

## **ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGY TO EVOLUTIONARY STEPS FOR MANUFACTURING STRATEGY IN SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES**

**Ricardo Palma**

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Facultad de Ingeniería, Maestría en Logística  
Mendoza Argentina Centro Universitario (M5502KFA), Ciudad, Mendoza. Casilla de Correo  
405. República Argentina.  
[rpalma@uncu.edu.ar](mailto:rpalma@uncu.edu.ar)

**Laure Morel**

Équipe de Recherche sur les Processus Innovatifs - Institute National Polytechnique de  
Lorraine - École Nationale Supérieure en Génie des Systèmes Industriels ENSGSI, INPL - 8  
rue Bastien Lepage B.P. 647 F5401,0 Nancy, France.  
[Laure.Morel@ensgsi.inpl-nancy.fr](mailto:Laure.Morel@ensgsi.inpl-nancy.fr)

**Raymundo Forradellas**

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Facultad de Ingeniería, Maestría en Logística  
Mendoza Argentina Centro Universitario (M5502KFA), Ciudad, Mendoza. Casilla de Correo  
405. República Argentina.  
[kike@uncu.edu.ar](mailto:kike@uncu.edu.ar)

**ABSTRACT:** Usually, we can find lots of methods and recipes for operating in the field of strategy. Many distinguished and important organizations, like the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and others, work so hard to help a constellation of Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) across the world. These kinds of enterprises exist in the developed countries as well as in the emerging economies, but, usually, the global strategy that they adopt can't be easily synchronized with the manufacturing function. Then, it's not common to find in the literature an easy way to move the actual manufacturing strategy towards the goal proposed by the global strategy. In this work, an analytical methodology is proposed to align this manufacturing strategy with global strategies using as a motivating force the customer satisfaction, innovation and the systemic competitiveness framework. This approach is made in step way, making small evolutionary steps to convert the actual operation actions into a strong and ductile manufacturing strategy.

**Keyword:** Manufacturing Strategy. Innovation. Small and Medium Enterprise.

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

As part of the global strategy, manufacturing strategy contributes to the success or breakdown of an enterprise. It must be in harmony with marketing, financial and human

resources, research, development, and innovation. If a company wants to be competitive, each part of his strategy must be something that is more than the sum of the isolated parts (synergy principle). No part is left out and no part dominates the other ones. Nevertheless, in some cases, business strategy is dominated by non-manufacturing functions, with the result being “thrown over the wall” to manufacturing (BRANS; MARESCHAL, 1986). Manufacturing that is inadequate with strategic planning and tries to be all things to all people delivers mediocre performance.

Nowadays, there is a growing interest in the SME around the world. As many authors point out, every big company has a root that leads to a brilliant idea developed in a garage. The gaps between those very different stages in the life of an enterprise are not only a matter of luck. Since Skinner (1969) outlined the importance of a strategic alignment of the manufacturing function. Since those days manufacturing strategy has become one of the most discussed issues in the field of operations management. Many publications offer conceptual frameworks and give empirical evidence concerning to the use of a manufacturing strategy. While extensive literature on manufacturing strategy has been written since the 1960s, some research questions remain unanswered (THUN, 2008).

Unfortunately, most of this effort is oriented to, or concerned with, big companies or corporations and only a small part research effort is working on the problems of small and medium enterprises and how to align the manufacturing function with the global strategy, while contemplate at the same time the need to innovate in the SME. In this reduced set, only five recent works have been found, thus, this subject's data includes the manufacturing strategy as a key factor on the company's innovation process. One of the strengths of the small and medium enterprises is their capacity for high innovation in products but not in process. However, the tools and soft technology that apply to solve the problem of innovate in the manufacturing system are not concerned with how to link it with the global strategy. Usually this problem is seen as a *dichotomy* matter where the SME must to decide between innovate or align the manufacturing strategy with the global strategy, but not the same things at the same time.

## 2 SCOPE

Many research programs say that the scope of the manufacturing strategy concept is not totally clear (SWAMIDASS; NEWELL, 1997). It's well known that the objective of the manufacturing strategy is to get a more competitive enterprise and help match the goals of the global strategy. More recent literature exposes the impact of the shortened life cycle, and

additional studies state that the manufacturing has become transformed in some kind of cryptic thing. Lots of anachronisms composed by three letter words like EOQ (Economic Order Quantity), JIT (Just In Time), SCM (Supply Chain Management), and CRM (Customer Relationship Management) appear to make more difficult to understand what a manufacturing strategy implies. Then the manager confuses “manufacturing strategy” with “manufacturing executive technology” (RHO; PARK; YU, 2001).

