



## Why slow down? Factors affecting speed loss in process manufacturing

Trattner, Alexandria Lee; Hvam, Lars; Haug, Anders

*Published in:*  
International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology

*Link to article, DOI:*  
[10.1007/s00170-019-04559-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-019-04559-4)

*Publication date:*  
2020

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Trattner, A. L., Hvam, L., & Haug, A. (2020). Why slow down? Factors affecting speed loss in process manufacturing. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 106, 2021-2034.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-019-04559-4>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# **Why slow down? Factors affecting speed loss in process manufacturing**

Alexandria Trattner<sup>a\*</sup>, Lars Hvam<sup>a</sup> and Anders Haug<sup>b</sup>

*<sup>a</sup> Department of Management Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark*

*<sup>b</sup> Department of Entrepreneurship and Relationship Management, University of Southern Denmark, Kolding, Denmark*

*\*Corresponding author*

Alexandria Trattner\*  
Industrial PhD candidate  
Technical University of Denmark  
DTU Management Engineering  
Produktionstorvet  
Building 426, room 130D  
2800 Kongens Lyngby, Denmark  
[alexandriatrattner@gmail.com](mailto:alexandriatrattner@gmail.com)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-1115-4203

Lars Hvam  
Professor  
Technical University of Denmark  
DTU Management Engineering  
Produktionstorvet  
Building 426, room 051  
2800 Kongens Lyngby, Denmark  
[lahv@dtu.dk](mailto:lahv@dtu.dk)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-7617-2971

Anders Haug  
Associate Professor  
University of Southern Denmark  
Department of Entrepreneurship and Relationship Management  
Universitetsparken 1  
DK-6000 Kolding  
[adg@sam.sdu.dk](mailto:adg@sam.sdu.dk)  
ORCID: 0000-0001-6173-6925

## **Why slow down? Factors affecting speed loss in process manufacturing**

Loss of production speed is an unavoidable reality for process manufacturers. Reduced production speeds are shown to consume 9%–15% of available production capacity in various production contexts and create substantial costs for capital-intensive process industries. Among the least-examined of the six big efficiency losses measured within total product maintenance, speed loss presents significant opportunities for potential efficiency improvements in manufacturing companies. Based on the literature, this paper presents an framework of the factors related to speed loss, including three overall dimensions: technology factors, human factors, and product factors. Next, a case study of two production lines to investigate this framework and quantify the scale of speed loss for the factors identified in the case study. For quantification, generalised least squares regression is performed to study the relationship between each factor and speed loss. The analysis of the production data reveals that technology and human factors have the strongest correlations with speed losses in this industry and account for the most speed loss. This research can directly support operational improvement initiatives in practice by identifying the factors with the strongest relationships to speed loss, aiding practitioners to select the most relevant means to improve speed and identify appropriate overall equipment effectiveness targets.

Keywords: Speed Loss, Total Productive Maintenance, Overall Equipment Effectiveness, Productivity, Process Industry

### **Acknowledgements**

The researchers thank the Innovation Fund of Denmark for its sponsorship of this research.

## 1 Introduction

Speed loss is an expensive, technical reality for large-scale, complex production processes. Formally identified as a source of lost capacity by Nakajima [1] in the total productive maintenance (TPM) methodology, speed loss is any deviation from the designed production speed or throughput in a manufacturing context caused by rough running, equipment wear, tool wear and operator inefficiency, among other factors [2]. Running at reduced speed can silently reduce the capacity of production lines, reducing service levels in capacity-constrained situations and eroding efficiencies in situations of surplus capacity. Reduced production speeds are shown to consume 9%–15% of available capacity in cases in the literature [3, 4] and reduced capacity from reduced production speeds thought to be higher in the large, automated production and packaging systems characteristic of process manufacturing [3, 5]. For large-scale process lines with millions of euros of revenue, increasing speed efficiency in production by only 1% can give firms competitive cost advantages over other players in the market [6].

Capacity losses due to reduced speed, though, are often overlooked by management and are not prioritised due to a mindset seeing some speed loss as allowable and to the difficulty of eliminating speed loss [7, 8]. Factory management and maintenance departments tend to focus on the more pressing demands of large production stop times than the smaller, persistent losses from variations in run rate [3, 8]. Speed loss is also difficult to notice in production as familiarity with the process can hinder operators' ability to detect deviations in speed [8], and unambitious speed targets keep factories from achieving their maximum potential speed.

Many companies have not been able to calculate the precise magnitude of speed loss due to poor data registration [3, 4, 9]. Difficulties in data collection partly stem from the chronic nature of speed loss as a production disturbance. Unlike sporadic disturbances easily

recognisable as large deviations from the normal state, chronic disturbances are usually small, numerous, hidden and complicated, have many concurrent causes and are often regarded as normal [10].

Considering the chronic nature of speed loss and the difficulties addressing its causes, the operations management and TPM literature lacks solutions specifically addressing speed loss [8]. Furthermore, the TPM literature includes limited quantification of speed loss and even less work guiding the identification of factors and quantifying factors' relative effects, particularly for process industry manufacturers (e.g. producers of food, oil, gas, chemical, metals, and commodity materials). Lastly, there is no discussion on the possibility of minimum expected speed losses for different operations based on the process technology, process variability and other factors unique to individual production settings. This information could aid operations managers in driving improvement initiatives, helping them discern potential speed improvements that could be realised through standardisation, capital expenditures and technological advancements.

This article contributes to the TPM and operations management literature with a framework of speed loss factors and a study examining speed loss figures for two process lines, a measure often unquantified in overall equipment effectiveness (OEE) studies due to the difficulty of data collection. Additionally, the study examines the mechanical underpinnings of speed loss on process manufacturing equipment, the factors that may impact this speed loss and the relative effects of each identified factor. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, this study presents the first comprehensive examination of possible factors leading to speed loss and the first application of regression analysis to quantify speed loss related to each factor in a case of two production lines.

The research question used to guide this investigation of speed loss is: *How do different factors affect speed loss on production lines?*

The study is structured as follows. First, a review of the literature discussing OEE, speed loss and factors related to speed loss is presented. On this basis, a framework of speed loss factors is constructed. Next, a case study of two process lines is presented and analysed through a mixed-methods research design. The factors identified in the case study are presented and used to build a generalised least squares (GLS) regression model, which is interpreted and discussed. Strong evidence is found of associations of speed loss with (1) technological factors and (2) human factors related to management decisions. Finally, conclusions are drawn, and avenues for future work are presented.

