



COMPETITIVENESS OF PRODUCTS, EQUIPMENT AND OF TECHNOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

GRIGORIEVA Natalia

Department of Mechanical Engineering technology,
Lutsk National Technical University; Lvov's str. 75, 43018, Lutsk, UKRAINE.
Corresponding author: Grigorieva Natalia: E-mail: vik_shabajkin@ukr.net

Submitted: 15.05.2015; accepted 25.05.2015.

Abstract. In the times of crisis, the competitive edge of a claimed produce acquires a special value. The paper considers the structure of competitiveness as a unity of quality, expenditure, profit and prices. It describes a method of forming competitiveness exemplifying, at the same time, an erroneous interpretation of competitiveness and methods of its "rapid determination". To analyze and synthesize an integral level of competitiveness, one may use the SADT-method of detailed step-by-step hierarchy of the objects under study. In this connection one can profit from the experience of the huge China and small Switzerland successfully reorganizing productions, diminishing concomitant costs, reducing release prices, combating corruption, creating favorable conditions for production and business.

Keywords: competitiveness, quality, SADT-method, product, experience.

1. Introduction

In machine building, as ultimately in other industries of the national economy, the produce, technological processes and processing equipment constitute a single complex providing competitiveness. In the conditions of crisis, the competitiveness of produce acquires a special significance as only competitive products, equipment and processes will be claimed on the part of both consumer, owing to a high quality and acceptable prices, and producers in view of lower costs and a possibility of creating work places. Simultaneously, a temporary decrease in profit will be necessary. The output of other produce will result in its non-claiming, warehousing, stagnation of production and aggravation of the crisis. Competitiveness is favorably influenced by crisis, it is the only index, recipient of further perfection. As is generally known, competitiveness is a property of objects that is characterized by a degree of real or potential satisfaction of a particular need as compared to analogous objects on a certain market [1]. Competitiveness is an integral value characterizing the attractiveness of products for the user and their profitability for the producer. It is difficult to talk about the competitiveness of products with a high cost of product output, but even at acceptable expenses, yet considerable operating expenditure or a high cost of produce, its competitiveness may

become doubtful. A concept of competitiveness is a compromise between the customer and the producer.

It is known that a competitiveness (*lat. concurre* to be rivals) is interpreted as a strife between the participants of market management for the most profitable conditions of production, purchase and sale of produce and services, as well as appropriation of maximum profits [1,2]. A competition is a self - regulator of economy with the functions of regulation, allocation, adaptation and controlling. The object of competition is the customer and producer, its subjects being enterprises, industries, regions, whole countries.

Statistics note [2] that only 10% of the developed technologies and constructions are put into operation, others, in view of their low-level competitiveness, are rejected. A similar situation is observed with technological equipment, especially automatic. Most publications on this subject are concentrated on the establishment of ready-made produce competitiveness, although of greater importance is the forming of competitiveness in the process of its production.

1.1. The test objective and tasks of analysis. The aim of the article is to ground the need for accurate representation competitiveness of production, its definition and the examples of possible errors. The objectives of the disclosure are a method of determining the competitive-

ness, an example of mistakes, bad choice of competitiveness criteria.

2. Method of determination competitiveness

The method for determining the level of competitiveness consists in the following. The information necessary for determining the level of competitiveness in-




Fig.1. Diagram for determining the level of competitiveness

cludes the indices of quality, all kinds of cost, profit and the price of sale (fig.1). Depending on whether this is a product, a process or a service, major indices of quality (1) are set. Further on production (2) and operating (3) costs, profit (4) and price of sale (5) are calculated. These addends constitute the sum total of the data necessary for determining the level of competitiveness (6). Following a reasonable choice of the prototype (7) a comparison index to determine competitiveness is developed. It is only through the reciprocal comparison of the indices of quality (8), cost (9), profit and the sale price (10) of the developed product, process or service (6) with the prototype (7) that one can obtain (11) partial integral levels of competitiveness (12), and through comparison (13) the integral level of the produce competitiveness (14) is obtainable. The presented factors and the work with them are the well-known points for determining a level of competitiveness. The exclusion of any of the factors from consideration does not make it possible to estimate, even approximately, the level of competitiveness, let alone a whole group of factors, such as cost, price etc. The same goes for the absence of a prototype. Having, for example, a product with the complete list of both indices of quality and of costs, profit and the price of sale, yet no prototype, it is impossible to judge about its competitiveness as the market can offer prototype products with both better or worse data, necessary for a determination like this.