The solutions proposed by many researchers and other organizations can help enterprises, but not in every aspect, since the methodology proposed is the same to all different types of companies. Thus, the help of an expert is needed to customize the solutions for each special case. In this work, a methodology is proposed but the final result is different for each type of company. The methodology here proposed assumes a need to evaluate the competitive status of the management team and the manufacturing responsibility on it. At the same time, the presence of a consultant is not needed to implement the manufacturing strategy (a DIY – Do It Yourself – approach is used).

The methodology is based in the fact that each change (evolution) in the product or service that the company brings necessarily must be followed by a change in the manufacturing strategy (ADAMIDES; POMONISA, 2009) (co-evolutions) and, consequently, a proper design of the supply network is needed to grant the stability and flexibility of the system (adaptation). In this case the evolution force is the innovation process that pushes the company and its manufacturing strategy to adapt itself to the market's needs (the costumers need). The methodology offers at the same time an additional value to the stakeholders that let him to see and understand more clearly the change in the environment (local and global) where the company operates (lives).

### **3 HYPOTHESES**

- a) It is possible to improve the global strategy of the company using some metric that limits the field of feasible solutions adopted by the manufacturing strategy. This improvement can be defined as the ability of the company and its manufacturing system to change the manufactured product by an innovative one, and the process to satisfy the ever-shortest life cycle imposed by the customer needs.
- b) Using the metrics that limit the field of decisions of the manufacturing strategy, it's possible to isolate a collection of manufacturing policies that can improve the alignment of the manufacturing strategy with the corporate strategy. At the same time, a better performance in the supply chain that leads to a low-level inventory and a high

flexibility may be obtained. This process has been observed in some clusters of high competitive companies where the innovation is extensively applied. The methodology pushes all the companies in the supply chain to speak between it using the benchmarking approach.

## **4 RESEARCH WORK AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1 Summary**

To develop the method proposed in this work, a three phases approach (with several steps in each one) has been followed. In the first phase, extensive bibliography and articles' reading has been made. Additionally to this reading, a preliminary diagnostic has been made over 175 enterprises using the metrics obtained in the literature revision.

In this diagnostic, only 49 companies have said that they believe that the manufacturing strategy impacts in the innovation process. Thus, the research has worked only with this sub set of companies that have completed a preliminary survey. As a consequence of the small number in the sample, is not possible to obtain a high level of confidence. But this reduced set of sample is enough to work in the region where to research program operates. However, an approach to the use a discrete events simulation techniques (SIMUL 8, 2003) can be used to improve the confidence level. This simulation can be implemented in the third phase as a corrective factor. In this simulation is possible to find two copy of each company that uses the same manufacturing strategy. Unfortunately, that is not included in the text of this article to limit the extent and conspicuity of work.

By comparing many of the successful manufacturing strategies and best practices cited by the literature with the successful ones found in the set of companies, a list of key factors was isolated using PROMETHEE analysis method (MOREL; CAMARGO, 2009). This method uses as input the manufacturing strategy (alternatives) and the attitude that the company has faced to the innovation (criteria) to rank the manufacturing strategy. Finally, a ranking of "fittest" manufacturing strategy is obtained. At the same time a classification criteria is given to us by the method, to understand which group of company can be able to integrate a cluster, because they uses the same criteria, and how important is the innovation in his success (BRANS; MARESCHAL, 1986; MOREL; CAMARGO, 2009; GODET, 1990).

At this point strategy adopted by each company is exposed. Nevertheless, the non-relevant information, such as the customer soft selection criteria, best and worst partner in the supply chain and so forth, is stored in a knowledge base, mixed with relevant one. This is

made in this way because some irrelevant factors may become critical in the future or in subsequent scenarios. The final result of the first phase is displayed as a rating table where the manufacturing practices are sorted from the most to the least important. This is the result of the first phase, and is itself useful for the company. It will be used as feeds for the second phase.

The second phase explores the potential capacity of the existing manufacturing strategy to cover the gap presented between actual and desired operating level. To decide on the proper step to be taken, a mixed methodology of data mining and human decision is used. Initially, the methodology offers to the decision taker (a human being) a collection of sequential sets of actions to be taken that are compatible with the constraints that the company has (especially financial constraints). Each time that the methodology sees a confirmation form of the human actor, a weight factor is increased for the rule that brings this conclusion.