## **2 Literature review**

### ***2.1 Speed loss and overall equipment effectiveness***

The use of speed loss as an operational performance measure has its roots in TPM, a methodology to maintain and improve equipment performance in manufacturing organisations developed by Nakajima [1]. The TPM methodology focuses on three main areas: maximisation of equipment effectiveness, operators' autonomous maintenance of equipment and the use of small group activities [5, 11]. OEE is defined as a measure of 'the ability to run equipment without failure, at the designed speed and with zero defects' [12] and is primarily used to prioritise efficiency improvements in manufacturing [7].

To maximise equipment effectiveness, Nakajima [1] defines six big losses in OEE that should be quantified and reduced. The six big losses are subdivided into three categories as follows:

#### *Availability losses (A)*

1. Equipment breakdown, causing reduced productivity or waste in defective products
2. Setup and adjustment losses

*Performance losses (P)*

3. Idling and minor stops due to interruptions or temporary malfunction
4. Speed loss from reduced run rates, measured as the difference between the equipment's designed speed and operating speed

*Quality losses (Q)*

5. Defects and rework
6. Start-up losses occurring in an early stage of production

OEE is calculated as shown in equations 1–4 based on the method proposed by Nakajima [1]. Equation 3 for performance efficiency is written in an expanded form to reveal the two sub-calculations: (1) the ratio of production speeds; and (2) the calculation of small stops' impacts [11, 13]. The ratio of production speeds can be expressed as speed efficiency (equation 5), whose complement is speed loss (equation 6).

$$AE = \frac{\text{Total time} - \text{Unplanned downtime}}{\text{Total time}} \quad (1)$$

$$PE = \frac{\text{Ideal cycle time}}{\text{Actual cycle time}} \times \frac{\text{Actual cycle time} \times \text{Output}}{\text{Operating time}} \quad (2)$$

$$QE = \frac{\text{Output} - \text{Quality defects}}{\text{Output}} \quad (3)$$

$$OEE = AE \times PE \times QE \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Speed efficiency} = \frac{\text{Ideal cycle time}}{\text{Actual cycle time}} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Speed loss} = 1 - \frac{\text{Ideal cycle time}}{\text{Actual cycle time}} \quad (6)$$

where,

*Total time*                      Operational time of equipment, excluding planned stops for holidays, maintenance and lack of orders

<i>Unplanned downtime</i>	Time when equipment is scheduled for production but is unable to produce
<i>Ideal cycle time</i>	Average theoretical processing rate of equipment for a given product mix
<i>Actual cycle time</i>	Weighted average processing rate for equipment with a given product mix
<i>Output</i>	Gross output of material produced by the equipment
<i>Quality defects</i>	Material rejected for not passing quality inspections

Nakajima [1] defines world-class performance in the OEE subcategories as availability efficiency (AE) of more than 90%, performance efficiency (PE) of more than 95% and quality efficiency (QE) of more than 99%, with the three measures multiplied to a world-class OEE of 84%. However, good OEE performance is argued to be industry-specific as OEE is influenced by external factors, such as material handling systems and inventory buffers [9, 13, 14]. For example, in a study of 23 companies, food and beverage companies are found to have a higher median OEE (74%) than other types of companies, while automated discrete production companies have the lowest OEE (59%) [9].

## ***2.2 Previous speed loss studies***

Whereas the magnitude of lost PE is known to be large, the magnitude of speed loss (and its complement, speed efficiency) is not directly calculated in many papers. Table I displays the PE of the case studies identified in the literature, with speed efficiency calculated in only two of the eight articles. PE varies from 54% to 100% across the studied cases, with speed loss of 85% and 91% in the two cases identified.

*Table I Performance loss in OEE case studies detailing performance efficiency*

<b>Author</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Performance efficiency</b>	<b>Speed efficiency</b>
Ahmad, Hossen and Ali [15]	Yarn producer, single process	80%–89%	85%–91%
Dal, Tugwell and Greatbanks [11]	Airbag producer, weaving department	85%	N/A
Hedman, Subramaniyan and Almström [9]	23 companies (seven food/beverage plants, nine mechanical workshops, four discrete automated plants, three polymeric plants)	100% for 80% of companies	N/A
Jonsson and Lesshammar [7]	Construction vehicle producer, metal profiles manufacturer	85%–94%	N/A
Ljungberg [3]	23 machinery systems	68%	91%
Morales Méndez and Rodríguez [16]	Auto-parts machining line	84%	N/A
Ohunakin and Leramo [17]	Beverage bottling facility	54%–65%	N/A
Tsarouhas [2]	Pizza production line	80%–97%	N/A
Tsarouhas [18]	Italian cheese production line	87%	N/A

### ***2.3 Factors related to speed loss***

Researchers and practitioners cite several reasons for reduced operating speed on manufacturing lines, including factors related to process technology, factory management, materials and quality, among other aspects (see Table II). By design, the characteristics of process technology influence production speed. Mechanical and electrical issues, old age and high wear can cause machines to run below the ideal cycle time while operating [1, 2].

Unplanned maintenance stops are also known to affect speed loss as time is needed to bring production back to normal speed after unplanned stops [6]. While physical limitations are considered in determining the ideal cycle times for machines in the engineering stage, machinery may operate at less than ideal capacity due to further technological constraints (e.g. downstream bottlenecks) and environmental limitations placed on factories [19].

Depending on the technology, there might also be a natural level of variation in the speeds of machines [20].