The mechanism of forming the competitiveness of products envisages revealing and determining the influence of all the factors in the course of their production, sale and exploitation, relatively combined into

seven groups. Expenses, related to making the produce on design, technological and production levels, belong to the internal factors, which corresponds to the *construction - technology - manufacturing - and quality - chain*. It is known that the very design of the product is the basis for its competitiveness. Never once has any low-quality and hard-to-make produce been competitive. The mechanism of forming competitiveness is, at that, based on the application of the concept of virtual development, manufacturing and exploitation of the product, i.e. preliminary modeling of these processes on a computer with obtaining virtual constructions, technologies, exploitation and – on these grounds – an advance estimation of competitiveness. Positive results and further – already real – development make it possible to enhance still more both the indices of quality and the level of competitiveness. The virtual planning and exploitation require special and costly programs rare as a complex so far.

3. Quick “results” definitions competitiveness

The method for advance estimation of quality and competitiveness of products was published in paper [3]. However, the process of competitiveness management is hampered by its misinterpretation as well as methods of estimation occasionally occurring in some publications. Thus, for instance, papers [4,5] published in *Poland* (2007) and *Slovakia* (2008) propose the «*rapid method*» of determining the competitiveness of flexible manufacturing systems (*FMS*) and technological processes on the proposed «*criteria*» whose values should be put in simple arithmetic formulas of the deformed averages to obtain the final result of the competitiveness level. Such a solution to the problems is tempting. What is the point in exploiting the sophisticate familiar methods requiring numerous calculations, if the same result is arrived at quickly without the account of concomitant costs, basic indices of quality and even in the absence of the prototype?

The proposed «*rapid method*» consists in the following. On the strength of a number of «*criterion*», having point age estimations within the limits of 1...5 and the averaged deformed formulas in which it is necessary to put them and the values obtained, the «*complex index of competitiveness*» is determined. The distortion of the average data follows due to the increase of the number of values in the denominator and the introduction of the coefficients of scales for two groups of the selected «*criteria*». The proposed formulas for the estimation of *FMS* competitiveness take into account eight «*criteria*» only: flexibility, autonomy, productivity, reliability, serviceability, ecological compatibility, complexity and power consumption (fig.2 a) which cannot be the criteria of competitiveness in any positive way. At the same time, the determinations of these «*criteria*» and their point age estimations are erroneous, although these are well-known determinations. By flexibility, for example, an indirect index, viz. degree of the use of time during the implementation of various tasks is meant, although

it is common knowledge that flexibility is a possibility for a purposeful change of technological capacities within the range of changing the regulative parameters, i.e. a possible number of the processed products or their nomenclature. Autonomy is, for an unknown reason, defined as the time during which the *FMS* can operate unattended, although it is common knowledge that autonomy is independence, however, not of the maintenance staff. Productivity is not a correlation of the cost of the ready-made products over a certain period of time to the sum of the allocation costs related to the exploitation; neither is reliability a correlation of the average time of shutdown to the useful fund of time [4] etc.

ratio and others are, for an unknown reason, missing for the estimation of the applied technology. Firstly, many factors determining competitiveness are not taken into account in these methods. Specialists know that competitiveness is determined by quality, production and operating costs, profits, price when compared to a prototype. For some reason, important indices without which it is, generally speaking, impossible to judge about competitiveness are not reflected here. These are, for instance, technical level, accuracy, standardness, stability, material capacity, transportability, maintainability, efficiency, longevity, safety, diagnostic ability, controllability, as well as production and operating costs, price,




Fig.2. Diagram for determining the «level of competitiveness» for methods [4, 5]

Amusing is also the definition of ecological compatibility as a correlation of the mass of waste to that of the ready-made products, although it is known that one should take into account not the amount of the waste but their harmfulness for the environment. Almost all of the «criteria» have the same illite-rate definitions.

As many as ten «criteria» are advanced for the applied technology [5], viz.: contemporaneity, automation possibility, simplicity of readjustment, degree of normalization, operating safety, reliability of functioning, extent of integration, adaptability of the equipment, easiness of service and term of use (fig.2 b). By the way, many definitions of the «criteria» are also erroneous, although these are terms settled down long ago. Criteria such as productivity, accuracy, labor output

terms of supply, after-sale service etc. Totally absent is the comparison with the prototype. Secondly, if one substitutes the given formulas for the weights of the «criteria», most absurd results will be obtained. Thus, for instance, an *FMS* variant with a good flexibility, autonomy, productivity and reliability is equivalent to that with useless «criteria», like these, yet possessing a high serviceability, ecological compatibility, complexity and low-energy consumption. Such a «rapid» result is a proof of the total faulty of the method. Such a «rapid method» helps only erroneous estimations of the competitiveness of products, processes and equipment. The erroneousness of the «rapid method» is evident from the comparison of fig. 1 and 2.