If the human actor rejects the step, then the weight factor is decreased for the reasoning process that arrives to this conclusion. Then, in a second enterprise that uses the methodology, the ranking of suggested step is affected by the experience increased by the previous interaction. Using this interaction the method is trying to work as a “substitute” of the consultant. As it will be explained later, a treatment supported by data mining techniques is used. To this research, a modified variation of the C 4.5 (ROSS, 2002) algorithm is used. This algorithm can build decision trees and isolate cluster of consistent step to cover the gap, but C 4.5 algorithm cannot use verbal judgments and only can use numerical judgments. So a modification had been made, as the reader can see over there. C 4.5 is a well-known basic tool used to learn the basis of data mining and can be used under GNU license.

Finally, in the third phase, using as entry the confirmed step form the phase 2, a suggested, a sequence of alignment of the production resources is constructed with special attention to Human Resources, Organizational Structure, Marketing, Technological Management, Process Management, Product and Material Technology and Financial Infrastructure. When the improvement is observed in the global strategy, the information is fed back to the knowledge base to improve the methodology of the Phase 2 and 3 (double feedback). This step is not totally developed at the current moment (draft in excel work sheet) and it has only a successful experience in the wine industry and textile cluster in the region of Mendoza, República Argentina. Then the reader can see only experimentation in such industry leaving the rest of the activities to a future work. Some limited successful experiences of implementation has been made in other industries, but the small number of

company is very low. Then precaution must be taken on the conclusion exposed at the end of this paper (limit the case only to wine and textile case is most safe).

## 4.2 The three phases methodology

The Figure 1 shows the steps that the methodology follows to adapt the manufacturing strategy to the customer needs and supply chain existing structure while try to innovate in the process.




Figure 1 – Resume map of the methodology

### 4.2.1 The First Phase

The proposed methodology has 3 phases. The first one is basically a diagnosis about the health care of the company among its manufacturing system and the capability to synchronize it with the supply chain (pulled by the client). As a result, we have at this point a list of desired actions to improve the innovation and adapt the company and the manufacturing strategy to the market's needs.

A collection of frameworks and methods from the literature have been analyzed. Amongst others, the reader can see Miller and Roth (1994) that think about this context in the same way as adopted by this work. Then, manufacturing strategy consists of two core elements: the manufacturing task, and the pattern of manufacturing choices.

First, we should know what the manufacturing function must accomplish (SKINNER, 1998). Skinner exposed this concept as “the competitive priorities” such as quality, cost, delivery or flexibility.

Second, we should be concerned with the major decisions on manufacturing structure and infrastructure that a company needs to achieve his goal, it's addressed by manufacturing

tasks and his possible weaknesses (HAYES; WHEELWRIGHT, 1984). But in the SME field this metrics can become less important because the customers demand other things linked to the product. The customer likes fast customer services or tailored solutions that the big companies cannot offer. This fact is usually observed in the software factory company or textile industry (in the sub set of company under study). However, this particularity of the SME is assumed as true for the rest of the company. Other metric that the customer appreciates in the SME is the innovation capacity. For the small company this metric may be the difference between life and death.

To develop this diagnostic first phase the emphasis must be put in this metric.

A deeper search in the literature can help us filter only methods and metrics that point to innovation as a key factor to the small enterprises. Supporting this idea, an approach is proposed, based on a work proposed by Brans and Mareschal (1986), Morel and Camargo (2009). A numerical assessment that qualifies the innovative attitude of the enterprise is adopted.

Table 1 – Verbal scale used in the phase 1

Attitude	Numeric Scale
Proactive	0.75 to 1
Preactive	0.50 to 0.75
Reactive	0.25 to 0.50
Pasive	0 to 0.25

The four words used to describe the innovation attitude of the enterprise are based in a recommendation used by Godet (1990) and also used by Morel and Camargo (2009) to make the performance evaluation of phase 1, a collection of manufacturing indicators is proposed and a comparison between the market and the supply chain where the company work is made to develop the PROMETHEE ranking (Table 2). To make the survey of this phase, a small form has been developed using Google Docs; and the company fill the form, can compare his performance with the mean of the region as a “Balanced Score Card” (KAPLAN; NORTON, 1996) (Table 2).