*Table II Publications discussing factors affecting loss of production speed in manufacturing contexts*

<b>Speed loss factors</b>	<b>Publications discussing factors</b>
Machine reliability and production stops	[2, 6, 17, 21]
Equipment age and wear	[1, 8]
Technological and environmental limitations	[11, 19, 22]
Natural process variation	[20]
Queue capacity for work in process	[23]
Operator training and inefficiency	[2, 8, 23, 24]
Improper maintenance	[1, 6, 8]
Measurement error	[11, 19, 25]
Ideal cycle time set too low	[1, 3, 7]
Production scheduling	[20, 22, 23, 26]
Capacity utilisation	[3, 21]
Material availability and quality	[8, 11, 19, 27]
Raw material mix	[27]
Quality (finished goods)	[1, 2, 28]
Product variety	[1, 21–23, 26]

Differences in crew, work standards, performance targets and the management of operators are also known sources of variations in production speed [24] and are directly controllable by factory management. Beyond production, a lack of standard operating procedures for maintenance activities can contribute to technical issues, such as equipment malfunction, forcing operators to reduce production speed [1]. A further factor within management’s discretion is the determination of ideal cycle times and speeds for equipment if no ideal cycle times are given in the equipment specifications. In industrial applications of OEE, speed loss is found to be negative in certain instances, implying that ideal speeds are often set too low for certain processes [3].

Production scheduling and sequencing, often under the influence of factory management, are shown to be significant factors affecting speed variations in production [20, 26]. When producing multiple product variants with different ideal speeds and sequence-

dependent setup times, it is critical that the products be sequenced to avoid large shifts in production speed and long stops for setup [20].

Speed on production lines may also be reduced to prevent products from being rejected in quality inspections [1]. Nurani and Akella [28] identify an inverted U-shaped relationship between production speed and profit accrual rate: at very high levels of speed, profits decrease due to higher quality-related expenses (e.g. scrap costs and opportunity costs of lost sales). Determining the maximum production speed that does not reduce product quality, therefore, is of interest when managing speed loss.

Other factors, such as capacity utilisation and product variety, are also shown to be related to the loss of production speed or throughput. The number of product variants sold by firms is shown to grow as firms globalise, expand markets and expand capacity [21, 22]. If not properly managed, product variety can decrease production speeds as low-volume products increase the number of changeovers and destabilise process settings [1, 21, 22, 26]. Similarly, the utilisation of machines determines the degree to which they can operate at ideal speed. Capacity-constrained machines are commonly pressed to operate closer to the ideal production speed than machines with excess capacity, as in the case of an OEE study by Ljungberg [3].

#### ***2.4 Methods for quantifying the effects of speed loss factors***

Improvement methodologies in the lean and TPM toolboxes are used to address speed loss in the literature [1, 8], but the methodologies are few and have limited explanatory and statistical power. First, Nakajima [1] proposes a four-step method to set progressively higher speed targets and reduce speed loss:

1. Achieve the standard speed for each product.
2. Increase the standard speed for each product.
3. Achieve the designed speed.

#### 4. Surpass the designed speed.

This approach is designed to expose hidden problems, such as inadequate maintenance, inappropriate setup and tuning and improper testing in the equipment design phase, among others [1]. However, the method offers little guidance on how to isolate and quantify the speed loss arising from specific factors.

Second, Benjamin et al. [8] take an explanatory approach applying the 5 Whys technique to assess speed loss at a metal barrel manufacturer. Benjamin et al. [8] apply Pareto analysis to speed loss issues and perform the 5 Whys method with the most commonly occurring issues to identify and address the cause. While identifying reduction in speed loss equalling 32.000 USD at the case company [8], the approach gives only rudimentary consideration to speed loss from different factors, examining each factor in isolation instead of assessing the factors' collective, incremental impact on speed loss. Furthermore, the 5 Whys approach is not ideal for assessing process manufacturing systems, which have many interacting sources of speed variation and many parameters to consider when increasing speed.


### **3 A framework of speed loss factors**

Fifteen speed loss factors are identified in the literature review (Table II), which may be organised into 10 categories, placed under three overall speed loss dimensions: (1) technology factors, (2) human factors, and (3) product factors. This is shown in Table III. Here, it should be noted that, management and operator factors are placed under a common dimension (human factors), since the line between such factors in some contexts is blurry. It should also be noted that the factors “equipment wear”, “improper maintenance” and “equipment age” are only indirect causes, in the sense that they result in unreliable or obsolete machines, which are the direct causes of speed loss.

Table III Dimensions and categories of speed loss contributors

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Factors identified in the literature</b>
Technology	Technology reliability	Machine reliability Production stops Equipment wear Improper maintenance
	Technology limitations	Technological limitations Equipment age Queue capacity for work in process
	Environmental limitations	Environmental limitations
Human	Operator inefficiency	Operator training Operator inefficiency
	Measurement error	Measurement error
	Planning issues	Production scheduling Ideal cycle time set too low Capacity utilisation
Product	Material availability	Material availability
	Material quality	Material quality Natural process variation Raw material mix
	Product variety	Product variety
	Product quality	Quality (finished goods)

Figure 1 illustrates how issues related to these three these dimensions may contribute to speed loss. As seen in the figure, each of the three dimensions affects the two other dimensions. Specifically, technology factors, such as unreliable machines, may negatively affect planning and operation processes, as well as product quality; human factors, such as poor planning decisions, may imply that the technology available is unsuited for the current product, thus, negatively affecting product quality; and product factors, such as poor material quality, may negatively affect operation processes and the machine efficiency. In other words, the factors within the three dimensions can indirectly affect each other.



*Fig 1 Speed loss factors*

#### **4 Methodology**


A case study approach was employed to investigate the developed framework. The case study method is appropriate for studies with unclear boundaries between the phenomenon and the context [29]. This research is aimed at identifying factors related to speed loss in a process manufacturing firm and quantifying their relationship, so the case study approach is appropriate. In the following sections, the case company is introduced, and the thematic and quantitative analysis approaches are detailed.

##### ***4.1 Research context***

The case company selected for analysis is a building insulation production facility in Europe, hereafter referred to as InsCo. InsCo is selected as it utilises a high-volume, continuous-flow process representative of the process industry. The factory consists of two production lines with similar layouts and product mixes. Both lines operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with a four-crew, rotating work schedule. The managers and personnel operating both

lines are well acquainted with lean tools and recently implemented OEE to measure production losses on the two lines. The lines have not experienced any major changes in capacity utilisation, production technology or product mix in the past five years, making them favourable for analysis. Both lines are assessed in this study and are referred to as L1 and L2 throughout the paper.