4. Use of the SADT-method for determining of optimum competitiveness

To optimize the process of ensuring the level of competitiveness at lowered costs, one can apply the SADT (Structured Analysis and Design Technique) method of detailed successive hierarchy of the objects under study. On these hierarchical levels, the analyzed object is examined in detail, equivalently to the previous level; functions and blocks of realizing the tasks set are determined. Environmental effect is taken into account, too. However, the methods of dismemberment are wholly determined by the purpose set, and are not related to the SADT- method. The application of this method is related to the realization of the multivariable process of determining the integral level of competitiveness on the accepted set of the operating factors with their optimization.

The SADT- diagram of the entry level (fig.3)




Fig.3. SADT- diagram of the initial stage for determining the level of competitiveness (ILC)

takes into account the basic data, which are drafts of products, structure of the process or service, specificity of application, as well as analogues and the prototype, means of achieving the purpose set, and the output data. The method presupposes an employment of the four basic functions, viz. determination of indices for the quality of product, process or service, concomitant costs, profit and the price of sale. On the basis of the input data, taking into account the influence of external environment, fundamental indices of quality are determined. Simultaneously, these indices are determined on the basis of operating requirements with due account of the analogical ones in the prototype, which are supposed to be more optimal. Coming next is a calculation of production, extra-production and operating concomitant costs, followed by determining the income and the price of sale. By the well-known formulas [6] necessary data are calculated and comparison is made with the analogous ones in the prototype, which provides a basis for

determining the integral level of the object's competitiveness. If the level appears to be somewhat lower yet can be made higher, the product, process or service are sent to revision or are, reversely, rejected.

5. Conclusions

The universally accepted method for determining the level of competitiveness envisages an obligatory taking into account of the indices of quality, development costs, introduction and exploitation, technological prime-cost of the products made on its application in comparison with the prototype. Managing the competitiveness of products, technologies and equipment particularly in the conditions of crisis except for marketing and application of the mechanism of directed forming envisages a reorganization in conducting designer, technological and production operations aimed at improving the quality indexes with a reduction of production costs due to the optimization of all links of the production

chain, co-operation and specialization. The same goes for the reduction of operating costs. Acceptability of the price of products in the time of crisis must be provided due to marketing, management and diminishing of the profit expected. Nonproductive costs can be reduced by reorganizing the infrastructure, deliveries, advertising etc., esp. by eliminating unplanned expenses in the form of bribery, recoiling etc. Special significance is attached to legal enterprise, tax-reduction, profit regulation, legal assistance, inflation, sponsorship etc.

In this connection one can profit from the experience of the huge China and small Switzerland successfully reorganizing productions, diminishing concomitant costs, reducing release prices, combating corruption, creating favorable conditions for production and business.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Professor, Department of Management of the Lvov Institute of Management Victoria Antonovycha Shabajkovicha for providing results of the investigation of competitive products.

References

1. Kuzmin O.S., Horbal N.I. Managing an International Competitiveness of the Enterprise. – Lviv: KOMPAKT-LV. 2005 – 304 pp.
2. Volchkevich L.I. Competitiveness of the Automatic Assembling in a Discrete Production. In: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference «Module Technologies and Constructions in the Technology of Machines». – Rzeszow, 2006. – P. 9-14.
3. Shabaykovych V.A., Grigoryeva N.S. Advance Estimation of the Quality and Competitiveness of Products. In: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference. Vol. 4. – Donetsk, 2008. – P. 3-6.
4. Lunarski E., Stadnicka D. Estimation of Competitiveness Level of the Applied Technology. Technology and Automation of Assembling. – Issues 2-3. – Warsaw, 2007. – P. 25-29.
5. Lunarski E. Determination of the Competitiveness of Flexible Manufacturing Systems. In: Akta Mechanika, Slovacja 2-A, 2008. – P. 381-386.
6. Kindrat A.G., Voloshchak R.P. Management of Competitiveness. – Moscow: Economics Publishers, 2002. – 308 pp.