Table2 – Ranking obtained by the phase 1

Manufacturing metric	Rank (importance)	
Flexibility	I	} Six most important
Manufacturing Cost	II	
Logistics SCM	III	
Innovation	IV	
Quality	V	
Manufacturing Cost	VI	
...	...	} Lest important
...	...	
Inventory Level	XXXII	

Any company can fill in the “Google Form” to make the performance survey. Accordingly, the Supplier and the Customer (the nearest supply chain echelons) are compared in term of “Passive, Reactive, Preactive or Proactive” against the SME. This is made by a numerical judgment. Afterwards, the company is informed about the main competitor (if the information is available at the knowledge base). Finally, the company must choose the strategy adopted by each metric (maximize o minimize). If the company says that the preference is to maximize flexibility, it means that the company wants to be (at least) the near the best in the market. This does not necessarily mean that the company wants to be proactive in the flexibility criteria of the manufacturing process. In this example, all the weight factors of the PROMETHE method (BRANS; MARESCHAL, 1986) have been set to the same value, but using the third phase each individual weight can be moved to make successive improvement to the methodology.

This example show the result obtained for one of companies that works in the textile sector in the region. All the companies works with skins, combined with cotton or wool combined in a clothing, then the flexibility of the manufacturing the most important in the ranking.

#### **4.2.2 The Second Phase**

This phase uses as a start point the ranking build with PROMETHE and comparing it to the strengths and weaknesses of the actual production policy. As a result, we can obtain a list of possible ways to evolve (change) the manufacturing strategy to a high operating level that can satisfy the customer's needs and, at the same time, satisfy the constraints imposed by the company like capacity, budget, machinery, and so on. The actions to take are offered by the methodology using a knowledge base, but human decision is also needed as was previously informed, especially in the first instances of use when the knowledge base is still empty. Once the decision has been made, the third step establishes the competitive factor's importance, such as quality, cost, delivery on time, success index and flexibility and others like manufacturing technology, facilities and infrastructure permeability to incorporate new innovative product (SWAMIDASS; NEWELL, 1997). As result, a second ranking is made and compared with the company's real capacity to achieve these requirements (RHO; PARK; YU, 2001). One additional thing that can be obtained at this point is the direction that the changing factor must follow (for example is not absolutely necessary ever to minimize the operating cost to get a better performance.)



Implemented over Google technology API the performance can be observed. The Table 3 is converted in the Figure 2.

Table 3 – Company Performance compared against de main actors in the supply chain and in the market

	Logistics SCM	Manufacturing Cost	Quality	Flexibility	Innovation
<b>Max / Min</b>	Max	Min	Max	Max	Max
<b>Supplier</b>	0,77	0,92	0,22	0,52	0,24
<b>Our Company</b>	<b>0,75</b>	<b>0,76</b>	<b>0,22</b>	<b>0,55</b>	<b>0,85</b>
<b>Customer</b>	0,43	0,65	0,22	0,51	0,61
<b>Mean in the market</b>	0,65	0,78	0,25	0,53	0,72
<b>Best in the market</b>	0,78	0,55	0,35	0,55	0,9
<b>Main Competitor</b>	0,66	0,55	0,28	0,34	0,6

Note 1. Information showed to the user ( Table 3) of the Google Web form showing his enterprise performance. The user only must to load the row marked as “Our Company”




Figure 2 – Result offered to the company

## 5 VOLUMES/PRODUCTS CRITICAL ANALYSIS

In the phase 2 two critical analysis must be done. The first critical analysis that is made compares the actual and desired performances obtained from the first step. Basically, a comparison between (I) Logistics and SCM, (II) Manufacturing Cost, (III) Quality, (IV) Flexibility and (V) Innovation Capabilities is confronted with the usually adopted policies like:

- Manufacture one product in a super high volume
- Some products, high volume c) Few products, medium volume
- Many products, small volume
- Many products, individual units.

Then, a question must be answered thinking about the impact the change of actual manufacturing policy (among “a” to “e”) in the performance of the metric may have (I to VI). For example, if the first phase is showing that the company is at the “reactive level” in the quality metric, and according to the maximize criteria adopted to this metric. The PROMETHEE ranking says that this metric is a priority; we must see if the actual manufacturing policy, say for example, type “e” (that means craftsman work); can be moved to “d” (small lot or batch processing).