The insulation production process (see Figure II) consists of a hot end where a combination of raw materials is melted and spun into fibres. The fibres are combined with recycled fibres from downstream waste, creating the primary material, which is compressed into a final form before being cured, cooled, cut and packed per product specifications. The continuous, circular nature of InsCo’s production process is characteristic of process manufacturing [19].



*Fig II Insulation production process*

Among the measures of speed or throughput on the production line, the primary material throughput (i.e. primary speed) is used to measure speed in this study. Primary speed is selected as it is a directly controllable speed upstream in the process, and live data on primary speed are immediately relayed to operators through process control visuals.

Downstream speed measures are not favourable for analysis as they are subject to many additional sources of variation, including manual data registration. Primary speed can be adjusted by melting and spinning more fibres or adding more recycled fibres. Increasing the output of the spinning process must be done gradually given the technological limitations and


environmental constraints. The recycled material content can be increased almost instantaneously if recycled fibres are present in the system.

Each production batch represents a single product variant, which is a unique combination of mechanical and thermal properties, dimensions and packaging materials. Changes between batches of different products can occur during production stops and runtime with non-conforming products rejected from the line as waste. Primary speed thus encompasses production of non-conforming material rejected downstream.


In the spring of 2016, InsCo implemented a speed standardisation programme. Lacking official, ideal cycle times for product variants, factory management set maximum speed targets for the primary speed for each product based on performance in the previous year. The targets are incorporated into a visual control tool: a digital speedometer (see Figure III), indicating whether the operators are on target (green), slightly under target (yellow) or far under target (red). If the target primary speed is not achieved for a given production batch, the operators enter an explanation into a free text field in the manufacturing execution system (MES).

Examining the target primary speed compared to the actual primary speed reveals that L1 and L2 often exceed the speed targets set by management (see, e.g., Figure IV), creating negative speed loss. The highest demonstrated, sustainable primary speed for each product is used as the ideal speed to avoid negative speed loss in the quantitative study [19]. To determine the highest demonstrated, sustainable primary speed, the researchers assess batches within the technical capabilities of the processes demonstrated in the period analysed and sustainable for a batch of greater duration than 30 minutes. If no feasible primary speed is found for a product in the period analysed, the factory target primary speed is used.

Both the qualitative and quantitative analyses are performed using three months of data at InsCo from 1 November 2017 to 31 January 2018, a stable period of operations at the company when the use of the speed tool was well established in the organisation.



*Fig III Speedometer used to monitor primary speed-target status at InsCo (conceptual)*



*Fig IV Primary speed for one day of production on L1 showing overachievement of factory speed targets and underachievement of maximum sustainable primary speed targets (y-axis labels removed to maintain confidentiality)*

## ***4.2 Data collection***

Data on suspected causes of speed loss from the operators' perspective were extracted at the batch level from the MES, translated from the local language into English using Google Translate software and coded by the researchers [30]. Translated meanings unclear to the researchers were verified with the factory manager. A preliminary set of speed loss causes was presented to the factory manager, whose feedback was incorporated to consolidate the factors. Three 1-hour, semi-structured interviews with the factory manager were held to understand the production context, scope the analysis and report the results. These discussions focused on the format of the speed variance tool, structure of the data, use of the tool and factors likely to affect speed loss at the factory.

Data for the speed loss factors from the thematic analysis were compiled from various sources at the case company to inform the quantitative study. Sensor data on the primary speed and recycled material speed were collected from the production data warehouse and pre-processed in the statistical software program R, using a local regression to create smooth curves and eliminate signal noise while fitting the predominant trends in the process variables. The data were cleaned of production stop times (primary speed of 0 tons per hour) to assess only equipment uptime. Outliers for the primary speed, classified using 1.5 times the interquartile range of the signal, were removed from the dataset. Sensor data from every 30 minutes of production time were analysed to capture the dynamic nature of production activities not visible at higher levels of aggregation [20].

Batch-level data containing the coded operator data, primary speed targets, and downtime information were also extracted and mapped to the sensor data. The data included a total of 1,231 production batches for 600 products from L1 and 626 batches of 300 products from L2. Additional data used in the analysis were the crew schedule and maintenance data from Excel spreadsheets at the factory.

### ***4.3 Data analysis***

First, a rigorous qualitative, thematic analysis of written operator input is performed to identify possible factors influencing speed reductions at the case company. This is followed by regression analysis of production data to quantify the magnitude of the relationship of speed loss with each identified factor. This mixed-methods approach is classified as an exploratory sequential mixed-methods approach, in which qualitative analysis feeds the collection and analysis of quantitative data from which conclusions are drawn [31].

The maximum likelihood estimates of regression coefficients for the combined factors were calculated using GLS regression using the nlme package in R [32, 33]. Regression analysis is proven to be an appropriate method for analysing changes in throughput and costs in chemical and glass producers [20, 26]. General linear regression is specifically applicable to regressing on time-series data due to serial correlations and heteroskedasticity in error terms [34].

In the following discussion of the findings, statistically significant factors are evaluated from a mechanical perspective to determine if the correlations evaluated in the regression analysis are causal. Although a significant correlation coefficient in a regression cannot be taken as direct evidence of a causal relationship between the factors and speed loss [34], the combination of a significant correlation coefficient and a mechanical explanation of a relationship can paint a stronger picture of causality.

## **5 Findings**

### ***5.1 Current speed loss at InsCo***

Before addressing the factors affecting speed loss, first, the efficiency of the two production lines is calculated. The OEE for L1 and L2 for the period studied are assessed using the method described by Nakajima [1], and the results are summarised in Table III. The data

registration practices at the firm allow recording all production stops, small and large, as unplanned downtime, moving the effect of small stops from the PE measure to the AE measure. Consequently, PE measures speed loss in isolation.

Table III shows that QE is the lowest of the OEE sub-measures at InsCo. The second lowest sub-measure is PE in the form of lost speed efficiency, equating to 9%–10% of lost capacity at InsCo. AE for both lines is higher than 90% and reaches the world-class standard within the TPM literature [1].

