Portland, Productivity Press. OR.
- Kaydos, W. (1998). Operational Performance Measurement: Increasing Total Productivity. CRC Press.
- Klipfolio. Retrieved from <https://www.klipfolio.com/resources/articles/what-is-a-key-performance-indicator> on 3 July 2016
- Krajewski, L. J. and Ritzman L. P., 1998, “Operations Management : Strategy and Analysis”, Addison-Wesley.
- Leimeister, J. M. (2012). Services Engineering and Management. Springer.
- Liang, L., Yang, F., Cook, W. D. and Zhu, J. (2006). DEA models for supply chain efficiency evaluation. Journals of Operations Research, (145), 35–49.
- Liang, L., Cook, W. D. and Zhu, J. (2008). DEA models for two-stage processes: game approach and efficiency decomposition. Naval Research Logistics, 55, 643–53.
- Liang, L., Wu, J., Cook, W. D. and Zhu, J. (2008). Alternative secondary goals in DEA cross-efficiency evaluation. International Journal of Production Economics, 113(2), 1025-1030.
- Lim, S. and Zhu, J. (2016). A note on two-stage network DEA model: Frontier projection and duality. European Journal of Operational Research, 248(1), 342-346.
- Lozano, S. and Gutierrez, E. (2011). Efficiency analysis of and target setting of Spanish airports. Network Spatial Econ, 11 (1), 139-157.
- Lynch, R. L. and Cross, K. F. (1991). Measure Up! Yardsticks for Continuous Improvement. Basilblackwell, Oxford.
- Mansor, M. A., 2010. Development of Performance Measurement Methods for Production Maintenance Activities in Manufacturing Systems. Ph.D. Thesis. Nagaoka University of Technology, Japan.
- Mickael, L., Magnus, T., Productivity and customer satisfaction in Swedish pharmacies: A DEA network model, 1999.

- Nakajima, S. (1992). The concept of production efficiency (structure of loss). Book of New TPM Deployment Program for Production Innovation, Processing and assembly Edition (in Japanese). Japan Instituted of Plant Maintenance.
- Neely, A., Mills, J., Platts, K., Gregory, M. and Richards, H. (1996). Performance measurement system design: Should process based approaches be adopted. International Journal of Production Economics, 46–47, 423-431.
- Renner, P.F., Basic Hotel Front Office PProduces, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey. 1994.
- Rolf, F. and Shawna, G. (2000). Network DEA. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 34, 35-49.
- Reza, K. M. and Roza, A. (2014). A unified network-DEA model for performance measurement of production systems. Journal of Measurement, 60, 186-193.
- Seiford, L. M. and Zhu, J. (1999). An investigation of returns to scale in data envelopment analysis. Omega, 27(1), 1-11.
- Shankar, R. (2010). Production System. Book of Industrial Engineering and Management. 2nd ed. Galgotias.
- Shankar, R. (2010). Productivity. Book of Industrial Engineering and Management. 2nd ed. Galgotias.
- Simons, R. (2012). Levers of Control: How managers use innovative control system to drive strategic renewal. Harvard Business School Press.
- Stapenhurst, T. (2009). The Benchmaking Book: A how-to-guide the best practice for managers and practitioners. Elserier Ltd.
- The European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) (1996). Self-Assement 1996 Guidelines. EFQM. Brussels. Belgium.
- Tone, K. and Tsut sui, M. (2009). Network DEA: a slacks-based measure approach. European Journal of Operational Research, 197, 243–252.
- Wongrassame, S., Gardiner, P. D. and Simmons, J. E. L. (2013). Performance measurement tools: the Balanced Scorecard and the EFQM Excellence Model. Measuring Business Excellence, 7(1), 14-29.