This process is implemented as a dialogue in a consultant help or Google Form where the decision taker is sequentially asked for each combination pairs of policy/metrics. The human response can take numeric values from 0 to 1. If there is a potential contribution when some policy is adopted, it contributes “1” (or does not contribute “0”) to move quality attitude from Passive to Reactive.

When the change in the manufacturing strategy is made and the new product delivered to the market, a final diagnosis is made to feedback data to the knowledge base and increase the reliability and viability of the methodology's actions suggested in step two.

## **6 PRODUCT FLOW/LAYOUT CRITICAL ANALYSIS**

The second critical analysis uses the same metrics provided by the PROMETHEE ranking, which are confronted against the followings policies:

- a) Functional Layout - Intermittent and varied flow
- b) Cell Layout – Regular Flow with patterns
- c) Linear Layout - (Equip or machine line) Continuous flow
- d) Linear Layout (Buildings line) Uninterrupted Streaming

Similar to the previous critical analysis, a confrontation between “a to d” policy is made against the “I to VI” metrics. Following the previous example, assume that the ranking is telling us that the “Manufacturing Cost” must be moved from reactive to proactive level, according to the best competitor in the market.

Then, the decision taker is asked by the impact to move the actual layout / product flow to a new one in the Manufacturing cost.

Although in both analyses questions are answered in values from 0 to 1, nothing prevents the study to provide trial answers involving numbers that represent units, money, time or inventory. It's necessary though that the responses are dimensionally homogeneous throughout the interrogation.

## 7 SELECTING THE PROPER MANUFACTURING (SOFT) TECHNOLOGY

It's possible to see the result of the dialogue between the human expert and the questions proposed by the critical analysis in Table 3.

Using the response of the expert, it can be possible to know which metric receives more impact than others when we change the two analyzed policies. It's also possible to determine a decreasing order of impact importance using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA), but more comprehensible results can be obtained using the J48 (WITTEN; FRANK, 2011) algorithm (a modification of classical C 4.5 classification tree algorithm – ROSS, 2002).

Here, (Table 4 and 5) we can see the result of the overall impact consequence. If the impact in the innovation capability metric is less or equal to 45% and the quality metric is less than 8% then the overall impact expected will be low (less than 20%). If quality is greater than 8% then the innovation capability is better than 1% and the overall impact will be Medium (70%), and so on.

Table 4 – Typical report observed in the textile cluster companies

Move from	Weight	0.5					Change	Overall performance
		Logistics SCM	Manufacturing Cost	Quality	Flexibility	Innovation		
Functional Layout Cellular Layout Lin. Layout (machine) Lin. Layout (buildings)	move to							
	Functional Layout	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No_change	0.5
	Cellular Layout	0.3	0.55	0.7	0.9	0.9	Change	0.75
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.7	0.45	0.76	0.6	0.3	Change	0.66
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.9	0.35	0.8	0.3	0.2	Change	0.51
	Functional Layout	0.6	0.8	0.85	0.6	0.6	Change	0.69
	Cellular Layout	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No_change	0.5
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.6	0.45	0.4	0.7	0.4	Change	0.51
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.45	0.35	0.3	0.4	0.1	Change	0.32
	Functional Layout	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	Change	0.7
	Cellular Layout	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.6	Change	0.68
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No_change	0.5
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.6	0.45	0.9	0.2	0.4	Change	0.51
	Functional Layout	0.9	0.2	0.5	0.9	0.9	Change	0.68
	Cellular Layout	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.6	Change	0.6
Lin. Layout (machine)	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.9	Change	0.52	
Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No_change	0.5	

Table 5 – Result of the tree classification technique J48 pruned tree for the overall impact in textile

J48 pruned tree for the overall impact in textile industry

```

The impact is ...
if Innovation <= 0.45
|           and Quality <= 0.08: Low (2.0)
|           and Quality > 0.08
|                                     | and Innovation <= 0.1: Low (3.0/1.0)
|                                     | and Innovation > 0.1: Med (7.0)
Innovation > 0.45
|           and Quality <= 0.54
|                                     | and Cost <= 0.34: Low (3.0/1.0)
|                                     | and Cost > 0.34: Med (5.0/1.0)
| Quality > 0.54: High (5.0)
  
```

The same reasoning can be interpreted using a tree graphic as shown in Figure 3.