*Table III Overall equipment effectiveness for two lines, L1 and L2, at InsCo, November 2017–January 2018*

<b>OEE Measure</b>	<b>L1</b>	<b>L2</b>
Availability efficiency (%)	96%	96%
Performance efficiency (%)	90%	91%
Quality efficiency (%)	86%	90%
OEE (%)	74%	79%

### ***5.2 Identifying factors related to speed loss***

Nine main groups of speed loss factors were identified through a thematic review of operator input to the MES through the speed tool at InsCo. These can be distributed across the three categories of the proposed framework (Figure I). In the following, the relationships to the factors of the framework are stated in parentheses after the identified speed loss factors from the case. The main technology factors include:

- 1) Furnace limits (Technology limitations and environmental limitations)
- 2) By-product drain (Technological limitations)
- 3) Technical issues (Technology reliability)
- 4) Production stop (Technology reliability )

The main human factors include:

- 5) Planning (Planning issues)
- 6) Start-up of the production line (Operator inefficiency)

The main product factors:

- 7) Quality issues (Product quality)
- 8) Raw materials issues (Material availability and quality)
- 9) No recycling (Material availability and quality)

Figure V shows the frequency distribution of the cited causes of speed loss on the two lines over the three-month period. The analysis is restricted to runs when InsCo's speed loss target is not achieved. More than one speed loss cause may be cited for a single batch. The most frequently cited causes of speed loss are furnace limitations (e.g. approaching a furnace's maximum capacity and approaching environmental limits on emissions) and draining of by-products created during melting from the furnace. Also cited are reduced speeds due to production planning (e.g. short run duration and large shifts between product speeds), production stops, raw material issues, lack of recycling material, start-up of the line, technical issues with equipment and quality issues experienced at the end of the line.

Interview data from factory management and process experts enable identifying additional possible causes of speed loss, including crew differences, product variety, factory learning curve, recycled content and natural process variation. These variables and those in Figure IV are aggregated, and the impact on speed loss is assessed in the following section.




Fig V Distribution of operator-suspected causes of speed loss

### 5.3 Quantifying the relationships between the factors and speed loss

A GLS regression model is constructed using the aggregated set of variables to reveal the potential causal relationships between the main factors of speed loss at InsCo. Equation 7 shows the dependent variable measured as the percentage speed loss based on the defined target speed for each product. Speed loss is expressed in percentage form to normalise the differing primary speed targets for the various products.

$$SPLOSS_t = (Target_t - Actual_t) / Target_t \times 100 \quad (7)$$

The independent variables (defined in Table IV) are assessed for multicollinearity using Pearson’s correlation coefficients (for the results, see appendices I and II for L1 and L2, respectively). Correlations close to 0.5 are identified among the crew variables for both L1 and L2. The correlation coefficients for the crew variables do not significantly exceed 0.5, so the crew variables are included in other stages of the modelling. The two production lines are assessed individually as it is hypothesised that the significance of different factors varies across the two lines.

Table IV Independent variable definitions

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Description</i>
<i>RUNTIME</i>	Hours of uptime for the current batch, mean centred to 0
<i>PREVSP</i>	Percentage change in the target speed of the current batch and the target speed of the previous batch, mean centred to 0
<i>NEXTSP</i>	Percentage change in the target speed of the current batch and the target speed of the following batch, mean centred to 0
<i>FURN</i>	1 if the current batch has a furnace limitation cited by the operators; 0 otherwise
<i>TECH</i>	1 if the current batch has a technical issue cited by the operators; 0 otherwise
<i>PRSTOP</i>	1 if the current batch has a production stop per the MES data; 0 otherwise
<i>QUAL</i>	1 if the current batch has a quality issue cited by the operators; 0 otherwise
<i>RECYC</i>	Recycling fibres in tons per hour from smoothened sensor data, mean centred to 0 and scaled using standard deviation.
<i>RAWMAT</i>	Tons of raw material per hour added to the melting process from smoothened sensor data, mean centred to 0 and scaled using standard deviations
<i>BYPROD</i>	1 if a by-product is drained from the furnace during run time; 0 otherwise
<i>MATER</i>	1 if the current batch has a material issue cited by the operators; 0 otherwise
<i>LEARN</i>	A continuous variable measuring the number of days since 1 November 2017, the beginning of the analysis period
<i>CREW1</i>	1 if the current batch is produced by the crew 1; 0 otherwise
<i>CREW2</i>	1 if the current batch is produced by the crew 2; 0 otherwise
<i>CREW3</i>	1 if the current batch is produced by the crew 3; 0 otherwise

A parsimonious array of 15 variables is assessed based on the qualitative speed loss causes cited by the operators and the feedback from management given in the interviews.

Exploratory, univariate analysis reveals that all fifteen variables are suitable for modelling with a linear relationship to percentage speed loss. There are no suspected interaction effects among the variables, so variable interactions are omitted from the model. The final model tested using GLS regression is shown in equation 8. Crew four is selected randomly as the base crew to which the other crews are compared in the model, so the crew four variable is excluded from equation 7.

$$SPLOSS_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 RUNTIME_t + \beta_2 NEXTSP_t + \beta_3 PREVSP_t + \beta_4 FURN_t + \beta_5 TECH_t + \beta_6 PRSTOP_t + \beta_7 QUAL_t + \beta_8 BYPROD_t + \beta_9 MATER_t + \beta_{10} LEARN_t \quad (8)$$

$$+ \beta_{11}RECYC_t + \beta_{12}RAWMAT_t + \beta_{13}CREW1_t + \beta_{14}CREW2_t + \beta_{15}CREW3_t + \varepsilon_t$$

The GLS regression results are shown in Table 5 for L1 and L2. For both models, the intercept is positive and significant, but the intercept is not shown for confidentiality. The variables that have statistically significant correlations with speed loss include the learning curve, select crew variables, batch runtime, percentage change in target speed between consecutive batches, limitations of the melting furnace and draining of by-products from the furnace. Quality issues with finished goods are significant only in the L1 model, while technical issues are significant in the L2 model.

The researchers expect higher *RUNTIME* to be associated with decreased speed loss, but the results show this is true only for L2. In L1, longer run times are related with increased speed loss. One potential underlying cause is that average runtimes in L1 are half of L2. For both models, the runtime coefficient is not large and explains no more than 1%–2% of the change in speed loss based on typical run times at InsCo.