Since C4.5 algorithm can handle numeric attributes, then a modification introduced by University of Waikato (2009) is made to the original algorithm to work with the judgment (Low, Medium and High), this translation is not necessarily linear. The use of human decision feedback can alter the linearity of this algorithm. This new variant is totally parametric in WAIKATO, (2009) and is called J48 algorithm and has been used in this work.




Figure 3 – Knowledge tree of the critical analysis for textile cluster

It is clear now that the knowledge rule constructed by J48 algorithm is showing that the Innovation Capabilities of the manufacturing process are the most important metric for this kind of enterprises.

Then follows that the Innovation followed by Quality and after the Manufacturing Cost are the key factors that impact in the global strategy and depend on the manufacturing strategy.

It is possible to continue to the moment when all the metrics are used, but in the initial condition, to operate the J48 algorithm, a confidence interval of 86% has been used. As a consequence, only with three metrics is possible to explain all the variability of this behavior. The final result is the same that can be obtained using de PCA method. At the bottom line it is possible to observe that 25 rectangles (result of 2+3+7+3+5+5) instances have been classified (figure 3). Only three instances show a degree of inexactitude that is identified as 3.0/0.1. That means that 3 instances are correctly classified with an 86% of confidence and 1 instance is not.

Using the same technique, it is possible to operate in the second critical analysis (flow / layout). In the table 6, a summary of results is showed. Additionally in this table two additional rows are showed. These rows remark where the manufacturing policy is impacted by the layout and the material flow. Then it is possible to observe “changed” or “not changed” and the overall impact in the performance (in a range of a numeric range from 0 to 1).

Table 6 – Typical response found in the form filled by wine industry

Move from	Weight	Weight					Change	Overall performance
		0.2	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.6		
Lin. Layout (machine)	move to	Logistics SCM	Manufacturing Cost	Quality	Flexibility	Innovation		
Functional Layout Cellular Layout Lin. Layout (machine) Lin. Layout (machine) Lin. Layout (machine)	Functional Layout	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	Change	0.7
	Cellular Layout	0.5	0.45	0.9	0.2	0.4	Change	0.51
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.9	0.2	0.5	0.9	0.9	Change	0.68
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.6	Change	0.6
	Functional Layout	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.9	Change	0.52
	Cellular Layout	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No change	0.5
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.3	0.95	0.7	0.9	0.9	Change	0.75
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.7	0.45	0.76	0.6	0.3	Change	0.56
	Functional Layout	0.9	0.35	0.8	0.3	0.2	Change	0.51
	Cellular Layout	0.5	0.8	0.8E	0.6	0.6	Change	0.69
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No_change	0.5
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.6	0.45	0.4	0.7	0.4	Change	0.51
	Functional Layout	0.45	0.35	0.3	0.4	0.1	Change	0.32
	Cellular Layout	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	Change	0.7
	Lin. Layout (machine)	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9	Change	0.57
	Lin. Layout (buildings)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No_change	0.5

Attention must be take on row at the top of Table 6 shows the weight factors that had been moved by the feedback process of the third phase.

Table 7 – A more detailed report of the wine industry classification tree J48 pruned tree for the overall impact in wine industry

J48 pruned tree for the overall impact in wine industry

The impact is ...

if Quality  $\leq$  0.3: then Low (3.0)

if Quality  $>$  0.3

| and Cost  $\leq$  0.7: then Med (10.0/1.0)

| and Cost  $>$  0.7: then High (3.0)

Correctly Classified Instances	<b>12</b>	<b>75,0000%</b>
Incorrectly Classified Instances	<b>4</b>	<b>25,0000%</b>
Kappa statistic		55,5600%
Mean absolute error		18,7500%
Root mean squared error		41,3000%
Relative absolute error		46,0162%
Root relative squared error		91,4913%

Confusion Matrix

Total Number of Instances

16 ( combining 4x4 policies)

a b c <-- classified as

2	0	1	a=Low
0	8	1	b=Med
0	2	2	c=High

Here (Table 7) we can see that when the impact of the layout and material flow is used to measure the impact in the five metrics, only the Quality and Cost are significant. With only two variables, it is possible to explain the behavior of the change in the policy established in the second critical analysis showed in the Product Flow/Layout Critical Analysis.

## 8 CROSS VALIDATION OF THE TWO CRITICAL ANALYSES

Using the two critical analyses, it is possible to establish the field of the most effective manufacturing strategy, comparing the layout / product volume policy according Swamidass and Newell (1997) and Miltenburg (2005).

To establish which manufacturing strategy must be used, it is necessary to find in table 3 the actual manufacturing policy (One Product/High Volume, Few product High Volume, Some Product /Med. Vol., Many Products/Small Vol., Many Products/Individual Units). Then we must choose the policy where we want to move. To make the decision, we must read the impact only in the column “Innovation Capability” and “Quality”, because they are the metrics that explain nearly all the behavior in textile cluster. The combination that gives us the best global performance must be chosen. If no difference in the instances is observed, then the Manufacturing Cost must be considered. These three metrics are the most significant for the textile industry in the region used by the survey.

As a result of the last work we can state that “Some Products/Med Vol” and “Many Products/Medium Volume” are the best manufacturing strategy for this case.

Repeating the last process with Table 7, it is possible to isolate the second manufacturing strategy that has high impact in the metric. Then, we suppose that for the textile cluster, the work leads us to the election of “Cellular Layout” and “Lineal Layout (machine oriented)”. Observing the place where the two policies interact, we can see that “Batch Flow”, “Operation Placed Line Flow” and “Lean JIT” manufacturing strategies are the best choice to obtain the desired operating level discovered in the first phase. The Figure 4 show operational fields for each manufacturing strategy. According to the type of layout and the products manufactured is possible to choose the manufacturing strategy.




Figure 4 – Operational fields for each manufacturing strategy

## 9 CONSTRUCTION OF THE THIRD PHASE

This phase use the data collected from the companies that have implemented the change in the manufacturing strategy and uses the information to decrease the uncertainty of the methodology. This is an ever converging process (HOPP, 2008). Each time that e constraint is violated the feedback process try to change the weight (Table 6). It is possible to make better recommendations using the new column in the data used in Table 7 to adapt the J48 algorithm (overall change column). The performance of each change in the decision rule reduces the covariance of the matrix constructed by the metrics of the first phase and the policies exposed in the second phase. In the same way, the use of the weight factor in Table 3 and 4 is always a convergent process (THUN, 2008). This process can offer a more simple way to improve the methodology if the sequence of actions and decisions follow the collaborative optimization technique suggested by Adida and DeMiguel (2010).

This feedback process continuously affects the J48 algorithm's result and so far, no evidence has been found that the process tends to diverge or oscillate.

This phase is not yet implemented as a web service, but it will be possible in the future to develop it. At this moment is implemented as a excel prototype.

Each time that a strategy manufacturing field is proposed this option must be checked to see if the constraints, that the company has, can be met. If they can't be met, then the weight used in the phase 2 must be changed using the action suggested by an expert or choose by a company that have similar weights. In a second instance, the compatibility with the supply chain must be tested. The company must usually ask itself whether its storage capacity, lead-time and production rate are able to work with the supplier and customer capacity. Also the own capacity and infrastructure must be checked

If the supply chain is not satisfied, then the weight used in the phase 2 must be increased. This modification is registered in the knowledge base.

## 10 RESULTS AND FINAL DISCUSSION

As was previously exposed, only 49 companies have followed the survey during 2009/2010.

From the total population than initially began the survey (175), 30 companies that have not followed the survey have found the bankruptcy. At this moment, we don't have more information about this part of the population. On other hand, from the set of 49 studied companies only 2 have gone bankrupt. In the sample set of 49 companies, it is possible to find many activities (Table 8).

Table 8 – Detailed lists of the company sectors that have participated in the survey, and final decision about the Hypotheses 1 and 2 expressed by the 49 companies

Sector	Cant.	Hypotheses 1	Hypotheses 2
Aeronautic	2		Verify
Agri food	3	Verify	Verify
Communication	2	Verify	
Building	6	Verify	
Materials Quality	1		Verify
Electromechanics	1	Verify	
Energy	1		Verify
Industrial Gases	3	Verify	
Logistics	2		Verify
Wood	2	Verify	
Metal Mechanics	7		Verify
Olive Oil	1	Verify	
Industrial Services	4		Verify
Textile	5	Verify	Verify
Wine	9	Verify	Verify

As a consequence of the reduced number of samples, the confidence level was not useful for the case where we have only one company (Material's quality, Electromechanical and Renewable Energy).



In olive oil, we have a special case because this is a single company but it has 7 different locations placed near the different cultivated (crop) zones. Then the confidence level can be improved in a new work that is being developed.