Both variables measuring the percentage change in speed targets for subsequent batches are significant. During operation, operators are known to anticipate higher speed later in the schedule and pre-emptively increase speed to prepare for the coming fast product. Evidence for this behaviour can be seen in the negative coefficient for *NEXTSP*, which reveals that if the next product to be produced on L1 or L2 has a higher primary speed target than the current product being processed, speed loss for the current product decreases. When assessing the effect of the previous product, the positive coefficient for *PREVSP* shows that if the previous product has a lower primary speed target than the current product being processed, speed loss for the current product increases (i.e. the line runs slower). In other words, it is preferable to schedule a product with high speed loss either after a faster product or before a faster product to avoid lost speed.

Table V Maximum likelihood estimates for the relationships between the process variables and the percentage speed loss on the two lines, L1 and L2, using GLS regression

Factor	L1				L2			
	Estimate	Std. Error	T value	P value	Estimate	Std. Error	T value	P value
(Intercept) <sup>a</sup>	-	0.204	38.563	<0.001***	-	0.207	38.414	<0.001***
RUNTIME	0.047	0.018	2.676	0.008**	-0.153	0.028	-5.381	<0.001***
NEXTSP	-0.177	0.011	-16.091	<0.001***	-0.100	0.011	-9.282	<0.001***
PREVSP	0.174	0.012	14.714	<0.001***	0.151	0.012	12.759	<0.001***
FURN	2.684	0.208	12.934	<0.001***	2.154	0.186	11.551	<0.001***
TECH	0.005	0.219	0.022	0.983	0.934	0.242	3.868	<0.001***
PRSTOP	-0.232	0.430	-0.539	0.590	0.039	0.196	0.197	0.844
QUAL	0.431	0.238	1.814	0.070**	0.566	0.297	1.906	0.057.
RECYC	-2.444	0.088	-27.705	<0.001***	-1.653	0.101	-16.325	<0.001***
RAWMAT	-0.694	0.083	-8.354	<0.001***	-1.294	0.092	-14.016	<0.001***
BYPROD	3.833	0.424	9.043	<0.001***	7.250	0.461	15.742	<0.001***
MATER	0.360	0.435	0.827	0.408	0.037	0.530	0.070	0.944
LEARN	-0.028	0.003	-9.142	<0.001***	-0.020	0.003	-6.290	<0.001***
CREW1	0.598	0.236	2.529	0.012*	0.061	0.256	0.238	0.812
CREW2	1.179	0.236	5.000	<0.001***	0.573	0.261	2.192	0.028*
CREW3	1.639	0.241	6.799	<0.001***	0.412	0.251	1.642	0.101
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = 0.665					Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> = 0.483			
Res. st. error = 4.369, degrees of freedom = 2965					Res. st. error = 4.853; degrees of freedom = 3020			
Significance codes: (.) p < 0.1, (*) p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001								

<sup>a</sup> Intercept estimates excluded for confidentiality

The batch runtime and the change in target speed between batches are largely determined by the production planning department. Although planners optimise the batch size and production sequence using experience-based heuristics, the production plan is still subject to last-minute schedule changes, which can cause large changes in speed. Primary speed can be adjusted quite quickly using recycled material, but if recycled material is not present, or if the maximum amount of recycled material for a product is already administered, then the furnace output must be adjusted at a very slow rate, which can cause a slower line speed at the beginning of a batch.

The quality of the finished product at the end of the line is also a statistically significant factor related to increased speed loss on L1. Quality issues are cited by the operators as a cause for decreased speed performance in 14% of all runtime on L1 and 11% of all runtime on L2. In case of poor quality, operators controlling primary speed receive feedback from the testing and inspection department on whether products' physical and aesthetics specifications are met. In some cases, corrective action is taken to reduce the line speed. Speed loss due to poor quality is estimated in 0.4% for the L1 model. The quality variable in the L2 model has a similar magnitude and direction as the L1 model, with a positive coefficient, but is only slightly statistically significant when considering the other variables.

Technical issues on the line (e.g. machine breakdown and reduced capacity) are significantly related to a 1% increase in speed loss only in the L2 model. The reason for the lack of significance of *TECH* in L1 is interesting as there are no noticeable differences in runtime affected by technical issues on L1 and L2. Further context was provided from the factory manager who explained in an interview that L2 suffered from higher severity mechanical failures in the period studied than L1, being a possible explanation for the significance of *TECH* on L2 and not L1.

The variables with the most negative impact on speed loss (positive coefficients) are by-product drain and furnace limitations. Draining by-products from the furnace is an obligatory task operators perform periodically to fulfil product specifications and factory safety procedures. By-products are drained from the furnace during approximately 4% of all runtime on both L1 and L2 in the period analysed. The impact of by-product draining is more drastic on L2, related to a 7% speed loss on but a 4% capacity loss on L1. Similarly, furnace limitations are related to an additional 2%–3% speed loss on L1 and L2 based on the model coefficients. This loss is sizeable considering that operators cite furnace limits for 25% and 47% of the runtime on L1 and L2, respectively. Multiplying the coefficients by the frequency of occurrence of *FURN* in the data, the variable *FURN* alone is related to an average 0.7% speed loss on L1 and 1% speed loss on L2.

Raw materials and recycling have negative, statistically significant coefficients in both models, indicating that additional flow of material from upstream allows operators to better achieve speed targets. A lack of recycling has dramatic effects on the speed loss on the production line and is cited as a cause of speed loss in 5% of batches on L1.

The variables for crews 1–3 indicate statistically significant differences from the performance of the control crew (crew 4) on both lines. The positive coefficients for all crew variables in both models suggest that crew 4 performs with the lowest speed loss on both lines.

An additional variable with a negative, significant regression coefficient in both models is the learning curve variable. The results show that for each additional day of experience operators on L1 and L2 have, the percentage speed loss on the line decreases by nearly one-fortieth of a percentage point, or one percentage point in forty days. The factory manager confirms that his team focused on speed loss activities on both lines in the period examined.

Variables with no significant relationship with percentage speed loss are production stops and raw material issues (i.e., material availability and quality). These variables are expected to relate to increased speed loss as they interrupt flow, but this is not the case.