The initial confidence level as a means for the experiment is near 86% and could be improved if the process is repeated every year (especially if we use extensively the third phase).

As a consequence of the second phase, the initial hypotheses 3.1 have been proved.

To prove the second conjecture (3.2) a discrete event simulation model is proposed. To make the simulation, software Simul 8 has been used.

## REFERENCES

ADAMIDES, Emmanuel D.; POMONISA, N. The co-evolution of product, production and supply chain decisions, and the emergence of manufacturing strategy. **International Journal of Production Economics**, v. 121, n. 2, p. 301-312, 2009.

ADIDA, E.; DEMIGUEL V. Supply chain competition with multiple manufacturers and retailers. **Forthcoming in Operations Research**, 2010. Available in: <http://faculty.london.edu/avmiguel/papers.html>.

BRANS, Jean-Pierre; MARESCHAL, Bertrand. **How to Decide with PROMETHEE**. (GAIA Software) ULB and VUB Brussels Universities. Vrije Universiteit Brussel. 1986. Available in: <http://homepages.ulb.ac.be/~bmaresc/PromWeb.htm>.

DUNOD, E. **Gestion Industrielle**. Paris, France, 1997.

GODET, Michel. Integration of scenarios and strategic management: using relevant, consistent and likely scenarios. **Futures**, v. 22, n. 7, September, p. 730-739, 1990.

HAYES, R. H.; WHEELWRIGHT, S. C. **Restoring our competitive edge**: competing through manufacturing, Wiley, New York, 1984.

HOPP, Wallace; SPEARMAN, Mark. **Factory Physics**. 2nd Ed., 2008.

KAPLAN, R. S.; NORTON, D. P. 1996. Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. **Harvard business review**, v. 74, n. 1, p. 75-85, 1996.

MILLER J. C.; ROTH A. V. A taxonomy of manufacturing strategies. **Management Science**, v. 40, n. 3, p 285-304, 1994.

MILTENBURG, John - Manufacturing Strategy. 2nd edition, 2005.

MOREL, Nemery; CAMARGO, M.A metrics-based diagnosis tool for enhancing innovation capabilities in SMEs. **Conference for the Workshop on Multicriteria decision analysis for enhancing innovation capabilities in SMEs**, ERPI laboratory, 2-3 fevrier, Nancy France, 2009.

RHO, Boo-Ho; PARK, Kwangtae; YU, Yung-Mok. An international comparison of the election of manufacturing strategy implementation gap on business performance. **International Journal of Production Economics**, v. 70, p. 89-97, 2001.

**ROSS, Quinlan C 4.5 algorithm.** **Handbook** of data mining and knowledge discovery. En , ed. KLÖSGEN, Willi, ZYTKOW, Jan M., New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, Inc. p. 267-276, 2002. Available in: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=778212.778254>. And. Available in: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ross\\_Quinlan#C4.5](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ross_Quinlan#C4.5)

SIMUL 8. **Software, a simulation workbench to discrete event process.** Available in: <[www.simul8.com](http://www.simul8.com)> K Concannon, Visual8 Corp, 2003.

SKINER, Wickham. **Manufacturing, the missing link in corporate from Production and operations management** (Spanish version) - Ed. Wiley, 1969. 38p.

SKINNER, W. **Manufacturing in the corporate strategy.** Wiley, Reviwed Edition, New York, 1998.

SWAMIDASS, P.; NEWELL, W. Manufacturing strategy, environmental uncertainty, and performance: a path analytic model. **Management Science**, v. 33 (1987) p. 509-524, 1997.

THUN, Jörn-Henrik. Empirical analysis of manufacturing strategy implementation. **International Journal of Production Economics**, v. 113, n. 1, p. 370-382, 2008.

WAIKATO. University Weka Machine Learning Framework. HALL, Mark; FRANK Eibe, HOLMES, Geoffrey; PFAHRINGER Bernhard; REUTEMANN, Peter; WITTEN, Ian H. 2009. **The WEKA data mining software: an update.** SIGKDD Explor. Newsl. v. 11, n. 1 (noviembre): p. 10-18. doi:10.1145/1656274.1656278. Available in: <<http://www.cs.waikato.ac.nz/ml/weka>>.

WITTEN I. H.; FRANK, E. **Data mining: practical machine learning tools and techniques** (Second Edition), 2011.

Originais recebidos em: 27/09/11

Aceito para publicação em: 10/04/12