## **6 Discussion and Conclusions**

Based on a literature review, the paper developed a framework of 10 factors contributing to speed loss in manufacturing lines, grouped in three speed loss dimensions: (1) technology factors, (2) human factors, and (3) product factors. Though no interaction effects were identified in the regression modelling phase of the study, anecdotal evidence from the case study support the idea that the factors under these three dimensions indirectly can influence each other. For example, it was seen that the product variety at InsCo influenced the production planning decisions on both lines. Production planning and by-product drain also were found to interact since the draining of by-product from the furnace could be scheduled during a planned maintenance stop rather than during production uptime, thus avoiding the incurred speed loss.

With a basis in the constructed framework, a case study of speed loss on two process manufacturing lines was carried out. These studies revealed nine significant factors related to speed loss. The nine factors identified are mainly related to the process design and technology installed at the factory, factors which operators have little influence over in daily operations. Instead, engineering resources are needed to better understand and mitigate furnace limitations, by-product draining and raw material and recycling dosing, which are related to speed loss.

The results of the analysis highlight specific sources of variation in production speed at InsCo, helping factory management to identify logical means to address these sources. Addressing furnace limitations is a key step to enable both production lines to run closer to

their ideal speeds, and the study results inform the business case for redesign of the furnace or capital investment for new technology.

Also found to be significant in this study are human factors, such as production scheduling, learning curve, unambitious target setting, crew differences and machine breakdowns from improper maintenance [2, 3, 22, 23]. This finding indicates that sizeable improvements in speed loss can be made by applying lean and TPM approaches, such as the speed loss method applied by Nakajima [1] and the 5 Whys analysis used by Benjamin et al. [8]. Actions to further optimise production planning and to implement best practice across crews should also be taken.

While the coefficient for the learning curve variable implies that operators reduce their speed loss with time, the linear relationship is limited to interpolation within the analysed data set and should not be extrapolated. Extrapolation would assume that the speed loss can be minimised indefinitely as operators gain more experience, which is not feasible.

Production stops and material issues are not significantly related to the percentage speed loss for either production line studied. This finding suggests that while these operational interruptions may catch operators' attention in the data as they affect speed loss, they are relatively minor compared to the natural fluctuations inherent in the process technology and human resources. Here, the benefit of applying more advanced statistical techniques to the analysis of speed loss in process manufacturing settings can be seen.

No evidence is found in the analysis to support the impact of measurement error and product variety. However, the impact of product variety on speed loss is seen indirectly through runtime and order sequencing, as discussed in the literature [26]. With regard to measurement errors, these may have occurred to a smaller extent, while being undetected.

This study is potentially limited by its determination of speed targets, which might have been skewed by outliers. The researchers took actions to clean out obvious outliers to

avoid this problem. Additionally, it is possible that critical variables are omitted from the regression model unbeknownst to the researchers. Another study limitation is possible measurement errors in the sensors, which may have contributed to variability in the dependent and independent variables.

This study contributes with a framework of factors leading to speed loss and a parallel case study quantifying the impacts of the identified factors on speed loss on two insulation production lines. The results validate most speed loss factors described in the literature from a process manufacturing perspective and highlight the importance of technology and management-related factors in reducing speed loss. Speed loss was found to cause a 9-10% loss of production capacity on the two lines studied, falling within the previously described range of 9-15% in other TPM studies [3, 15]. Similar results are expected to be found in other capital-intensive, continuous-flow manufacturers (e.g. producers of foam mattresses, frozen baked goods and steel beams) due to the high rigidity and integration of the equipment. Finally, the paper demonstrated that the GLS regression approach utilised in this study is useful for practitioners to (1) identify factors related to speed loss; (2) set appropriate OEE and speed loss targets for unique production contexts; and (3) prepare business cases for capital investment to overcome technology-related speed loss factors.

Future research need to further explore the usefulness of the proposed framework and possibly extend it. Also, there is a need for more studies that examine what are the manor speed loss factors.

## References

1. Nakajima S (1988) Introduction to Total Productive Maintenance (TPM). Productivity Press, Cambridge, MA
2. Tsarouhas P (2007) Implementation of total productive maintenance in food industry:

- a case study. *J Qual Maint Eng* 13:5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552510710735087>
3. Ljungberg Ö (1998) Measurement of overall equipment effectiveness as a basis for TPM activities. *Int J Oper Prod Manag* 18:495–507.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01443579810206334>
  4. Ahmed S, Hassan MH, Taha Z (2004) State of implementation of TPM in SMIs: a survey study in Malaysia. *J Qual Maint Eng* 10:93–106.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13552510410539178>
  5. Nakajima S (1989) *TPM Development Program: Implementing Total Productive Maintenance*. Productivity Press, Cambridge, MA
  6. Zuashkiani A, Rahmandad H, Jardine AKS (2011) Mapping the dynamics of overall equipment effectiveness to enhance asset management practices. *J Qual Maint Eng* 17:74–92. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552511111116268>
  7. Jonsson P, Lesshammar M (1999) Evaluation and improvement of manufacturing performance measurement systems - the role of OEE. *Int J Oper Prod Manag* 19:55–78
  8. Benjamin SJ, Marathamuthu MS, Murugaiah U (2015) The use of 5-WHYs technique to eliminate OEE's speed loss in a manufacturing firm. *J Qual Maint Eng* 21:419–435.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-09-2013-0062>
  9. Hedman R, Subramaniyan M, Almström P (2016) Analysis of Critical Factors for Automatic Measurement of OEE. *Procedia CIRP* 57:128–133.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.11.023>
  10. Ljungberg Ö (1997) *Att Förstå & Tillämpa TPM* (in Swedish). Novum Grafiska AB, Gothenburg
  11. Dal B, Tugwell P, Greatbanks R (2000) Overall equipment effectiveness as a measure of operational improvement – A practical analysis. *Int J Oper Prod Manag* 20:1488–1502. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570010355750>

12. Muchiri P, Pintelon L (2008) Performance measurement using overall equipment effectiveness (OEE): Literature review and practical application discussion. *Int J Prod Res* 46:3517–3535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540601142645>
13. De Ron AJ, Rooda JE (2006) OEE and equipment effectiveness: An evaluation. *Int J Prod Res* 44:4987–5003. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540600573402>
14. Chan FTS, Lau HCW, Ip RWL, et al (2005) Implementation of total productive maintenance: A case study. *Int J Prod Econ* 95:71–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2003.10.021>
15. Ahmad N, Hossen J, Ali SM (2018) Improvement of overall equipment efficiency of ring frame through total productive maintenance: A textile case. *Int J Adv Manuf Technol* 94:239–256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-017-0783-2>
16. Morales Méndez JD, Rodríguez RS (2017) Total productive maintenance (TPM) as a tool for improving productivity: a case study of application in the bottleneck of an auto-parts machining line. *Int J Adv Manuf Technol* 92:1013–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-017-0052-4>
17. Ohunakin OS, Leramo RO (2012) TPM implementation in a beverage industry. *J. Eng. Appl. Sci.* 7:128–133
18. Tsarouhas PH (2013) Equipment performance evaluation in a production plant of traditional Italian cheese. *Int J Prod Res* 51:5897–5907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2013.807373>
19. Ogle RA, Carpenter AR (2014) Calculating the capacity of chemical plants. *Chem Eng Prog* 110:59–63
20. Anderson S, Sedatole KL (2013) Evidence on the Cost Hierarchy: The Association between Resource Consumption and Production Activities. *J Manag Account Res* 25:119–141. <https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar-50293>

21. Fisher ML, Ittner CD (1999) The Impact of Product Variety on Automobile Assembly Operations: Empirical Evidence and Simulation Analysis. *Manage Sci* 45:771–786. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.45.6.771>
22. Allwood JM, Childs THC, Clare AT, et al (2015) Manufacturing at double the speed. *J Mater Process Technol* 229:729–757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmatprotec.2015.10.028>
23. Aboutaleb A, Kang PS, Hamzaoui R, Duffy A (2017) Standalone closed-form formula for the throughput rate of asynchronous normally distributed serial flow lines. *J Manuf Syst* 43:117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2016.12.006>
24. Hopp WJ, Spearman ML (2008) *Factory Physics, Third Ed.* Waveland Press, Inc., Long Grove, IL, USA
25. De Ron AJ, Rooda JE (2005) Equipment effectiveness: OEE revisited. *IEEE Trans Semicond Manuf* 18:190–196. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSM.2004.836657>
26. Berry WL, Cooper MC (1999) Manufacturing flexibility: Methods for measuring the impact of product variety on performance in process industries. *J Oper Manag* 17:163–178
27. SEMI (2014) *Specification for Definition and Measurement of Equipment Productivity, SEMI E079-0814E.* Mt. View, CA
28. Nurani RK, Akella R (1992) Quality and Speed Trade-offs in Manufacturing Systems. In: *Proceedings of the 1992 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation.* Nice, France, pp 1145–1149
29. Yin RK (2018) *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods, Sixth Edit.* Los Angeles
30. Google (2018) Google Translate. <https://translate.google.com/>. Accessed 1 Jun 2018
31. Creswell JW (2014) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, Fourth Ed.* Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, California, USA

32. R Core Team (2018) R: A Language and environment for statistical computing
33. Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, et al (2018) nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models
34. Wooldridge JM (2006) Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach, Third Ed. Thomson Higher Education, Mason, Ohio

Appendix I Pearson's correlation coefficients for independent variables on L1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 RUNTIME														
2 NEXTSP	0.045													
3 PREVSP	0.101	0.26												
4 FURN	-0.072	0.07	-0.055											
5 TECH	-0.014	-0.046	-0.085	0.119										
6 PRSTOP	0.03	0.093	0.039	0.012	0.012									
7 QUAL	-0.062	0.044	-0.01	0.189	0.086	0.074								
8 RECYC	-0.265	0.077	-0.018	0.126	0.114	0.012	0.088							
9 RAWMAT	-0.147	0.018	0.104	0.034	0.052	0.073	0.042	-0.061						
10 BYPROD	-0.015	-0.011	0.022	-0.02	0.023	0.03	0.005	0.027	-0.017					
11 MATER	0.047	0.029	-0.016	-0.04	0.049	0.063	0.071	0.066	0.028	0				
12 LEARN	0.071	0.042	-0.028	0.325	-0.053	0.002	0.156	0.131	-0.073	0.006	0.054			
13 CREW1	-0.046	0.042	-0.01	0.223	0.047	0.024	0.134	0.091	-0.023	0.027	0.09	0.064		
14 CREW2	-0.082	-0.02	-0.043	0.101	0.109	0.027	0.119	0.175	0	0.03	0.144	0.028	0.518	
15 CREW3	-0.076	-0.005	-0.057	0.146	0.129	-0.175	0.095	0.231	0.002	0.017	0.057	0.075	0.507	0.521

Appendix II Pearson's correlation coefficients for independent variables on L2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 NEXTSP														
2 RUNTIME	-0.047													
3 PREVSP	0.264	0.132												
4 FURN	-0.003	-0.097	0.017											
5 TECH	-0.107	-0.097	0.071	0.06										
6 PRSTOP	0.066	-0.195	0.059	-0.007	-0.18									
7 QUAL	0.03	0.013	0.015	0.001	0.082	0.01								
8 RECYC	0.146	0.18	-0.123	0.083	-0.136	0.186	0.242							
9 RAWMAT	0.013	-0.176	-0.014	0.038	0.093	0.05	-0.01	0.076						
10 BYPROD	-0.006	-0.055	-0.034	-0.015	-0.012	0.075	0.028	0.053	-0.008					
11 MATER	0.049	-0.019	0.033	-0.061	0.078	-0.004	0.05	-0.036	0.025	-0.004				
12 LEARN	0.016	0.019	0.029	-0.126	-0.053	0.044	-0.075	-0.021	0.145	0.018	0.063			
13 CREW1	-0.018	0.041	-0.052	-0.07	-0.149	-0.04	-0.004	0.059	-0.031	-0.009	-0.059	-0.037		
14 CREW2	-0.051	0.054	-0.035	-0.201	-0.137	-0.066	-0.096	-0.011	0.035	-0.01	-0.046	0.009	0.51	
15 CREW3	-0.036	0.091	-0.021	-0.02	-0.083	0.034	0.005	0.037	0.004	0.003	0.027	0.007	0.499	0.49